

**CITY OF MOBILE
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD**

Minutes of the Meeting
April 23, 2007

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m. by Chair, Bunky Ralph. MHDC's Aileen de la Torre called the roll as follows:

- **Members Present:** Tilmon Brown, Harris Oswalt, Cameron Pfeiffer, Bunky Ralph, David Tharp and Craig Roberts.
- **Members Absent:** Robert Brown, Michael Mayberry and Joe Sackett.
- **Staff Members Present:** Aileen de la Torre, Anne Crutcher and John Lawler.

| <u>In Attendance</u> | <u>Mailing Address</u> |
|----------------------|---|
| Cathy McAtee | 223 Office Park Drive, Gulf Shores, 36542 |
| Susan Thomas | 1744 Hunter Avenue 36604 |
| Roger Franz | 207 South Cedar Street 36602 |
| Todd Drummond | P.O. Box 16667 Mobile 36606 |
| Ronald P. Brown | 7 North Bayou Street 36602 |
| Enoch Aguilera | 1118 Government 36604 |
| Douglas Kearley | 10 Wisteria 36607 |
| N.H. Holmes | P.O. Box 864 Mobile 36601 |
| Ray Floyd | 5819 I-10 Industrial Pkwy |
| Dan Koch | 3 Dauphin Street 36602 |

David Tharp moved to approve the minutes of the last meeting as emailed. Cameron Pfeiffer seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved. Jim Wagoner moved to approve the mid-month COAs. The motion was seconded by David Tharp and unanimously approved.

MID-MONTH APPROVALS

1. **Applicant's Name:** Holmes and Holmes
Property Address: 22 South Lafayette Street
Date of Approval: March 26, 2007
Attach a treated wood handicapped access ramp to the residence per the submitted plans.
2. **Applicant's Name:** Coxwell Roofing and Construction
Property Address: 753 St. Francis Street
Date of Approval: March 27, 2007
Install new membrane roof system, 2,500 square feet to match existing.
3. **Applicant's Name:** The JTB Group, LLC
Property Address: 412 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: March 27, 2007
Paint balcony Charcoal or Bellingrath Green.
4. **Applicant's Name:** Ken Baggette
Property Address: 12 LeMoyné Place
Date of Approval: March 28, 2007
Install new roof: Timberline shingles, weathered grey in color.
5. **Applicant's Name:** Patti and Joe Schilling
Property Address: 1112 Palmetto Street
Date of Approval: March 29, 2007
Remove the remains of an existing non-historic shed destroyed in Katrina and rebuild using stock MHDC plans for sheds.
6. **Applicant's Name:** Neese Properties, LLC
Property Address: 21 North Julia Street
Date of Approval: March 29, 2007
Repaint house in existing color scheme.
7. **Applicant's Name:** Tom and Tissa Loehr
Property Address: 201 South Dearborn Street
Date of Approval: March 30, 2007
Construct shed per MHDC provided plans with Hardiplank siding and a wood door. Shed will be painted to match house.

8. **Applicant's Name:** Caroline Coker
Property Address: 13 Semmes Avenue
Date of Approval: March 30, 2007
 Replace paired windows on the non-historic front porch enclosure on the south elevation with single 2/2 wood sash windows with true divided lights. Replace aluminum siding with wood siding to match the original in material, profile and dimension.
9. **Applicant's Name:** Lone Oak Properties
Property Address: 911B Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: April 2, 2007
 Install 3-tab shingle roof, onyx black in color to match existing roof.
10. **Applicant's Name:** Robert Sims
Property Address: 1109 Government Street
Date of Approval: April 2, 2007
 Repair/replace rotted wood as necessary to include siding, trim and second floor banister with materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Replace existing awning cloth with new cloth in green or black. Repaint in existing colors.
11. **Applicant's Name:** Marshall McLeod
Property Address: 30 Hannon Avenue
Date of Approval: April 3, 2007
 Repaint house in the following Devoe color scheme:
- Body – Desert Twilight (grey green)
 - Porch – Templeton Gray (blue gray)
 - Trim – White
12. **Applicant's Name:** Vaughan and Linda Drinkard
Property Address: 1070 Government Street
Date of Approval: April 4, 2007
 Install cast iron fence painted black per submitted plans. Fence to be 4'9" high with 5' high end and intermediate posts and match the fence installed at 1119 Govt. Install a total of 5 gates: 3' wide gate on west property line, double-leaf 3' gate (6' total) along the south property line, double leaf 7' gate (14' total) along east property, 12' electric sliding gate at driveway, double leaf 8' gate (16' total) at east end of property on south elevation. (Renewal of CoA issued March 13, 2006).

NOTICES OF VIOLATION and MUNICIPAL OFFENSE TICKETS

1. **Notice of Violation:** Christian Hendricks. Did not receive Architectural Review Board approval for work.
Property Address: 961 Savannah Street
Date of Violation: April 6, 2007
Status of Violation: Mr. Hendricks installed a more appropriate door and porch rail.
2. **Notice of Violation:** Thomas Beale III. Lack of maintenance/neglect.
Property Address: 54 Catherine Street
Date of Violation: April 6, 2007
Status of Violation: Mr. Beale boarded up windows. The house is supposedly under contract for sale to be renovated.
3. **Notice of Violation:** M.A. Publishing. Lack of maintenance/neglect.
Property Address: 467 Dauphin Street
Date of Violation: April 6, 2007
Status of Violation: Windows have been properly boarded up.
4. **Notice of Violation:** Ellen Turner. Lack of maintenance/neglect.
Property Address: 1014 Dauphin Street
Date of Violation: April 6, 2007
Status of Violation: Windows and doors were secured and boarded up.

OLD BUSINESS

1. **045-07-CA:** 451 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Jerry Irwin/Douglas Kearley
Request: Multiple renovations.
APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

NEW BUSINESS

2. **051-07-CA:** 1744 Hunter Avenue
Applicant: Thomas and Susan Thomas
Request: Multiple renovations.
APPROVED. Certified Record attached.
3. **052-07-CA:** 207 South Cedar Street
Applicant: Roger and Donna Franz
Request: New fence.
APPROVED. Certified Record attached.
4. **053-07-CA:** 350 South Broad Street
Applicant: Ronald Brown
Request: Multiple renovations.
APPROVED. Certified Record attached.
5. **054-07-CA:** 13 Semmes Avenue
Applicant: Caroline Coker
Request: Multiple renovations.
TABLED. Certified Record attached.
6. **055-07-CA:** 1114 Government Street
Applicant: Enoch Aguilera Jr.
Request: Renewal of previous approval.
APPROVED. Certified Record attached.
7. **056-07-CA:** 200 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Lipscomb Signs/Woodlands Bank
Request: New signage.
APPROVED. Certified Record attached.
8. **057-07-CA:** 100 Houston Street
Applicant: George Stoudenmire/James Sarhan
Request: New addition.
APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. Certified Record attached.
9. **058-07-CA:** 709 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Holmes and Holmes, Architects
Request: Multiple renovations.
APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. Certified Record attached.
10. **059-07-CA:** 1509 Government Street
Applicant: Advantage Sign Company/Wavenet
Request: New signage.
TABLED. Certified Record attached.
11. **060-07-CA:** 110 North Lafayette Street
Applicant: Cathy McAtee
Request: New fence.
APPROVED. Certified Record attached.
12. **061-07-CA:** 203 George Street
Applicant: Garry Mitchell
Request: New fence.
APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. Certified Record attached.
13. **062-07-CA:** 55 North Water Street
Applicant: Architectural Signing/Retirement Systems of Alabama
Request: New signage.
APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. Certified Record attached.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

045-07-CA: 451 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Jerry Irwin/Douglas Kearley
Received: 03/16/07 (+45 Days: 04/30/07)
Meeting: 04/09/07
Resubmitted: 04/09/07 (+45 Days: 05/24/07)
Meeting: 04/23/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street Commercial
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Multiple renovations including the addition of an iron porch/gallery on the front of the building.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, John Toulmé built this two-story masonry building in the Federal style circa 1851. It has housed a number of commercial ventures, including the Freight Line Furniture Company and Alabama Upholstery. As with most commercial buildings, the first floor storefront has been altered significantly throughout the years.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This building is currently vacant. It is being renovated into a retail space with a second floor condominium unit. As mentioned above, the first floor storefront of this building has been altered significantly during previous updates.
- 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 improvements include the following:
 - 1. Repair exterior stucco, removing paint to leave it natural.
 - 2. Repair/replace as necessary any brickwork.
 - 3. Repair/replace as necessary the wood windows with wood windows to match in profile and dimension.
 - 4. Reroof with architectural fiberglass/asphalt shingles.
 - 5. Reinstall any missing architectural elements, such as wood windows, operable wood shutters, wood louvers and wood doors, with historically accurate/appropriate elements and materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension.
 - 6. Rebuild the first floor storefront in off-white enameled aluminum with clear impact-resistant glazing and stucco over a masonry bulkhead.
 - 7. Install a new iron gallery with iron columns per the submitted plans.
 - 8. Install a new flush automatic garage door with applied panels on the east elevation.
 - 9. Enlarge an east elevation opening to create a new doorway and install a new wood door with transom.
 - 10. Enlarge an opening on the second floor of the north elevation to create a new doorway and install a wood jib door leading to the gallery.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information contained in the application, staff feels that the proposed work will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district. There are, however, some elements that the Board feels should be clarified and/or altered.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Project architect Douglas Kearley was present to discuss the application. He stated that the street sign was probably installed when the building was stuccoed in the 1920s. He stated that marble street signs are original signs and that the garde de frise was present only on the west side where a connecting balcony could be built some day. The jib door should be located at mid-point, similar to other examples along the street. The interior consists of one large symmetrical room. All iron columns on the first floor will remain. 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

David Tharp 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 Jim Wagoner 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 Harris Oswald and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 04/23/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

051-07-CA: 1744 Hunter Avenue
Applicant: Thomas and Susan Thomas
Received: 04/06/07 (+45 Days: 05/21/07)
Meeting: 04/23/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Extend rear wing. Add a covered walk to connect the wing with the garage. Partially enclose rear non-historic deck.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this one-story frame residence was built circa 1945. At one point in time the original wood siding was covered with aluminum siding. A picket fence and rear deck was added circa 2002.

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 aluminum siding covering the wood siding. Mr. and Mrs. Thomas plan on removing the aluminum at a future date. In order to maintain the look of the house, they propose to build the addition with wood siding and cover it with aluminum. The rear deck and pergola are non-historic additions to the house.
- 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. Partially enclose the rear deck per the submitted plans, reusing removed elements on the new addition and matching all new elements to existing ones, to include siding, roofing and architectural features.
 - 2. Extend the northeast wing of the residence per the submitted plans, reusing removed elements on the new addition and matching all new elements to existing ones, to include the foundation, siding, roofing and architectural features.
 - a. A set of wood 15-light French doors & transom will be placed on the west side of the addition.
 - b. A wood 15-light door will be placed on the north side of the addition.
 - c. There will be wood steps at each door.
 - 3. Install a covered walk per the submitted plans with materials and elements that match those of the main residence; the roof will be supported by simple columns with capitals.

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 deck is a non-historic element to the house and the rest of the proposed work will be sympathetic to the existing residence. Staff feels, however, that adding aluminum siding to the addition is an unnecessary expense if Mr. and Mrs. Thomas intend on removing it in the future.

Staff recommends approving the application. Staff recommends giving the applicants the choice of not adding the aluminum siding to the new addition if they so wish.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Susan Thomas and architect Douglas Kearley were present to discuss the application. Mr. Kearley stated that the wood siding on the addition would match the wood under the aluminum siding.

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 David Tharp and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

David Tharp 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: 04/23/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

052-07-CA: 207 South Cedar Street
Applicant: Roger and Donna Franz
Received: 03/28/07 (+45 Days: 05/12/07)
Meeting: 04/23/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Install a wood shadowbox fence along the property line.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this two-story frame Victorian was built in 1889. Formerly located at 103 Jefferson, the residence was moved in the 1980s to its present site at 207 South Cedar Street.

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 is currently no fence on this property.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines say fences should "complement the building and not detract from it."
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
 - 1. Install a 5'-4" rough-cut cypress shadowbox fence in a French Gothic style approximately 70'-0" along the south property line from the southeast corner of the lot toward South Cedar.
 - 2. Install a 4'-0" rough-cut cypress shadowbox fence with gates in a French Gothic style from either side of the residence to the property lines.

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. The proposed fence falls within the standards of the Design Review Guidelines. Staff recommends approving the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Roger Franz was present to discuss the application. He had no additions to present to the Board. 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

Harris Oswald 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 Cameron Pfeiffer 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 according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by David Tharp and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 04/23/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

053-07-CA: 350 South Broad Street
Applicant: Ronald Brown
Received: 03/28/07 (+45 Days: 05/12/07)
Meeting: 04/23/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Conflicts: Tilmon Brown recused himself from discussion and voting on the application.
Project: Rehabilitate house to as close to original as possible.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this one-story frame residence was built circa 1900. By 1924, however, a large addition had been constructed on the northeast corner of the building. In 1993, the original wood windows were replaced with aluminum awnings. The house is currently vacant, although recently it had been used as two separate rental units.

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 vacant and in fair to good condition. As mentioned above, it has undergone a number of renovations and alterations throughout the years.
- 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 rotten siding and trim with materials matching existing in material, profile and dimension.
 - 2. Reclad the roof with Timberline 50-year dimensional shingles.
 - 3. Replace all aluminum windows with 3/1 wood sash windows that within the existing openings.
 - 4. Replace the rotted front porch decking with 1'-0" by 4'-0" tongue and groove pine.
 - 5. Replace metal porch posts with wood posts and rails per submitted photo.
 - 6. Rebuild masonry chimneys to operation with materials matching existing in material, profile and dimension.
 - 7. Replace the two rear doors with one rear wood door in an appropriate style.
 - 8. Add an 8'-0" by 22'-0" wood deck to the rear of the house.
 - 9. Add a 6'-0" wood privacy fence to the left and rear of the property.
 - 10. Add a wood picket fence to the front and right side of the property.
 - 11. Paint the house in the following Sherwin Williams color scheme:
 - a. Body – Cabbage Rose
 - b. Trim – Cajun Red
 - c. Accents – Roycroft Bottle Green
 - 12. Remove left side front door and fill opening with siding matching existing in material, profile and dimension.

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 proposed work seeks to reconfigure later, unsympathetic alterations into something more appropriate and historically accurate. Staff remains guarded, however, about enclosing one of the front doors. Based on the Sanborn maps, the door on the left side appears to be the original door, although both doors appear likely to have been there since 1924.

Staff recommends approving Items C1-11. Staff recommends denying Item C12. Mr. Brown will need to submit door specifications for the rear door before installation.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Ronald Brown was present to discuss the application. He explained that, based upon interior features, he concluded that the left side was the earlier side of the house. Floors in that location were pine. The right portion of the front was added after 1904 and the floors in that section are oak. There is also no central dividing wall in the structure and a firewall was added sometime in the recent past. He would like to remove one of the front doors and return the building to single family use.

Mr. Brown also explained that he would like to add a 3 ft. picket fence on an existing 12 in base to the front and side of the house. The fence would stop at the steps and there would be no gates. Fencing will be 12 ft. from the house and set back approximately 30 ft. from the street.

He also explained that with the existing cheek walls, the railing would not be added down the stairs.

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

Cameron Pfeiffer moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report with fact C.10 amended to read: "Add a 3 ft. high picket fence on top of the existing 12 inch base for a total of 4 ft. in height." The motion was seconded by Harris Oswalt and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

David Tharp moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, 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: 04/23/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

054-07-CA: 13 Semmes Avenue
Applicant: Caroline Coker
Received: 03/30/07 (+45 Days: 05/14/07)
Meeting: 04/23/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Conflicts of Interest: Jim Wagoner disclosed that he knew the applicant.
Project: Reopen previous enclosures. Add a wheelchair ramp at the rear.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this one-story frame Victorian cottage was built circa 1900.

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 vacant. It has undergone a number of renovations and alterations throughout the years, including having the front porch partially enclosed and an addition put on the back. Ms. Coker received mid-month approval for some of the proposed restoration work on March 30, 2007.
- 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. Partially reopen the enclosed side porch approximately 10’-0” back.
 - 2. Add an appropriate wood door that will lead out to the front porch.
 - 3. Replace the wall added to the rear porch with a screen.
 - 4. Reopen the enclosed area at the southwest corner and add a small wheelchair ramp.

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 proposed work, which seeks to reconfigure later, unsympathetic alterations into something more appropriate and historically accurate, is mostly minor restoration. Staff recommends approving the application. Ms. Coker will need to submit the specifications of the door before installation.

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 that the application was incomplete and that elevations were necessary in order to determine the appropriateness of the request.

FINDING OF FACT

There was no finding of fact.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Jim Wagoner moved to table the application pending submission of additional information. The motion was seconded by David Tharp and unanimously approved.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

055-07-CA: 1114 Government Street
Applicant: Enoch Aguilera Jnr
Received: 04/02/07 (+45 Days: 05/17/07)
Meeting: 04/23/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Renew the Certificate of Appropriateness.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this one and one-half story late Victorian frame residence is all that remained of the Walter Bellingrath property that once stood facing Ann Street. It was moved to this site in 2005 to be incorporated into the Berney/Fly Bed and Breakfast.

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 vacant and in fair to poor condition. As mentioned above, it was moved to this location in 2005 and the owners were in the process of renovating when Hurricane Katrina hit. They are currently waiting to hear from the Alabama Historical Commission regarding their application for funds to repair the damage through the Hurricanes Rita and Katrina Grant Program.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines call for renovations to be sympathetic to the age and style of the building.
- C. The proposed plan is to continue the work and renovation of the Bellingrath garage approved site plan dated January 24, 2005. The architectural blue prints and all permits are the same as when they were originally approved.

RECOMMENDATION

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Aguilera was present to discuss the application. He explained that he would have a new contractor and was anticipating funds from a Katrina Grant pool. 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 David Tharp 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 Harris Oswald and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 04/23/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

056-07-CA: 200 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Lipscomb Signs/Woodlands Bank
Received: 04/02/07 (+45 Days: 05/17/07)
Meeting: 04/23/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street Commercial
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: New Signage.

BUILDING HISTORY

The Van Antwerp Realty Co. built this two-story, George Rogers designed, masonry building in 1925 with a basement that extends under the sidewalk and a foundation that can support an additional 18 stories. Due to the Depression, the additional stories were never built.

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. Woodlands Bank is moving into the first floor of the building, which is currently vacant.
- B. The Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state that signs shall “not obscure the architectural features or openings of a building...relate to the design of the principal building on the property...be in proportion to the building and the neighboring structures and signs...match the historic materials of the building...[and] use focused, low intensity illumination.”
- C. The proposed sign package includes the following:
 - 1. Install two 15½ SF (totaling 31 SF) aluminum wall signs with dimensional 1” thick cut letters and company logo.
 - 2. Install six 1½ SF (totaling 9 SF) vinyl window signs with the company name and logo.
 - 3. Install two 1 SF (totaling 2 SF) vinyl door signs with the company name and logo.
 - 4. The total sign package is approximately 42 SF; all signs will be unlit.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the signs will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district. The proposed signs fall within the standards of the Sign Design Guidelines. 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

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, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines and a COA be issued. The motion was seconded by Jim Wagoner and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 04/23/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

057-07-CA: 100 Houston Street
Applicant: George Stoudenmire/James Sarhan
Received: 04/03/07 (+45 Days: 05/18/07)
Meeting: 04/23/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Add a 21'-0" by 23'-0" bedroom suite to the south side of the residence.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this one-story frame bungalow was built circa 1920. A rear 10'-0" by 16'-0" addition was added in 2002.

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 relatively wide lot for this street. The building is set toward the north side of the property with a large expanse of lawn on the south side.
- 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 21'-0" by 23'-0" bedroom suite addition includes the following:
 - 1. Set the addition on brick piers with wood lattice to match existing.
 - 2. Match all new materials, finishes and details to the existing materials, finishes and details, including the wood lap siding and trim, exposed rafter tails, architectural shingles, 3/1 wood sash windows and operable wood shutters.
 - 3. Reuse the paired windows removed from the south elevation on the east end of the addition.
 - 4. Install a pair of wood 12-light French doors and wood steps on the west end of the addition.
 - 5. Install a horizontally oriented stained glass window on the south end where the bath will be located.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information contained in this application, staff feels that the proposed work will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district. All elements of the new addition will match the existing materials, including the foundation, siding, trim, roofline and shingles, 3/1 wood windows and doors, overhanging eaves and wood shutters. The addition will also be set back approximately 31'-0" from the front elevation.

Staff feels, however, that the stained glass window on the south end of the addition should have a vertical orientation in order to maintain the lines of the house.

Staff recommends approving Items C1&2. Staff recommends amending Item C3 to either install a more vertical window or, if the window itself cannot be altered, to leave the wood shutters off.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

The applicants were present to discuss the application.

The Board questioned the applicants about discrepancies in the elevation drawings. The applicants stated that they were going to match all details of the existing house.

There was discussion regarding the stained glass window. The applicants have not yet chosen the glass. It was agreed upon that the applicants would remove the glass from the application and return at a later time with its design. The applicants also agreed to remove the shutters from this bathroom window since it appeared too horizontal in design.

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

Cameron Pfeiffer 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 David Tharp and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued conditioned on the omission of the bathroom shutters and the applicants returning to the Board with the design of the stained glass. The motion was seconded by Jim Wagoner and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 04/23/08

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

058-07-CA: 709 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Holmes and Holmes Architects
Received: 04/05/07 (+45 Days: 05/20/07)
Meeting: 04/23/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street Commercial
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Conflicts: Tilmon Brown disclosed that he had had business dealings with Mr. Drummond, but that they are not currently in business together and it would not affect his ability to judge the application fairly.
Project: Convert building into condominiums.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this two-story masonry building, which is actually two buildings, was built in the late 1800s. It has housed a number of commercial ventures, most recently the Decorator's Market.

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 vacant and in fair to good condition. It has undergone a number of renovations and alterations throughout the years. Many of the existing windows have been boarded or enclosed.
- 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. Remove and store existing wood pedestrian doors; install new wood doors per submitted design (North Elevation).
 - 2. Remove and store existing wood carriage door; install new wood impact resistant windows with snap in mullions on interior and exterior per submitted design (North Elevation).
 - 3. Reconfigure the existing rear fire exits per submitted design, which includes adding a centrally located elevator shaft and new steel exit stairs, adding metal exit doors, installing a canvas awning at the second-floor exits, removing the wood canopy over the wood carriage door and enclosing the carriage door.
 - 4. Remove the large second-story window above the carriage door on the left side of the south elevation to install the new fire exit (South Elevation).
 - 5. Reinstall the removed window on the right side of the south elevation at the location of the old fire exit on the second story, where there was a previous window of the same profile and dimension (South Elevation).
 - 6. Remove and store existing wood pedestrian doors; install new wood impact resistant windows with snap in mullions on interior and exterior per submitted design (South Elevation).
 - 7. Cut in new 9/9 wood-sash impact resistant windows with snap in mullions on interior and exterior and stucco heads/sills per submitted design (East Elevation).
 - 8. Sand, repair or replace as necessary the existing exterior elements that will be maintained with materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension (All Elevations).
 - 9. Repave and reline the existing parking lot on the east side of the building, which will necessitate the removal of one 9” pear tree.
 - 10. Retain or replace the remaining trees with maples or crepe myrtles at the discretion of the City’s horticulturalist.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff feels that there are some aspects to this application that will negatively impact the historic integrity of the building and the district.

The window schedule calls for impact resistant windows with snap in mullions on the interior and exterior; however, the Board generally does not approve windows without true divided lights. Staff recommends installing either 6/6 wood sash windows with true divided lights or 1/1 wood sash windows. Moreover, the sidelights on the new window that will replace the carriage door on the front elevation should have a mullion system with true divided lights that matches the sash window in the center.

The south elevation shows flat metal doors with either one or no lights. While the Board has approved metal paneled doors in the past, staff recommends fire-rated wood doors with panels at the rear exits. However, should the Board feel that metal doors are acceptable in this case, staff recommends the doors have embossed decorative panels or similar treatment that maintains the historic look of the building. Also, staff needs more detailed specifications for the stairs, for example whether the rails will be tube or wire metal.

Staff feels that the rest of the application will not negatively impact the historic integrity of the building or the district. The majority of the remaining work involves restoration to rehabilitate the existing elements, including repaving the existing asphalt parking lot and retaining or replacing trees. In addition, the reconfigured fire escape and elevator shaft will use stucco and wood trim that match the existing elements. It is also located at the rear of the building, even though it will be visible from both Conti and Washington Streets. Finally, the window that will be removed on the south elevation will be reinstalled where there was a previous window of the same profile and dimension.

Staff recommends approving the application with the above-mentioned changes to the windows and metal doors. Staff also recommends maintaining the outlines of any enclosed windows. The applicant will need to contact Urban Forestry regarding the removal of trees.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Architect Nick Holmes III and his client, Todd Drummond, were present to discuss the application.

Mr. Holmes explained that the proposed canvas awning will not be installed and that the roof was flat and reroofing was part of this application. By way of clarification, the existing doors on the south elevation are metal, but moldings could be added to them if the Board requested it. He would prefer doors with lights, but decorative panels would be acceptable. He stated that the existing metal stair is a typical modern design.

Mr. Holmes also explained that the proposed windows do not have flat snap-in muntins as outlined in the staff report. They have simulated (dimensional) divided lights that are glued to each side of the glass. He further stated that he had discussed the issue with the chief building inspector and new windows must meet wind loads of 130 miles an hour. There are no windows with true divided lights that meet this criterion. He pointed out that the Secretary of the Interior's Standards dictate that new elements should be differentiated from the old making the window choice for the project appropriate. He would be willing to bring a material sample so that the Board could see what is proposed.

Transom and door in the west bay will also have impact resistant glass to meet code.

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 whether any double pane windows with true divided lights existed that could meet current wind loads of 130 miles per hour. Staff was assigned the task of seeking out such a product.

FINDING OF FACT

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report with the following amendments: 3 – omit canvas awnings at 2nd floor, 6 – remove and store existing metal pedestrian door... and 7 – replace snap-in with dimensional glued muntins. The motion was seconded by David Tharp and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application impairs the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued conditioned on the applicant returning with a material sample of the proposed windows for review. The motion was seconded by David Tharp and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 04/23/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

059-07-CA: 1509 Government Street
Applicant: Advantage Sign Company/Wavenet
Received: 04/09/07 (+45 Days: 05/23/07)
Meeting: 04/23/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Facing Government (Sign Review Only)
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-2
Project: New Signage.

BUILDING HISTORY

This multiple story masonry building was constructed in the latter half of the twentieth century. It houses a number of businesses.

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 is currently no sign for this building.
- 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.”
- C. The proposed sign will be a 5' tall, 51 SF (25½ SF per side) double-faced aluminum monument structure with six internally lit plastic cabinets for signage per side.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the monument sign will impair the historic integrity of the district. The proposed sign does not fall within the standards of the Sign Design Guidelines concerning materials and lighting. The sign should also relate to the building, which is brick, does not have a gable and has white masonry bands in between the windows.

Staff recommends alternative lighting and materials for the proposed signs. Staff also recommends the applicant keep the total square footage to 50 SF.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Ray Floyd from Advantage Signs was present to discuss the application. He explained the sign would be constructed of aluminum with a textured finish and painted the same color as the building. Although it is internally lit, it could be lit with external floodlights. In response to Board comments, he stated the pediment could be eliminated and the base could be concrete if preferable. 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

There was no finding of fact.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

David Tharp moved to table the application in order for the applicant to work with Staff. The motion was seconded by Tilmon Brown and unanimously approved.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

060-07-CA: 110 North Lafayette Street
Applicant: Cathy McAtee
Received: 04/09/07 (+45 Days: 05/24/07)
Meeting: 04/23/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Install a 6'-0" iron fence around the property.

BUILDING HISTORY

This one-story commercial building from 1982 is a "modern interpretation of a Gulf Coast cottage that stylizes many of [its] features."

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 is currently a picket fence around the north, west and part of the east sides of the property that will be removed for the proposed installation. The shadow-box fence around the remainder of the property will remain.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines say fences should "complement the building and not detract from it."
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
 - 1. Install a 4'-0" black aluminum fence per the submitted specifications that will sit on a 2'-0" Old Chicago brick base.
 - 2. Install two 6'-0" by 24'-0" iron vehicular gates at Campbell Street (north).
 - 3. Install one 6'-0" by 4'-0" iron pedestrian gate at North Lafayette Street (west).

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. The proposed fence and gates fall within the standards of the Design Review Guidelines. Also, the fence and gates are similar to the fencing that surrounds many of the commercial and institutional properties in this area. Staff recommends approving the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Cathy McAtee was present. She explained the fence was for security as it is on the edge of the Old Dauphin Way District. The gates will be the same design. 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

Discussion ensued regarding the height of the fence with some Board members wanting to restrict the fence to a total of 4 ft. in height.

FINDING OF FACT

Harris Oswalt moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. 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, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines and that a COA be issued. The motion was seconded by David Tharp and approved. Tilmon Brown, Cameron Pfeiffer and Jim Wagoner voted in opposition.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 04/23/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

061-07-CA: 203 George Street
Applicant: Garry Mitchell
Received: 04/09/07 (+45 Days: 05/24/07)
Meeting: 04/23/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Install a 6'-0" iron fence to match the driveway gates.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this one-story frame residence was built circa 1888 for Hope and Honora Slatter. It has undergone a number of modifications throughout the years.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. There is currently a picket fence that will be removed for the proposed installation. A 6'-0" iron fence and gate was installed along the south side of the residence in 1997.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines say fences should "complement the building and not detract from it."
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
 - 1. Install a 6'-0" black iron fence about 50'-0" along the north property line from the northwest corner of the lot to the northwest corner of the house per the submitted specifications; it will match the existing fence on the south side that was installed in 1997 per ARB approval.
 - 2. Install one 6'-0" by 4'-0" iron pedestrian gate facing west.

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. The proposed fence and gate fall within the standards of the Design Review Guidelines. It will also match the section of fence and gate on the south side of the property. 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. Staff did explain to the Board that when the south side fence was approved by the ARB years ago, the CoA requested that a matching fence be built on the north side of the property.

BOARD DISCUSSION

New Board member Craig Roberts asked about the height restriction of fences. It was his understanding that fences could be no higher than 3 ft. for the first 25 feet behind the sidewalk. Board members explained that when you can see through the fence, a fence could be higher than 3 feet. Discussion followed about the proliferation of fences in the neighborhoods creating walls between residents.

FINDING OF FACT

David Tharp 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

David Tharp 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. Harris Oswalt seconded the motion. The application was denied.

Harris Oswalt moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application impairs the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued for the fence at 4 ft. in height. The motion was seconded by David Tharp and approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 04/23/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

062-07-CA: 55 Water Street
Applicant: Architectural Signing/Retirement Systems of Alabama
Received: 04/13/07 (+45 Days: 05/28/07)
Meeting: 04/23/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street Commercial
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: New Signage.

BUILDING HISTORY

This is the new garage structure for the RSA tower.

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 garage structure incorporates the facade of the Coley Building.
- 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.”
- C. The proposed sign package includes the following:
 - 1. Install two 35 SF (totaling 70 SF) internally lit plastic cabinets with parking information and the RSA logo at locations PA1 on St. Michael Street and PA2 on St. Francis Street.
 - 2. Install two internally lit plastic cabinet signs with no commercial message.
 - 3. Install nine unlit plastic informational signs with no commercial message.
 - 4. The total sign package is approximately 70 SF; the Board cannot approve more than 64 SF.
 - 5. An 89½ SF sign package was approved on 03/26/07.
 - 6. The size for the RSA medallions is 22 SF (11 SF each).

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the signs will impair the historic integrity of the building or the district. The proposed signs do not fall within the standards of the Sign Design Guidelines concerning the material and lighting. Staff recommends alternative lighting and materials for the proposed signs. Staff recommends the Board consider the total square footage. The applicant will need to get a variance from the Board of Zoning Adjustment for signage in excess of 64 SF.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Dan Koch representing RSA was present. In response to Board questions, Mr. Koch stated the gold band of the RSA logo sign is translucent metallic while the background is opaque. It would be possible to make the lettering opaque, which would create the same effect as a back lit sign—it would create a halo effect. There would be a 3/8-inch acrylic backing for water tightness that would not be evident.

The Board noted that tenant signage would be reviewed.

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

Since much of the proposed signage is informational, the Board counted only the lit portions bearing the RSA logo.

FINDING OF FACT

David Tharp 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: C.2 – Install *one* internally lit metal faced cabinet sign with no commercial message, C. 4 – The total sign package is approximately 22 SF and C.7 – No signage faces shall be lit from within. The motion was seconded by Cameron Pfeiffer and approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

David Tharp 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 and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued for the amended application. The motion was seconded by Jim Wagoner and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 04/23/08.