

## ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES

March 19, 2008 – 3:00 P.M.

Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

### A. CALL TO ORDER – Chair

The meeting was called to order by the chair Tilmon Brown at 3:00. The members present were Tom Karwinski, Harris Oswalt, Cameron Pfeiffer, Tilmon Brown, Bunky Ralph, Craig Roberts, Jim Wagoner and Barja Wilson. The Minutes of the previous meeting were unanimously approved per a motion of Bunky Ralph and second of Tom Karwinski. The Mid-Month Requests were approved as submitted per a motion of Harris Oswalt and a second of Bunky Ralph.

### B. MID-MONTH APPROVALS

1. **Applicant's Name:** Melanie Bunting  
**Property Address:** 1010 New St. Francis Street  
**Date of Approval:** February 25, 2008  
Repair/replace rotted wood on the exterior with wood to match existing in profile and dimension. Repaint residence in the following color scheme:
  - Body – BLP Monticello, RC29
  - Trim – BLP Summerville Red
  - Accents – Sherwin Williams Library Pewter, SW0038
  - Ironwork – BLP Strowbridge Manor, RC17
2. **Applicant's Name:** Lipford Construction  
**Property Address:** 152 South Monterey Street  
**Date of Approval:** February 25, 2008  
Replace rotten wood on siding, porch deck and columns with new materials to existing in profile, dimension and material.
3. **Applicant's Name:** Howard McPhail  
**Property Address:** 261 Rapier Avenue  
**Date of Approval:** February 25, 2008  
Repaint residence in the existing color scheme.
4. **Applicant's Name:** Bowen Maintenance Corporation  
**Property Address:** 1013 Savannah Street  
**Date of Approval:** February 27, 2008  
Replace rotten wood elements on the front porch with wood to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Repaint in the existing color scheme.
5. **Applicant's Name:** Cameron Pfeiffer  
**Property Address:** 204 Michigan Avenue  
**Date of Approval:** February 27, 2008  
Install Icylene spray foam insulation to the sub-floor of the residence.
6. **Applicant's Name:** Edward Adams  
**Property Address:** 1209 Selma Street  
**Date of Approval:** February 28, 2008  
Repaint building in the following Sherwin Williams color scheme:
  - Body – Downing Straw, SW2813
  - Door – Rookwood Red, SW 2802
  - Porch Floor – Rookwood Dark Green, SW 2816
  - Windows and Columns – White
7. **Applicant's Name:** Kit Linck Construction  
**Property Address:** 16 Oakland Terrace  
**Date of Approval:** February 28, 2008  
Install new roof using architectural 3 tab shingles, onyx black in color.

8. **Applicant's Name:** John Peruzzo  
**Property Address:** 52 LeMoyne Place  
**Date of Approval:** February 28, 2008  
Repair/replace the wood staircase to the rear garage/guest cottage with new materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension. New elements will be rebuilt to the exact specifications of the original staircase. All new lumber will be pressure treated.
9. **Applicant's Name:** John Moore  
**Property Address:** 1050 Dauphin Street  
**Date of Approval:** February 28, 2008  
Paint building in the existing Sherwin Williams color scheme:
- Body – Inviting Ivory, SW 6372
  - Trim – White
10. **Applicant's Name:** Conde-Charlotte Museum House  
**Property Address:** 104 Theatre Street  
**Date of Approval:** February 29, 2008  
Paint building in the following Benjamin Moore color scheme:
- Body – Monterey White, HC27
  - Trim – Off White
  - Porch Floor and Back Steps – Battleship Grey
11. **Applicant's Name:** Carla Sharrow  
**Property Address:** 1611 Government Street  
**Date of Approval:** March 3, 2008  
Renewal of COA dated 10/10/06. Repair to rotten wood as necessary with new wood to match existing in material, dimension and profile. Paint exterior in the following color scheme:
- Body – Faint Coral of Quaint Peche
  - Trim – White
12. **Applicant's Name:** Stauter Construction  
**Property Address:** 359 Church Street  
**Date of Approval:** March 3, 2008  
Repair/replace rotted wood with new wood to match existing in material, profile and dimension.
13. **Applicant's Name:** Susan C Kirk  
**Property Address:** 162 Dexter Avenue  
**Date of Approval:** March 3, 2008  
Repair/replace rotten wood to match existing in material, profile and dimension, including siding, railing and part of rear door. Reinstall removed gate. Touch up paint, including painting rear to match rest of house.
14. **Applicant's Name:** Nicholas A. Vrakelos  
**Property Address:** 56 LeMoyne Place  
**Date of Approval:** March 3, 2008  
Renewal of COA dated 05/24/07. Repair and/or replace damaged and deteriorated wood cornice, soffit and fascia as necessary with new materials to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Paint new materials to match existing. Install new roof with charcoal gray, black or weathered wood shingles.
15. **Applicant's Name:** Image Designs Inc/Cunningham Bounds  
**Property Address:** 1601 Dauphin Street  
**Date of Approval:** March 3, 2008  
Replace the existing face of the Cunningham Bounds monument sign with a new 20SF non-illuminated burgundy and black painted aluminum face with the Cunningham Bounds logo.
16. **Applicant's Name:** Roy Allgauer and Mary McGinnis  
**Property Address:** 114 Macy Place  
**Date of Approval:** March 4, 2008  
Repave drive with pea gravel and replace concrete walk from sidewalk to porch steps with tan pavers.

17. **Applicant's Name:** A1 Roofing  
**Property Address:** 160 South Cedar Street  
**Date of Approval:** March 4, 2008

Repair leak on the rear of the roof with shingles to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Repair/replace rotten wood fascia and siding with new wood to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Repaint residence in the existing color scheme.

#### C. OLD BUSINESS

1. **150-07-CA:** 1107 Elmira Street  
**Applicant:** Marc Jackson  
**Request:** Reconstruct the residence.  
**Approved:** Certified Record attached.

#### D. NEW BUSINESS

1. **019-08-CA:** 62 South Royal Street/112 Government Street  
**Applicant:** Mike Cowart/Windwood Mobile LLC  
**Request:** Repave existing parking area, add landscaping and irrigation, continue existing fence, install entry gates, add a waste dumpster, install a sign.  
**Approved:** Lighting to be submitted, Certified Record attached.
2. **020-08-CA:** 103 South Ann Street  
**Applicant:** E. Crosby Latham  
**Request:** Reroof, repair exterior wood elements, install shutters, repaint and replace front porch decking.  
**Approved:** As amended, Certified Record attached.
3. **021-08-CA:** 26 North Royal Street  
**Applicant:** Annie Ingram/Goodwin, Mills and Cawood Inc  
**Request:** Install five retractable awnings and one permanent awning with a sign.  
**Approved:** Certified Record attached.
4. **022-08-CA:** 1118 Palmetto Street  
**Applicant:** Floyd Hendricks/Douglas Kearley  
**Request:** Add a side gable roof dormer.  
**Approved:** Certified Record attached.
5. **023-08-CA:** 210 Dauphin Street  
**Applicant:** Max Morey and John Switzer/Douglas Kearley  
**Request:** Reconstruct the front façade and the north and west walls.  
**Approved:** Balcony to be submitted, Certified Record attached.
6. **024-08-CA:** 260 North Jackson Street  
**Applicant:** Lowerline Properties LLC/Tom Karwinski  
**Request:** Remodel existing building into four units, add new parking and install a fence.  
**Approved:** Certified Record attached.
7. **025-08-CA:** 62 North Reed Street  
**Applicant:** Tom Radcliff  
**Request:** Replace the front porch columns and front doors.  
**Tabled:** Certified Record attached.

#### E. OTHER BUSINESS and ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Staff presented an application from David Gwatkin to the Board for an ADA access ramp at 308 West Street. After reviewing the submitted plans, the Board voted to allow Staff to approve the ramp as a mid-month.
2. Flo Kessler was present to discuss the appeal of 805 Church Street. Ms. Kessler reviewed the history of the project beginning with the November 2005 application. She then stated a settlement had been reached and would be presented to the City Council. She asked for the Board to approve the settlement which would have the blue panels painted the

originally proposed colors; have the curb cut in front of the building removed; and landscape the property in accordance with the minimum standards of the Landscape Ordinance. The porch would remain without any alterations.

Discussion ensued concerning the procedures and how the settlement was reached. Concern was expressed that the Board had been left out of the negotiation process. John Lawler explained procedures and stated that it was not unusual for staff to negotiate settlements for City Boards.

Celia Lewis, a neighbor, stated that she and others had and do obey the rules of the Review Board. She pointed out that her husband is a restoration contractor often works in the historic districts and he follows the rules. She believes that if this negotiation or appeal is allowed the ordinance is virtually nullified, as anyone who objects to an ARB decision will simply negotiate a settlement. This she believes will result in a greatly weakened ordinance and will cause long-term harm to the historic districts. Ms. Lewis requested the ARB stand firm on their original decision after Board member Craig Roberts asked what the neighbors wanted the ARB to do.

Marie Dyson, president of the Church Street East Historic District, addressed the Board. She reiterated the statements and concerns of Ms. Lewis. She agreed that the ARB should stand firm and asked that the Board reject the settlement.

Several Board members spoke to the procedural issue of why this issue came back to the Board. Ms. Kessler explained that Councilman Carroll had been working to resolve the problem and this was being done to assist his actions.

Craig Roberts called the question, but Councilman Carroll was asked to address the Board. He believes the Council will overturn the Board. He stated he thought this would have a long-term negative impact on the ARB and the preservation process. He stated that Board members represented the Council and though they should consider the opinions of the public, he felt it was important that the Board maintain its good standing with the Council. Craig Roberts asked if that meant the Board was supposed to be a rubber stamp for the Council.

Discussion was ongoing about the settlement and much of it focused on the porch. Cameron Pfeiffer read from the most recent application – including the public hearing commentary and previous minutes – that in past meetings, it was the porch which had been most discussed by the Board as being inappropriate per ARB guidelines in light of the significance and prominence of the facades of historic buildings or non-contributing buildings in historic districts. The Board also discussed that the most recent application had already been an endeavor to reach a settlement or compromise with the applicant regarding many items, including the porch. However, with the current settlement presented, the applicant was still not addressing the porch.

The chair stated he believed that this had become a political issue and was no longer about the building. He stated that the appeal would never have gone so far if the appeal had been to the courts and that politics needed to be removed from the process. Councilman Carroll agreed that the appeals should go to Court and he was working on an ordinance change to see that happened.

Jim Wagoner asked what guarantees the Board had that the work would be done as provided for in the settlement and how long would it take to have the corrective actions taken. Doug Anderson, attorney for the applicant, stated he believed a mutually acceptable time could be worked out before the matter went back to the Council the following Tuesday.

Harris Oswalt moved the ARB agree to the terms of the settlement provided all proposed corrective actions be completed within 60 days. The motion died for lack of a second.

**F. ADJOURNMENT:** The meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

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

**150-07-CA:** 1107 Elmira Street  
**Applicant:** Marc Jackson  
**Received:** 08/23/07  
**Meeting:** 09/10/07

**Resubmitted:** 02/18/08  
**Meeting:** 03/05/08

**Resubmitted:** 03/05/08  
**Meeting:** 03/19/08

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Oakleigh Garden  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Reconstruct the residence.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to previous records, this one-story frame residence was built circa 1880 and modified circa 1910. It has undergone numerous alterations since then and suffered considerable damage in Hurricane Katrina when a tree fell on it. The building, except for the façade, was dismantled in February 2008.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

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

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. Mr. Jackson received funds through the Hurricanes Katrina and Rita grant program in order to return the residence to a habitable condition. This application was denied the first time due to the nature of the renovation; however, he has since worked closely with staff to develop an acceptable plan. In the interim between the two Board meetings, the tree was removed and the building dismantled.
- B. The Guidelines call for renovations and new additions to be sympathetic to the age and style of the building.
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
1. Replace the rear stoop with a 30’-10” x 40’-10” one-story addition with porch per the submitted plans.
    - a. Foundation will be brick piers with wood lattice.
    - b. Siding will be wood lap.
    - c. Roof will be fiberglass shingles.
    - d. Windows will be wood 6/6 sashes with true divided lights.
    - e. The rear porch will have 6x6 wood posts with capitals and handrails.
    - f. Design elements such as the trim, fascia, roof overhang, etc will match the former residence.
  2. Reconstruct the formerly existing residence per the submitted plans.
    - a. Removed materials will be reused, including the brick piers, fireplace and wood sash windows.
    - b. The residence will need to be rebuilt to the current building code.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Based on the submitted information, staff feels that reconstructing the residence will not impair the historic integrity of the district. Although Mr. Jackson will have to follow current building codes, most – if not all – of the salvaged material will be reused. Also, the proposed addition will match the existing design and materials.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Mr. Jackson was present to discuss the application. He stated he would reuse all salvaged materials including all the windows. He would have plywood prepared to meet the wind requirements. For the addition he will be using wood, true divided light sash to match the historic windows on the house.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussed the request. There was concern about the lack removal of the majority of the historic building. The staff noted that the Katrina grant from the State might be in danger of being rescinded due to the extreme damage done to the house. The applicant replied he had spoken with the AHC and the grant was still approved.

**FINDING OF FACT**

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

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Harris Oswald 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: 3/19/09.**

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

**019-08-CA:** 62 South Royal Street/112 Government Street  
**Applicant:** Mike Cowart/Windwood Mobile LLC  
**Received:** 02/18/08 (+45 Days: 04/03/08)  
**Meeting:** 03/19/08

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Church Street East (112 Government Street only)

**Classification:** Non-Contributing

**Zoning:** B-4

**Project:** Repave existing parking area, add landscaping and irrigation, continue existing fence, install entry gates, add a waste dumpster, install a sign.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This lot has been parking for many years. It is now part of the Hampton Inn and Suites at 62 South Royal.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

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

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. As mentioned above, this is currently an asphalt parking lot with some landscaping and a fence along South Royal and part of Government.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, "parking areas should be minimized through good site planning and design...and should be screened by the use of low masonry walls, wood or iron fences or landscaping. Lighting [must] avoid invading surrounding areas." Dumpsters should be screened.
- C. The Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile state that signs shall "relate to the design of the principal building [and] shall use focused, low intensity illumination."
- D. The proposed work includes the following:
  1. Repave the existing parking lot with new asphalt per the submitted plan.
  2. Add landscaping and irrigation per the submitted plan.
  3. Continue the existing iron fence to surround the parking area per the submitted plan.
  4. Install entry draw gates and metal ticket dispensers at Government and Conti per the submitted plan.
  5. Install a dumpster at St. Emanuel per the submitted plan.
    - a. It will sit on a diagonal from St. Emanuel and have concrete bollards.
    - b. It will have an 8'-0" masonry wall with brick veneer and an aluminum cap be on three sides.
    - c. There will be an 8'-0" steel gates with rough sawn cedar planks on one side.
  6. Install one 5'-0" tall, 20SF single-faced aluminum monument sign at South Royal.
    - a. The base will be brick to match the Hampton Inn and Suites building.
    - b. Lighting will be external, ground-mounted floodlights directed to the sign face.

**RECOMMENDATION**

The majority of the proposed work will not impair the historic integrity of the district. The parking lot is extant and the sign falls within the standards of the Guidelines. The dumpster will be screened from view by the masonry enclosure and the angle in which it sits, although staff is concerned that it is in a relatively prominent location. Also, staff feels there should be more interior landscaping. The locations for the proposed lighting are known; however, the applicant has not determined the type and style. All light should be directed internally and any spill over should be eliminated.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Mike Cowart was present to discuss the applications. There will be two more green areas and three light fixtures added to the plan. The sign will have a spotlight and brick base to match the brick on the building. The dumpster will face the parking lot across St. Emanuel and not the buildings. The wall will have a metal brick cap, painted to match the brick. The owners believe that the land will be used for other purposes in the future and a parking deck may eventually be built on part of the property. There was an addendum to the to install shutters on the windows of Veet's next door to provide privacy to the guests.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussed the request. There was general agreement that the shutter solution was an appropriate manner to meet the hotel owner's goals. Also, the Board asked that the light standards be brought back to the Board.

### **FINDING OF FACT**

Jim Wagoner moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report with the addition of Fact E: Shutters will be placed on the windows on the north side of Veet's per the submitted plan. The motion was seconded by Craig Roberts 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 and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Cameron Pfeiffer and unanimously approved. **Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 3/19/09.**

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

**020-08-CA:** 103 South Ann Street  
**Applicant:** E. Crosby Latham  
**Received:** 03/03/08 (+45 Days: 04/16/08)  
**Meeting:** 03/19/08

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Reroof, repair exterior wood elements, install shutters, repaint, replace front porch decking.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This two-story frame residence with Italianate detailing was constructed circa 1876. It was moved to its current address in 1934 from the NE corner of Government and Ann when the Catholic Diocese sold the land to Shell. It has been used as a five-unit apartment for a number of years.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

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

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. This residence is currently in good condition. As mentioned above, it has been used as a five-unit apartment for a number of years and the new owners wish to turn it back to a single-family dwelling. Formerly on the Endangered Properties List, it was renovated with the help of a façade grant in 1993.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “the exterior material of a building helps define its style, quality and historic period. Original [material] should be retained and repaired. Replacement of exterior finishes, when required, must match the original in profile, dimension and material.”
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
1. Replace the flashing and shingles with new flashing and Timberline architectural shingles in a grey blend.
  2. Repair/replace as needed exterior wood elements to include eaves, siding and windows with materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension.
  3. Install operable wood louver shutters.
  4. Paint in the following Ace Paint color scheme:
    - a. Body – Silent White, E39
    - b. All trim, front porch columns, railing and door – White
    - c. Shutters, foundation brick and stucco – India Ink, F59
  5. Replace the front porch deck and balcony with Pewter/Escapes Trex Engineered Decking.

**RECOMMENDATION**

The majority of the proposed work is typical maintenance that will not impair the historic integrity of the building or district and the operable wood shutters are also an acceptable treatment for this residence. However, replacing the wood decking on the front porch and balcony with PVC engineered decking is inappropriate and staff recommends denying this part of the application.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Cosby Latham and Deborah Krauss were present to discuss the application. The application was expanded to install an 8x8 garden shed, Williamsburg Classic by Gardensheds. Also, operable shutters will be added to the house the rear stairs will be removed from the house. The rear balustrade will be 36” high and the columns will be 15x15.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussed the request. There was concern about the use of the PVC engineered decking on the front porch and balcony. The owner agreed to use wood that matched the historic wood.

### **FINDING OF FACT**

Cameron Pfeiffer moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report with the addition of Fact D: Install an 8x8 Williamsburg Classic garden shed manufactured by Gardensheds as presented to the Board per the submitted brochure, and Fact E: Remove the rear stairs; and altering fact C.5. to read: "Repair the front porch deck and balcony with wood to match the original in profile and dimension." The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph and unanimously approved.

### **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Bunky Ralph 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 Craig Roberts and unanimously approved. **Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 3/19/09.**

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

**021-08-CA:** 26 North Royal Street  
**Applicant:** Annie Ingram/Goodwin, Mills and Cawood Inc  
**Received:** 02/28/08 (+45 Days: 04/13/08)  
**Meeting:** 03/19/08

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Lower Dauphin  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** B-4  
**Project:** Install five retractable awnings and one permanent awning with a sign.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

The Battle House Hotel was built in 1908. It is the second Battle House Hotel on the site; the first was destroyed in a fire.

**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 opened as a hotel once again in early 2007 and is part of the RSA complex of buildings. This part of the ground floor area is being renovated into the Joe Cain Café, which has 45 linear feet of frontage.
- B. The Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and along Government Street 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.” Awnings are reviewed on a case-by-case basis.
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
  1. Install one permanent 14’-0” wide by 5’-0” tall by 14’-0” deep eggplant-colored canvas awning over the main door.
    - a. Four metal poles sunk into the ground will hold it up.
    - b. It will have one 9SF logo sign on each side, totaling 27SF.
  2. Install one retractable 1’-6” tall by 10’-0” deep (fully extended) eggplant-colored canvas awning at each window, totaling five.
  3. Install one 8SF etched bronze flush-mounted wall sign at the main door.
  4. The total sign package is approximately 35SF.

**RECOMMENDATION**

As with many commercial buildings, the ground floor of the Battle House has been altered a number of times throughout the years; therefore, staff feels that an awning and sign will not impair the historic integrity of the building or district. Because staff is unsure of how the awnings will be attached in order to create the least amount of damage, the applicant will bring the mounting system to the meeting. It is unclear if the retractable awnings will also have the restaurant logo. The applicant is advised to contact the Right-of-Way Department to secure permission to build on and over the City’s right of way.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Annie Ingram and Jerry Dickerson were present to discuss the application. They brought information on colors and styles. The projecting awnings will be reduced in size from 10’ to 6’ and the restaurant logo will indeed be on all of the awnings. The mounting will be screwed into the wood lintels of the windows with two screws. The extended supported canopy will have the housing for the poles in the ground, but they will not be tapered as originally planned. Douglas Kearley, in the audience, commented that the purple, green and gold colors requested for the awning were New Orleans colors and that Mobile’s colors were just purple and gold.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

Several members expressed a preference for the tapered poles but agreed the straight poles did not impair the building.

### **FINDING OF FACT**

Harris Oswalt moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report altering fact C.2. to read: "Install one retractable 1'-6" tall by 6'-0" deep (fully extended) eggplant-colored canvas awning at each window, totaling five." The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph and unanimously approved.

### **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Jim Wagoner and unanimously approved. **Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 3/19/09.**

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

**022-08-CA:** 1118 Palmetto Street  
**Applicant:** Floyd Hendricks/Douglas Kearley  
**Received:** 02/28/08 (+45 Days: 04/13/08)  
**Meeting:** 03/19/08

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Oakleigh Garden  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Add a side gable roof dormer.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to previous records, this two-story frame residence was built circa 1854; however, its Victorian-era detailing dates to the 1890s.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

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

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. Mr. Hendricks is renovating the attic level of the residence to create more living space.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “[a]ccessory roof elements not original to the structure, such as vents, skylights, satellite dishes, etc, shall be located inconspicuously.”
- C. The proposed work will add a gabled dormer (approximately 4’-0” deep by 3’-0” wide by 9’-0” tall) at the west elevation in between two existing chimneys. All new materials will match existing materials to include the wood lap siding, wood trim, wood corner boards, wood sash window and shingle roof.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the changes will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district. The dormer is a small addition that will be located toward the rear of the residence in between two chimneys and all the new materials will match existing. The existing roof and the interior have dictated its size, shape and pitch. Staff recommends approving the application.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Douglas Kearley was present to answer any questions of the Board. He noted that the size and shape of the dormer was dictated by its position between two chimneys.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

There was no further Board discussion.

**FINDING OF FACT**

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

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Bunky Ralph 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 Craig Roberts and unanimously approved. **Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 3/19/09.**

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

**023-08-CA:** 210 Dauphin Street  
**Applicant:** Max Morey and John Switzer/Douglas Kearley  
**Received:** 03/04/08 (+45 Days: 04/18/08)  
**Meeting:** 03/19/08

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Lower Dauphin  
**Classification:** Contributing (but integrity was lost due to a fire)  
**Zoning:** B-4  
**Project:** Reconstruct the front façade and the north and west walls.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to previous records, this masonry commercial building was constructed circa 1885. As with most commercial buildings, the storefront has been altered a number of times. The building suffered a fire that damaged the majority of it in 2004 and left the previously exposed interior brick walls unsupported.

**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 the proposed change...will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the historic district...”

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. As mentioned above, this building suffered a serious fire in 2004 and it is now essentially a shell. Long before that, the building on the west side was demolished, leaving the interior brick of 210 Dauphin exposed. Due to these things, the building has lost much of its integrity.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines call for renovations to be sympathetic to the age and style of the building.
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
  1. Repair, replace or reconstruct as needed existing elements on the front façade.
    - a. The pressed tin cornice will be scraped, primed and painted.
    - b. Cast iron washer anchors will be installed and painted to match the brick or stucco.
    - c. New window hoods and brackets will be cast from the remaining hood.
    - d. New 2/2 clad wood sash windows will be installed to meet current wind/impact load requirements.
    - e. The iron balcony rail, brackets and wood decking will be reinstalled with the addition of Lawler #9047 casting at the bottom to bring height to 42”.
    - f. Stucco will be matched with sand-finished stucco, primed and painted.
    - g. Wood trim will be scraped, primed and painted.
    - h. The storefront will have aluminum windows and paired doors installed to meet current wind/impact load requirements.
    - i. The bulkhead will be stucco over 8” CMU.
    - j. There will be a 4-panel wood door with transom on the left side.
  2. Repoint the existing brick and reset the existing terra cotta coping on the right side of the west elevation.
  3. Demolish and reconstruct the north and left-side west walls with stucco on cement board and metal lath.
  4. Install 2/2 clad wood sash windows and a rear metal door at the north elevation.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Because of the amount of work to be done, many of the new elements will need to be up to current code, including the height of the iron balcony and the impact resistance of the storefront windows. As mentioned above, much of the building’s integrity was impaired from fire and exposure. Staff feels that the majority of the work will not impair the integrity of the district. However, staff feels the storefront should be wood or masonry rather than aluminum. Staff also questions if there is a more acceptable treatment than demolishing and rebuilding the north and west walls with new materials. This building has an easement and the Properties Committee will need to approve all work before it commences.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Douglas Kearley and John Switzer, the owner, were present to address the application. They noted there is a new cinder block wall with interior steel structure. They agreed to use a wood storefront instead of an aluminum storefront but would like to

extend the proposed balcony eight feet to within 18 inches of the curb. Four-inch pipe columns will support the balcony and the original rail will be utilized and reproduced to complete the surround.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board noted that no elevation with the proposed balcony was submitted and requested one.

#### **FINDING OF FACT**

Cameron Pfeiffer moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report altering fact C.1.h. to read: "The storefront will have wood windows and paired doors installed to meet current wind/impact load requirements." The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph and unanimously approved.

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

Bunky Ralph 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 on condition that an elevation of the gallery be submitted. The motion was seconded by Craig Roberts and unanimously approved. **Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 3/19/09.**

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

**024-08-CA:** 260 North Jackson Street  
**Applicant:** Lowerline Properties LLC/Tom Karwinski  
**Received:** 02/29/08 (+45 Days: 04/14/08)  
**Meeting:** 03/19/08

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** DeTonti Square  
**Classification:** Non-Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-B  
**Project:** Remodel existing building into four units, add new parking and install a fence.  
**Conflicts of Interest:** Tom Karwinski recused himself and left the room.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to previous records, this two-story masonry building was constructed in 1964.

**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 being used as commercial and residential space. It is a non-historic building with few defining features. The area to the north is a grassy lot.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines call for renovations and new additions to respect the age and style of a building as well as to respect the character of the historic district.
- C. The proposed work on the building includes the following:
  1. Front Elevation
    - a. Repair and match as needed the existing stucco exterior.
    - b. Reduce the size of the second floor window openings to install white 6/6 wood clad windows.
    - c. Retain the size of the first floor window openings and install white 6/6 wood clad windows with transoms.
    - d. Remove the stairs but retain the landing on the second floor and add a metal guardrail.
    - e. Install a single French door with transom on the first floor and paired French doors on the second.
    - f. Enclose the openings on the front wall with materials to match existing.
  2. Rear Elevation
    - a. Repair and match as needed the existing stucco exterior.
    - b. Continue the front dentil cornice detail around the building.
    - c. Enclose all existing openings and remove the stairs.
    - d. Create new openings on the second floor and install white 6/6 wood clad windows.
    - e. Create new openings on the first floor and install paired French doors with transoms.
  3. South Elevation
    - a. Repair and match as needed the existing stucco exterior.
    - b. Continue the front dentil cornice detail around the building.
    - c. Enclose all existing openings.
    - d. Create new openings on the second floor and install white 6/6 wood clad windows.
    - e. Create new openings on the first floor and install white 6/6 wood clad windows with transoms.
    - f. Add new vents if needed.
  4. North Elevation
    - a. Repair and match as needed the existing stucco exterior.
    - b. Continue the front dentil cornice detail around the building.
    - c. Enclose all existing openings.
    - d. Create new openings on the second floor and install white 6/6 and 8-pane wood clad windows.
    - e. Create new openings on the first floor and install white 8-pane wood clad windows.
    - f. Alter the downspouts to allow new windows.
    - g. Create a new gable front entry with iron columns and a door with sidelights and a transom.

D. The proposed work on the site includes the following:

1. Leave all existing walls and repair as needed with materials to match.
2. Install a new concrete walk to the new shared entrance.
3. Create an area for garbage cans with a 6'-0" fence on three sides.
4. Install a 6'-0" metal picket fence on top of the existing block wall.
5. Install a 6'-0" metal picket fence with capped stucco columns along the front and north sides of the parking area.
6. Install an 8'-0" wood privacy fence at the corner of the building by the trash cans.
7. Create a new parking area to the north of the building using concrete parking pads and bumpers, concrete curbs and a grasscrete driving field.
8. Landscape around parking area.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the changes to the building will not impair the historic integrity of the district. This is a non-contributing, non-historic structure with few defining features. Also, staff feels the parking area will not impair the historic integrity of the district. While the area where the cars park will have concrete, the remaining area will have grasscrete and landscaping to give it the effect of a grassy lot. Staff recommends approving the application.

#### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

William Tonsmiere was present to answer any questions of the Board.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussed the request noting the use of the grasscrete.

#### **FINDING OF FACT**

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

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

Bunky Ralph 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 Cameron Pfeiffer and unanimously approved. **Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 3/19/09.**

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

**025-08-CA:** 62 North Reed Avenue  
**Applicant:** Tom Radcliff  
**Received:** 03/10/08 (+45 Days: 04/24/08)  
**Meeting:** 10/15/07

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Replace the front porch columns and front doors.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

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

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

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

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. The porch and front façade appear to have been altered at some point.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state that renovations and new additions should respect the age and style of the building.
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
  - 1. Replace the paired 4x4 posts at the front porch with paired 8x8 square posts per the submitted plans.
  - 2. Replace the door on the right side of the façade with a window per the submitted plans.
  - 3. Replace the door on the right side of the façade with a new door.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff feels the proposed posts will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district. Mr. Radcliff has expressed a desire to remove the brick plinths. However, although the porch and front façade appear to have been altered at some point, staff has recommended against it. The Board has generally ruled against enclosing secondary doors when it is a defining feature of the style, such as Creole Cottages, but they have allowed later doors to be removed as long as the solid to void ratio is maintained. Although the second door has likely also reached historic status, the door opening will only be partially enclosed, therefore maintaining the solid to void proportion of the front façade. The solid 6-panel main door, which is not typical of the era, is recent. Staff feels a more appropriate door is acceptable; however, final approval should be contingent upon staff seeing a photo or specifications of the proposed door before installation.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Tom Radcliff was present. He stated that a magazine had offered to pay for alterations to the house but it had to be done within three weeks. He stated that he would have custom windows and doors within that period to complete the project. He felt that the columns on the raised brick piers were too thin and were not original. Craig Roberts expressed concern that there was not an elevation showing what the building would look like with the columns the owner suggested. Other Board members agreed. The owner was unable to explain how the changes would be made or what exactly they would look like.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

Though there was objection to the project’s concept, Craig Roberts noted the plans were inadequate to understand the proposal.

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

There was no Finding of Fact. Harris Oswalt moved that the application be tabled for lack of information. The motion was seconded by Tom Karwinski and approved with Roberts and unanimously approved.