

## ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES

April 16, 2008 – 3:00 P.M.

### A. CALL TO ORDER – Chair

The meeting was called to order by the chair Tilmon Brown at 3:00. Staff read the Introductory Statement. The members present were Tom Karwinski, Tilmon Brown, Bunky Ralph, Michael Mayberry, Craig Roberts, Cameron Pfeiffer and Barja Wilson.

The Minutes of the previous meeting were unanimously approved per a motion of Michael Mayberry and second of Bunky Ralph. The Mid-Month Requests were approved as submitted per a motion of Tom Karwinski and a second of Bunky Ralph.

### B. MID-MONTH APPROVALS

1. **Applicant's Name:** Mrs. Heubach  
**Property Address:** 354 Chatham Street  
**Date of Approval:** March 31, 2008  
Repair/replace rotten wood throughout the exterior with wood to match existing in material, profile and dimension.  
Paint in the existing color scheme.
2. **Applicant's Name:** Chris King  
**Property Address:** 1254 Elmira Street  
**Date of Approval:** March 31, 2008  
Paint building to match color scheme on main house at 208 South Georgia Avenue.
3. **Applicant's Name:** Wanda Vergos  
**Property Address:** 104 South Ann Street  
**Date of Approval:** March 31, 2008  
Repair fire damage to the building with materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension.
4. **Applicant's Name:** Kimberly Tew  
**Property Address:** 9 Semmes Avenue  
**Date of Approval:** March 31, 2008  
Repair/replace rotten wood on the existing fence with new boards to match existing in material, profile and dimension.  
Repair/replace rotten wood on the front porch and steps. Repair/replace wood siding on the rear of the residence with new siding to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Paint the porch and steps in Charcoal. Rebuild the rotten porch rail to match what existed (see photos on file with MHDC). Rebuild the damaged back wall of the rear shed and reinstall the soffit. Paint in the existing color scheme.
5. **Applicant's Name:** Mike LaSarge  
**Property Address:** 68 South Georgia Avenue  
**Date of Approval:** March 31, 2008  
Repair/replace rotten wood siding on the north side with siding to match existing in material, profile and dimension.  
Paint in the existing color scheme.
6. **Applicant's Name:** Jane Siegel  
**Property Address:** 256 West Street  
**Date of Approval:** March 31, 2008  
Paint in the existing color scheme.
7. **Applicant's Name:** Adline Clarke  
**Property Address:** 155 South Broad Street  
**Date of Approval:** March 31, 2008  
Paint building white with grey trim. Repair rotten wood as necessary with materials to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Repair roof as necessary with materials to match existing.
8. **Applicant's Name:** Marcia and Stanley Lewis  
**Property Address:** 62 North Monterey Street  
**Date of Approval:** April 1, 2008  
Reroof with sandstone metal shingles to match the current asbestos shingles in profile and dimension.

9. **Applicant's Name:** Ken Baggette  
**Property Address:** 1051-1053 Government Street  
**Date of Approval:** April 1, 2008  
Repair fire-damaged roof with materials to match existing.
10. **Applicant's Name:** Marie Dismukes/Catholic Housing of Mobile  
**Property Address:** 351 Conti Street  
**Date of Approval:** April 3, 2008  
Caulk windows and doors as needed.
11. **Applicant's Name:** Dave Johnson  
**Property Address:** 1112 Selma Street  
**Date of Approval:** April 3, 2008  
Replace rotten wood on porch to include columns with new materials to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Paint to match existing color scheme.
12. **Applicant's Name:** Ed and Susan Crowson  
**Property Address:** 1219 Elmira Street  
**Date of Approval:** April 3, 2008  
Replace wood on front porch with materials to match existing. Paint to match existing color scheme.
13. **Applicant's Name:** Slate and Tile Roofing  
**Property Address:** 1401 Blacklawn  
**Date of Approval:** April 3, 2008  
Remove, repair and replace existing tile roof. Missing tiles to match original in color, profile and dimension.
14. **Applicant's Name:** Kevin Cross  
**Property Address:** 1001 Augusta Street  
**Date of Approval:** April 3, 2008  
Reroof with architectural shingles in a dark blend. Prep and paint in the following color scheme:
- Body – ICI Paints Winter’s Silence, D0532
  - Trim – ICI Paints White on White, D0437
  - Shutters – Benjamin Moore Night Horizon, 2134-10
15. **Applicant's Name:** Coulson Construction Company LLC  
**Property Address:** 1254 Elmira Street  
**Date of Approval:** April 3, 2008  
Reroof building with black architectural shingles.
16. **Applicant's Name:** Faith Community Missionary Baptist Church  
**Property Address:** 1110 Texas Road  
**Date of Approval:** April 4, 2008  
Replace window on the rear west side with materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension.
17. **Applicant's Name:** Veets  
**Property Address:** 66 South Royal Street  
**Date of Approval:** April 4, 2008  
Install a 28SF aluminum sign using the existing lighting. It will look similar to the Royal Scam sign.
18. **Applicant's Name:** Brett Faircloth  
**Property Address:** 257 Stocking Street (rear of 1419 Monroe)  
**Date of Approval:** April 4, 2008  
Repair wood with materials to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Paint in the existing colors.
19. **Applicant's Name:** Thad Phillips  
**Property Address:** 12 South Catherine Street  
**Date of Approval:** April 7, 2008  
Repair wood with materials to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Paint in the existing colors.

20. **Applicant's Name:** The Jason's Company  
**Property Address:** 12 South Catherine Street  
**Date of Approval:** April 7, 2008  
Install new roof using 3tab shingles, 30 year, Onyx in color.
21. **Applicant's Name:** John Hayes  
**Property Address:** 29 South Reed Avenue  
**Date of Approval:** April 7, 2008  
Repair rotten wood as necessary with materials to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Paint in the existing color scheme from 1995.

### C. NEW BUSINESS

1. **034-08-CA:** 1760 Dauphin Street  
**Applicant:** William Graham  
**Request:** Construct a 2-car carport.  
**Approved:** Certified Record Attached.
2. **035-08-CA:** 1110-1112 Government Street/Montauk Avenue  
**Applicant:** Michael Lee/Central Park Condominiums  
**Request:** Install a fence.  
**Tabled:** Certified Record Attached.
3. **036-08-CA:** 1706 Dauphin Street  
**Applicant:** Aimee McCormick  
**Request:** Remove inappropriate alterations to renovate building exterior.  
**Approved:** Certified Record Attached.
4. **037-08-CA:** 103 South Ann Street  
**Applicant:** E. Crosby Latham  
**Request:** Add a rear porch.  
**Approved:** Certified Record Attached.
5. **038-08-CA:** 2250 DeLeon Avenue  
**Applicant:** Lucy Barr Designs  
**Request:** Construct an addition.  
**Tabled:** Certified Record Attached.
6. **039-08-CA:** 27 South Reed Avenue  
**Applicant:** Lawrence and Melissa Specker  
**Request:** Remove inappropriate alterations to renovate building exterior.  
**Approved:** Certified Record Attached.
7. **040-08-CA:** 351 Conti Street  
**Applicant:** Marie Dismukes/Catholic Housing of Mobile  
**Request:** Paint the brick.  
**Tabled:** Certified Record Attached.
8. **041-08-CA:** 302 McDonald Avenue  
**Applicant:** Ronald Hinton  
**Request:** Construct a greenhouse.  
**Approved:** Certified Record Attached.

### D. OTHER BUSINESS and ANNOUNCEMENTS

Staff brought up the question of historic light fixtures in the historic districts. The Electrical Department had asked the Board to consider the replacement and maintenance problems with some of the neighborhood light fixtures. Some of the fixtures are no longer available, some are very costly and keeping spares for the various types is straining the City's resources. The Electrical Department would like to establish one or two historic fixtures that would replace the current fixtures as attrition made the current lights unworkable. There was general agreement among the Board members that this was a reasonable request and they

believed a workable solution with some caveats. The replacements should only be used through attrition; there should be no wholesale replacement of historic fixtures. There should be a sufficient variety of fixtures to allow appropriate designs to be used in appropriate locations. The Board should approve the designs before they are purchased and installed. It was noted that though the Board believed this to be a reasonable solution, it did not guarantee the cooperation of the various neighborhoods.

The Chair brought up the meeting held by the neighborhoods with Councilman William Carroll. There was general agreement that the meeting went well and two things came from the meeting. One was that the various ARB members should make an effort to get to know the Council people who made their appointments. The Board agreed that this was a good idea and many Board members felt they would like to do it. The second issue concerned appeals. It was suggested Board members should attend the Council meetings when there was an appeal and explain to the Council how they reached their decision. Several of the Board members agreed they would welcome the opportunity. Another suggestion was that the Board Members should actively lobby the Council Members before the appeal was heard. This suggestion caused much conversation. Bunky Ralph stated that she believed the Council had generally supported the ARB and she believed it would be unethical, unwise and wrong to change the Board's current method of no ex-parte communications with the Council. She believed that this was proper for the Board in hearing an application and was proper for the Council in hearing an appeal. It was pointed out that the suggestion for the lobbying came as a pragmatic response from the Council's attorney to complaints that the appellants were lobbying Council members. ARB attorney John Lawler agreed that this was a practical solution but it was wrong. He pointed out that if Board members did have such ex-parte discussions with Council, it would be grounds for overturning any decision. He agreed that Board members could answer factual questions by Council members that were part of the public record, but they could not cross the line into advocating for a point of view. Board member Cameron Pfeiffer echoed the concerns of Attorney Lawler. She stated that the City code specifically prohibited lobbying efforts on an application to either the Review Board or the City Council. She also said it was highly unethical and violated her attorney's Code of Conduct. There was further conversation on the matter but general agreement was reached that no Board Member would seek out a Council Member and if contacted would provide only factual information and discourage further contact.

Barja Wilson and Cameron Pfeiffer both stated they were planning to attend the New Orleans conference and Tom Karwinski said he now had a conflict and would not be attending.

Cameron Pfeiffer said she had just had the Icynene Insulation System put in her house and was very pleased with it.

**E. ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 5:15.**

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

**034-08-CA:** 1760 Dauphin Street  
**Applicant:** William Graham  
**Received:** 03/21/08 (+45 Days: 05/04/08)  
**Meeting:** 04/16/08

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Construct a 2-car carport.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to previous records, this one-story frame residence with Classical detailing was built circa 1906.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

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

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. There is currently a small wooden pergola under which cars park.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “[a]n accessory structure...includes, but is not limited to garages, carports, pergolas, decks, pool covers, sheds and the like...[t]he structure should complement the design and scale of the main building.”
- C. Mr. Graham is proposing to construct a 10’-0” by 10’-0” carport per the submitted plans.
  - 1. It will be located behind the house, which sits on a corner lot, and be 16’-0” from the street.
  - 2. It will sit on a concrete slab and have smooth-faced Hardiplank siding.
  - 3. There will be a double 6-panel front door and single 6-panel back door.
  - 4. There will be recessed lights and a ceiling fan in the parking area.
  - 5. All detailing, including the roof shingles, columns, corner boards, soffit, fascia and paint colors, will match the main residence.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff feels that the work will not impair the historic integrity of the building or district. The design of the proposed carport will complement the existing residence and staff recommends approving the application. Mr. Graham will need to clear any setback issues with Urban Development before construction.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Bill Graham and Chad Roberts were present to discuss the application. They noted that the building would be 26 x 22.5 feet and the concrete drive would be part of the application. They also wanted to use a gray/black rubberized shingle to match the shingles on the existing house. Craig Roberts noted that some people have had problems with the rubberized shingles curling in the hot sun. He also questioned if there was enough room in the back to park the cars.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussed the request.

**FINDING OF FACT**

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report amending them as follows: the carport would be 26 x 22.5; a rubberized roof would be used matching the roof on the main house; and the concrete drive is part of the application. The motion was seconded by Cameron Pfeiffer and unanimously approved.

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application as amended does not impair the historic integrity of the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph and unanimously approved. **Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 4/16/09.**

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

**035-08-CA:** 1110-1112 Government Street/Montauk Avenue  
**Applicant:** Michael Lee/Central Park Condominiums  
**Received:** 03/25/08 (+45 Days: 05/08/08)  
**Meeting:** 04/16/08

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Oakleigh Garden  
**Classification:** Non-Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-3  
**Project:** Install a fence.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This townhouse complex was constructed in 2006.

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

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. The Central Park Condominiums face Government Street with rear access facing Montauk Avenue. Urban Development requires that access to Montauk be blocked.
- B. The Guidelines state that fences “should complement the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District.” Also, “the height of solid fences in historic districts is generally restricted to six feet, however, if a commercial property or multi-family housing adjoins the subject property, an eight foot fence may be considered.”
- C. Mr. Lee is proposing to install an 8’-0” wood privacy fence per the submitted site plan.
  1. The finished side will face the exterior.
  2. The area between the fence and sidewalk will be landscaped.

**RECOMMENDATION**

The proposed fence falls within the standards of the Guidelines. However, Mr. Lee is proposing a setback of 12’-0” from Montauk. Code requires a setback of 25’-0” from the street for a solid fence over 3’-0” tall.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

No one was present to discuss the application.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussed the request. There was considerable concern about the size and placement of the fence. It was felt that as designed, the fence would impair the historic integrity of the Montauk Street neighborhood. John Lawler pointed out that the applicant had not realized that there would be any trouble with the design and had therefore not attended the meeting. He suggested tabling the application and encouraging the owner to attend the next meeting.

**FINDING OF FACT**

There was no Finding of Fact.

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Bunky Ralph moved that the application be tabled. The motion was seconded by Tom Karwinski and unanimously approved.

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

**036-08-CA:** 1706 Dauphin Street  
**Applicant:** Aimee McCormick  
**Received:** 03/26/08 (+45 Days: 05/09/08)  
**Meeting:** 04/16/08

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way  
**Classification:** Non-Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Remove inappropriate alterations to renovate building exterior.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to previous records, this two-story frame residence was built circa 1915. However, subsequent inappropriate renovations and additions have altered the building to a point that it is currently not contributing.

**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 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. As mentioned above, this building has undergone such inappropriate renovations and additions that its status as contributing to the district was compromised.
- 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 work proposed includes the following per the submitted plans:
  1. Replace/repair stucco with stucco to match existing.
  2. Replace/repair rotten wood throughout the exterior with wood to match existing.
  3. Reroof with architectural shingles.
  4. Replace the board and batten throughout the exterior with stucco to match existing.
  5. Cover the rear concrete block section of the building with stucco to match existing.
  6. Move the wall on the enclosed front porch to install a new wood column to match existing.
  7. Create new window openings and install windows in the additions to match the original residence.
  8. Paint in the following Sherwin Williams color scheme:
    - a. Body – Camelback, SW6122
    - b. Trim – Navajo White, SW6126
    - c. Accents – Van Dyke Brown, SW7041

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff feels that the changes will not impair the historic integrity of the district. The proposed work falls within the standards of the Design Review Guidelines and staff recommends approving the application.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Aimee McCormick was present to speak to the application. She stated that the front of the property would be landscaped and a plan by Terry Plauche would be submitted. In response to questions she also stated: the windows will be new, wood 1/1, 31x72 inches; the awning will be canvas, bronze in color; there would be no handrails unless required by code; and the roof will be GAF, timberline, Barkwood in color. There were also clarifications on the various doors, which will be wood.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussed the request. There was general discussion concerning the doors and the awnings

### **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 amended as follows:

3. Reroof with architectural shingles, GAF Timberline, Barkwood in color.
7. Create new 32"x72" window openings to install wood 1/1 windows in the additions to match the original residence.
9. Replace existing door with a wood and glass door.
10. Install rear barn door as submitted.
11. Install canvas awnings, bronze in color to match the trim.

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 as amended in the Facts does not impair the historic integrity of the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Barja Wilson and unanimously approved. **Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 4/16/09.**



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

**037-08-CA:** 103 South Ann Street  
**Applicant:** E. Crosby Latham  
**Received:** 03/28/08 (+45 Days: 05/11/08)  
**Meeting:** 04/16/08

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

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

**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 that new additions should respect the age and style of the building.
- C. Mr. Latham is proposing to construct a 19’-0” by 19’-0” one-story rear porch per the submitted plans.
  - 1. It will sit on stucco piers with wood lattice.
  - 2. There will be full-width stucco steps with cheeks.
  - 3. Operable wood shutters will be installed on the side elevations.
  - 4. There will be 16” square recessed-panel columns with pilasters to match.
  - 5. It will have brackets to match those of the existing residence.
  - 6. It will have a modified bitumen roof with ARB approved stock railing and posts to match the columns.
  - 7. There will be two new windows installed on the second floor to match the existing units on the rest of the residence in material, profile and dimension.
  - 8. There will be two sets of double French doors installed on the first floor.
  - 9. There will be new siding on the rear elevation to match the rest of the residence.
  - 10. All new materials will be painted in the existing color scheme.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the work will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district and recommends approving the application.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Crosby Latham and Mrs. Krause, the owner, were present to discuss the application. They stated the rear balustrade was different from the one on the front because they wanted a simpler effect on the rear. They also asked if they could use wood instead of stucco steps on the rear. Also the porch would 19’-0” by 10’-0”.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussed the request. There was general agreement that wood steps would be acceptable, but a couple of Board members advised the applicant to check code requirements for balustrades on the first floor.

**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 amending the size to be 19'-0" by 10'-0" and allowing an option of stucco or wood steps. The motion was seconded by Tom Karwinski and unanimously approved.

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application as amended in the Facts does not impair the historic integrity of 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: 4/16/09.**

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

**038-08-CA:** 2250 DeLeon Avenue  
**Applicant:** Lucy Barr Designs  
**Received:** 03/31/08 (+45 Days: 05/14/08)  
**Meeting:** 04/16/08

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Ashland Place  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Construct an addition.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to previous records, this two-story frame residence was built circa 1921.

**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 sits on a large corner lot.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state that new additions should respect the age and style of the building.
- C. The work proposed is to construct a 42’-10” by 40’-8” addition per the submitted plans.
  - 1. It will sit on a continuous brick foundation with metal vents.
  - 2. It will have wood lap siding, trim, shutters and 6/6 or 3/3 sash windows.
  - 3. It will feature a screened-in porch with exterior brick chimney, steps and iron railing on the left side.
  - 4. It will have a timberline roof over the main section and a bitumen roof over the screened-in porch.
  - 5. The design and materials of the addition will match and/or complement the existing residence.
  - 6. It will be painted in the existing color scheme.

**RECOMMENDATION**

The design and materials of the new addition will match and/or complement the existing residence. However, staff is concerned about the size of the proposed work, primarily because this residence is prominently located on a corner lot. Overlarge additions are acceptable if they cannot be or are minimally seen from the street – thus not overwhelming the lines of the original residence.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Lucy Barr was present to discuss the application. She said the addition is one story, which should diminish the overall effect on the property. The Board asked her about offsetting the addition to minimize the linearity. It was also noted that there might be set back problems.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussed the request. There was general discussion concerning size and linearity of the addition and its effect on the house and the neighborhood. It was felt that the addition altered the character of the structure and should be minimized in some way. It was suggested that this should be referred to a design committee with the designer and the owner attending.

**FINDING OF FACT**

There was no Finding of Fact.

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Bunky Ralph moved that the application be tabled and the project be referred to the design committee. The motion was seconded by Cameron Pfeiffer and unanimously approved.

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

**039-08-CA:** 27 South Reed Avenue  
**Applicant:** Lawrence and Melissa Specker  
**Received:** 03/31/08 (+45 Days: 05/14/08)  
**Meeting:** 04/16/08

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Remove inappropriate alterations to renovate building exterior.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to previous records, this one-story frame Craftsman was built circa 1915.

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

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. The work for this residence was approved in 2002, but was never completed. The work is slated to begin again; however, because it has been 6 years, staff felt it should go before the Board.
- 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 work proposed includes the following per the submitted plans:
  1. Replace the board and batten siding with lap siding to match existing.
  2. Enclose the windows on the south side with lap siding to match existing, leaving one opening.
  3. Enclose the rear door.
  4. Replace the horizontal window with double French doors that will lead to a new wood rear deck.
  5. Recess part of the second floor addition to create a dormer with casement windows.
  6. Partially extend the first floor rood over the new deck.
  7. Paint in the existing color scheme.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff feels that the changes will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district. The proposed work falls within the standards of the Design Review Guidelines and staff recommends approving the application.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Lawrence and Melissa Specker were present to answer questions.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussed the request clarifying that these were the same plans approved in 2002.

**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 Craig Roberts 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 district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Tom Karwinski and unanimously approved. **Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 4/16/09.**

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

**040-07-CA:** 351 Conti Street  
**Applicant:** Marie Dismukes/Catholic Housing of Mobile  
**Received:** 03/31/08 (+45 Days: 05/14/08)  
**Meeting:** 04/16/08

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Church Street East  
**Classification:** Non-Contributing  
**Zoning:** B-4  
**Project:** Paint.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This twelve-story reinforced concrete building was constructed circa 1975 as a retirement home.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

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

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. The brick veneer on this residence has never been painted. Staff has received a number of complaints from the residents about the proposed work.
- B. The Guidelines state, “[t]he painting of unpainted brick is...inappropriate in most cases.”
- C. The proposed plans include painting the building in one of the following Sherwin Williams paint schemes:
1. Option 1
    - a. Body – Sawdust, SW6158
    - b. Platform – Roycroft Copper Red, SW2839
    - c. Rails – Rockwood Shutter Green, SW2809
  2. Option 2
    - a. Body – Chatroom, SW6171
    - b. Platform – Hardware, SW6172
    - c. Rails – Black of Night, SW6993
  3. Option 3
    - a. Body – Perfect Greig, SW6073
    - b. Platform – Portabello, SW6102
    - c. Rails – Tricorn Black, SW6258
  4. Option 4
    - a. Body – Quartersawn Oak, SW2836
    - b. Platform – New Colonial Yellow, SW2853
    - c. Rails – Terra Brun, SW6048
  5. Option 5
    - a. Body – Aurora Brown, SW2837
    - b. Platform – Roycroft Suede, SW2842
    - c. Rails – Roycroft Bronze Green, SW2846

**RECOMMENDATION**

The Board generally does not approve the painting of unpainted brick.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Marie Dismukes and Larry McPherson were present to discuss the application. They stated there were water problems with the building with water coming through the windows and the mortar. They felt this would be the only thing to solve the problem. They stated that the engineer’s report recommended this as the solution. Staff noted that there had been numerous calls from the residents complaining about caulking the windows shut. Though staff had assumed that the mid-month

caulking request was the normal caulking, in fact, the intention was to seal all the windows shut. From a Review Board perspective, staff felt there was no real difference, but advised the Board that this would be the time to overrule the staff should they be so inclined.

Mr. Gregory Shue a resident in the tower spoke to the caulking. He felt that many of the residents were confined to their apartments and sealing the windows would mean they would never get any fresh air. He stated they had complained but the administration was unresponsive to their concerns. It was pointed out that this was a matter for the tenants to settle with the management. The applicants reiterated the need to seal the building. They stated that the tenants opened their windows creating humidity and mildew problems for the whole building.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussed the request. Michael Mayberry noted that the engineer's report did not suggest painting the building. Staff pointed out that all the studies done on historic buildings condemned the use of non-breathable paints on any building. Staff offered to get the applicants in touch with the Association for Preservation Technology and the National Center for Preservation Technology. Staff did point out that this is a non-historic building, and though this plan would probably result in exacerbating the problem, the Board charge was impairment of the historic district. Several Board members warned the applicants that this plan might result in more problems rather than fewer. Craig Roberts pointed out that the size of the building and its design required some careful thinking about the colors and the color scheme. He believes it would be impossible to determine the true appearance of the building from the small paint swatches. He also felt because of the size of the building, the Board should be very careful in allowing a color scheme with such little idea of how it would look. He suggested that the Board needed a large scale rendering of the building with the color scheme the Diocese wanted. Michael Mayberry offered to provide the name of someone who could do the rendering to the applicants.

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

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

Craig Roberts moved that the request be tabled and large-scale renderings with the desired color scheme be presented to the Board. The motion was seconded by Barja Wilson and unanimously approved.

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

**041-07-CA:** 302 McDonald Avenue  
**Applicant:** Ronald Hinton  
**Received:** 04/01/08 (+45 Days: 05/16/08)  
**Meeting:** 04/16/08

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Leinkauf  
**Classification:** Non-Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Construct a greenhouse.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to previous records, this residence was built circa 1960.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

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

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. There is currently a shed in the back yard. The greenhouse has been partially constructed.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “[a]n accessory structure...includes, but is not limited to garages, carports, pergolas, decks, pool covers, sheds and the like...[t]he structure should complement the design and scale of the main building.”
- C. Mr Hinton is proposing to construct an 8’-0” by 9’-0” frame greenhouse in the back yard.
  1. It will have wood lap siding to the ground (the floor will be dirt).
  2. The windows will match those of the main building.
  3. There will be a French door on the front.
  4. The roof will consist of clear plastic panels.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff feels the greenhouse will not impair the integrity of the district. The building is located in the rear of the property and will match the detailing of the main house. While clear plastic roof panels is generally not appropriate in the districts for typical outbuildings, the purpose of this building precludes this guideline. Mr. Hinton will need to clear any setback or lot coverage issues with Urban Development.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Mr. Hinton was present to discuss the application. He stated he had begun work without ARB approval without thinking and apologized. The Board questioned Mr. Hinton on some of the details and these were incorporated in the facts. He did say that he was using a professional greenhouse type of roof like that used on the greenhouses at the Lowe’s stores.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussed the request. There was general discussion concerning the materials.

**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 following amendments: C. Mr. Hinton has begun to construct an 8’-0” by 9’-0” frame greenhouse in the back yard. It will have wood, horizontal lap siding to the ground (the floor will be dirt), painted white. The windows will be 6/6, 3x5 foot, white aluminum clad to match those of the main building. There will be a 15 light metal French door on the front. The roof will consist of clear, hollow core, plastic panels. 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 as amended does not impair the historic integrity of 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: 4/16/09.**