

CITY OF MOBILE
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

Minutes of the Meeting
May 7, 2007

CALL TO ORDER

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

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

<u>In Attendance</u>	<u>Mailing Address</u>
Edmund Zoghby	5300 Oak Bend Ct. 36609
Johnna Rogers	250 St. Anthony St. 36603
Caroline Coker	16 Semmes Avenue 36604
Elizabeth Sanders	261 Dauphin St. 36602
Tony Moore	310 Dauphin St. 36602

Jim Wagoner moved to approve the minutes of the last meeting as emailed. The motion was seconded by David Tharp and unanimously approved. David Tharp moved to approve the mid-month Certificates of Appropriateness. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswalt and unanimously approved following Tilmon Brown's questioning of item 6. Staff explained that it viewed the application as repair/replace and approved it upon that basis. Staff will contact the applicant to verify the work being done. The Board felt it probably more appropriate that similar applications come before the Board.

MID-MONTH APPROVALS

1. **Applicant's Name:** Patrick Thistlewaite
Property Address: 1654 Hunter Avenue
Date of Approval: April 9, 2007
Reroof porte-cochere to match existing in material, color and profile. Repaint in the following colors:
 - Body – Paper Brown
 - Trim – White
 - Porch Deck – Black Green

2. **Applicant's Name:** John Klotz
Property Address: 354 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: April 10, 2007
Prep and paint building in the existing colors.

3. **Applicant's Name:** Travis Foote
Property Address: 153 Houston Street
Date of Approval: April 11, 2007
Remove the non-historic vinyl siding to re-expose the original wood siding underneath. Repair/replace rotted/damaged wood siding as necessary with new wood that matches the existing in profile and dimension. Replace the rotted wood front door with a new Craftsman-style wood door that is similar in design to the existing door. Replace two of the three existing non-matching windows on the non-historic bathroom addition at the southeast corner of the residence with wood sashes that match the windows throughout the rest of the exterior. Remove the non-historic rear awning and trellis. Prep and paint the exterior in Sherwin-Williams historic palette (colors to be determined later).

4. **Applicant's Name:** Alex and Bethany Kraft
Property Address: 1219 Texas Street
Date of Approval: April 11, 2007
Repaint in the following Sherwin Williams colors:
 - Body – Meditative, 6227
 - Trim – White
 - Shutters – Rainstorm, 6230
 - Porch Ceiling – Light Blue
 - Porch Deck, Steps and Brick Caps – Refuge, 6208

5. **Applicant's Name:** Christian Hendricks
Property Address: 961 Savannah Street
Date of Approval: April 12, 2007
Install a new wood rail per MHDC stock plans. Install a new door sympathetic to the residence.
6. **Applicant's Name:** Heavenly Body
Property Address: 10-12 St. Emanuel Street
Date of Approval: April 12, 2007
Replace the existing rotted 2/2 wood sash windows with new 2/2 wood-clad sash windows with true divided lights that will fit within the existing window openings. Repair and repaint the exterior in neutral tan or beige with white trim. Replace the rusted gutters with new similar gutters. Repair the first floor storefront with materials that match existing. Replace the single storefront door with a double door.
7. **Applicant's Name:** M and A Publishing
Property Address: 467 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: April 13, 2007
Reboard second-story north windows on the exterior and paint to match building.
8. **Applicant's Name:** Your Handyman
Property Address: 1413 Brown Street
Date of Approval: April 13, 2007
Repair/replace rotted wood as necessary throughout the exterior with materials to match existing. Repaint the residence in the following Sherwin-Williams colors:
 - Body – Inspired Lilac, SW6820
 - Trim – White
 - Accents – Potentially Purple, SW6821
9. **Applicant's Name:** Mack Lewis
Property Address: 11 Common Street
Date of Approval: April 16, 2007
Replace rotted wood on the exterior with materials to match existing. Repaint in the existing colors.
10. **Applicant's Name:** Carol Barrios
Property Address: 312 Chatham Street
Date of Approval: April 17, 2007
Replace rotted wood on the exterior with materials to match existing. Repaint in the existing colors.
11. **Applicant's Name:** Norman Figures/Global Roofing
Property Address: 850 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: April 17, 2007
Install new 3-tab Weathered Wood color shingles.
12. **Applicant's Name:** William Gadd
Property Address: 206 Marine Street
Date of Approval: April 18, 2007
Prep and repaint the residence white with green trim.
13. **Applicant's Name:** Sue Woener
Property Address: 15 McPhillips Avenue
Date of Approval: April 18, 2007
Repaint house in the existing Sherwin Williams colors:
 - Body – Renwick Heather
 - Trim – Dark Brown
 - Awnings – White
14. **Applicant's Name:** Mary Bryant
Property Address: 1006 Caroline Avenue
Date of Approval: April 18, 2007
Paint body in custom yellow per the sample on file. Trim will be Bellingrath Green to match existing.

15. **Applicant's Name:** Darrell Anthony
Property Address: 1212 Government Street
Date of Approval: April 18, 2007
Install new 3-tab Charcoal color shingles.
16. **Applicant's Name:** Neese Properties LLC
Property Address: 21 North Julia Street
Date of Approval: April 19, 2007
Replace rotted wood on the exterior with materials to match existing. Repaint in the existing colors.
17. **Applicant's Name:** Pete's Foundation
Property Address: 1120 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: April 19, 2007
Repair foundation to level two brick columns.
18. **Applicant's Name:** Paul McCaffrey
Property Address: 205 Dexter Avenue
Date of Approval: April 20, 2007
Replace missing wood railing/spindles on the front porch with railing/spindles that match existing in material, profile and dimension. Repair/replace as necessary rotted wood throughout the exterior with materials that match existing in material, profile and dimension. Repaint in the existing color scheme. Construct a small storage shed in the rear of the property per stock plans that match the style of the residence. Pave the drive with light-colored cement.
19. **Applicant's Name:** Bayside Remodelers LLC
Property Address: 1257 Government Street
Date of Approval: April 23, 2007
Repair/replace rotted wood as necessary throughout the exterior with materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Repaint in the existing colors.

NOTICES OF VIOLATION and MUNICIPAL OFFENSE TICKETS

No NOV's or MOT's were issued.

OLD BUSINESS

1. **012-02/03-CA:** 310 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Tony Moore
Request: Renew the Certificate of Appropriateness. Change the nameplate on the building.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.
2. **054-07-CA:** 13 Semmes Avenue
Applicant: Caroline Coker
Request: Multiple renovations.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.
3. **058-07-CA:** 709 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Holmes and Holmes, Architects
Request: Multiple renovations.

TABLED. Certified Record attached.

NEW BUSINESS

20. **063-07-CA:** 250 St. Anthony Street
Applicant: Johnna and Richard Rogers
Request: Install a balcony on the outbuilding.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

21. **064-07-CA:** 106 St. Francis Street
Applicant: Knight Sign Industries
Request: Replace old Regions Bank signs/logos with new Regions Bank signs/logos.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

22. **065-07-CA:** 1108 Old Shell Road
Applicant: Mobile Revolving Fund
Request: Install a privacy fence.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

OTHER BUSINESS and ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. It was suggested by Tilmon Brown that the Guidelines Committee should review the sign guidelines. There is no historic precedent for limiting the size of signs and requirements should be reviewed. A Guidelines Committee meeting will be announced soon.

2. The next meeting of the Review Board will be held at 3:00 p.m. Thursday May 24th in conjunction with a Certified Local Government meeting being held in Mobile.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

012-02/03-CA: 310 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Tony Moore
Received: 11/05/02 (+45 Days: 12/20/02)
Meeting: 11/18/02
Resubmitted: 04/19/07 (+45 Days: 06/03/07)
Meeting: 05/07/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street Commercial
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Renew the Certificate of Appropriateness. Change the nameplate.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this commercial building with a mansard roof was built in the late 19th century. In 1903, the Zoghby's opened a department store in it, which closed in 1985. It has been the Spot of Tea since the early 90s.

This building has undergone numerous changes throughout the years, some drastic. From the 1950s to 1997, the front façade had been covered with aluminum. The original brick was exposed after the aluminum was removed, but as the brick was badly damaged, the façade was stuccoed. The second-story gallery has been removed and replaced at least once before. The first floor storefronts have been significantly altered. A Zoghby nameplate was added to the building in the 90s.

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 the Spot of Tea. The proposed work is part of Mr. Moore's plan to keep the restaurant open in the evenings.
- 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 proceed with the work approved by the Architectural Review Board on November 19, 2002. The architectural blue prints and all permits are the same as when they were originally approved. Mr. Moore is also seeking to change the nameplate on the building from Zoghby to Moore.

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.

The proposed balcony will upgrade the existing reconstructed balcony, which is currently not strong enough to hold many people. The outdoor café will reopen the carriageway, which had been enclosed. And the sidewalk gallery will be only minimally attached to the building. In addition, the building has been significantly altered a number of times.

Staff recommends renewing the Certificate of Appropriateness. Staff also recommends approving the new nameplate. The current nameplate, which has already been partially removed, is a non-historic element. In addition, although the Zoghbys had a very long history in the building, they were not the original owners.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Owner Tony Moore was present to discuss the application. He explained that the balcony design was the same as submitted several years ago. He was not prepared to do the work at that time. In response to Board concerns about the second floor balcony being accessible from the sidewalk, Mr. Moore stated that the stairs would be secured to prevent unauthorized access. He also explained that the balcony would be constructed to allow for 4 ft. of traffic flow on the sidewalk. When the business is closed, the full expanse of the sidewalk will be open. Mr. Moore showed a rendering of the name requested for the front of the building. He stated that the name will be engraved on black granite and the letters will be painted silver leaf. They will appear white from the ground. In place of the name Moore requested for the sign location will be the names Zoghby-Moore.

Edmund Zoghby was present to discuss the application. He stated that no more space than originally designated for the nameplate would be taken up by Zoghby-Moore. The letters will be sized to fit in the designated nameplate space.

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 Jim Wagoner 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 David Tharp and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 05/07/08.

**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
Resubmitted: 04/23/07 (+45 Days: 06/07/07)
Meeting: 05/07/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Conflicts: Jim Wagoner stated that he was a friend of Ms. Coker but could make an unbiased decision on the application.
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.

In the previous meeting, the Board felt it did not have enough information to make an informed decision. They asked Ms. Coker to provide drawings of what the residence will look like with the proposed changes as well as the specs of the door before installation.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Ms. Coker was present to discuss the application. She presented elevation drawings to the Board. She explained that eventually the aluminum siding would be removed from the building. She stated that her mother was confined to a wheel chair and a ramp would be constructed off the back of the house that would be nearly invisible from the street. 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 Cameron Pfeiffer 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 Tilmon Brown and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 05/07/08.

**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
Resubmitted: 04/23/07
Meeting: 05/07/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street Commercial
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4
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. In order to follow impact resistance guidelines, the applicants have proposed wood windows with mullions glued to the interior and exterior of the glass to simulate true divided lights. As this proposal does not conform to the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts, the Board requires further investigation to find windows that will conform to both the building codes and historic guidelines (or a suitable compromise) before installation can occur. A Certificate of Appropriateness was issued for all other work on 23 April, 2007. The part of the application dealing with the proposed windows was tabled to give time for research.

RECOMMENDATION

Although they would prefer to have windows with multiple lights, the applicants have indicated that they would consider 1/1 sash windows. Staff recommends approving the application if a suitable compromise has been achieved.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Neither the applicant nor his representative was present to discuss the application. Staff reported that the north and east elevations will have issues with impact resistant windows. Staff contacted the Florida SHPO who said that the state is flexible with window options in order that hurricane loads be met. Savannah is flexible with large projects and more restrictive in residential projects. The Secretary of the Interior’s standards are also flexible. The code allows for exceptions in historic buildings except in hazard zones, of which Mobile is one. Staff reported meeting with the Chief Building Inspector on the issue and felt that Urban Development will not be flexible in allowing non-rated windows to be installed in this and similar situations. If an applicant did not want to install rated windows, the code allows for numbered plywood panels to be stored on site or for the installation of storm shutters for use in an approaching hurricane. 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 at length the problem of finding a true divided light window that will meet hurricane wind loads of 130 mph. The Board continues to prefer these historic style windows as specified in the Guidelines. Other options that might be permitted by the Board would be 1/1 or rated windows with glued dimensional muntins.

Board members decided to meet with representatives of the Urban Development Department to discuss window specifications. The Board felt that the same problems with meeting wind loads exists with leaded glass.

FINDING OF FACT

There was no finding of fact.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Tilmon Brown moved to table the application until the Board could meet with representatives of the urban Development Department to discuss windows in historic buildings. The motion was seconded by David Tharp and unanimously approved.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

063-07-CA: 250 St. Anthony Street
Applicant: Johnna and Richard Rogers
Received: 04/16/07 (+45 Days: 06/01/07)
Meeting: 05/07/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: DeTonti Square
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-B
Project: Install a balcony on the outbuilding.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this unusually large, three-story Italianate residence was built circa 1853 and incorporated part of a house that had been built circa 1833.

It was at one time the home of J.M. Withers, a mayor of Mobile and the person in charge of Mobile's defenses during the Civil War. It is said that Admiral Franklin Buchanan, commander of the *Merrimac* and the *Tennessee*, planned his strategy for Mobile Bay in this building. It also served as the headquarters for the Mobile County Chapter of the American Red Cross from 1947 to 1970.

The building remained in fair condition with only minor repair jobs until 2002, when Mr. and Mrs. Rogers purchased the property and began a complete sympathetic restoration.

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. Although there is currently a door on the second floor of the rear outbuilding, there is no balcony.
- 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 work will add a 0'-3" by 12'-0" cantilevered iron balcony with treated wood planks to the rear outbuilding. It will be held up by either four metal brackets or two 0'-3" diameter metal posts, depending on what the contractor feels is sufficient. The rail is a 5'-0" section of iron panel that matches the railing on the main building

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the proposed work will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district. The materials and design of the balcony fall within the standards of the Design Review Guidelines. The work in question is also going to be done on a rear outbuilding.

Staff recommends approving the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Johnna Rogers was present to discuss the application. She explained that she was trying to improve the look of the rear outbuilding and constructing a small balcony to correct the "floating door" on the second floor. The piece of ironwork she will use matches that on the front porch of the main house. Brackets are preferred, but if necessary, two cast iron posts will be used to support the balcony. The Board discussed with Ms. Rogers that the railing might not 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

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 Cameron Pfeiffer 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 David Tharp and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 05/07/08

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

064-07-CA: 106 St. Francis Street
Applicant: Knight Sign Industries
Received: 04/19/07 (+45 Days: 06/03/07)
Meeting: 05/07/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street Commercial
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Replace the old Regions Bank signs/logos with the new Regions Bank signs/logos.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this building, originally the Merchants National Bank, was built in 1928. It is a 23-story skyscraper with Neo-Classical elements at the street, Corinthian columns, stepped upper stories, a pyramidal roof and dark brick accents to create Art Deco patterns at the upper levels.

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 a Regions Bank, which has recently updated their logo. The signage has been altered a number of times throughout the years.
- B. The Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile state that signs shall “not obscure the architectural features or openings of a building...shall relate to the design of the principal building on the property...shall be in proportion to the building and the neighboring structures and signs...should match the historic materials of the building...[and] shall use focused, low intensity illumination.”
- C. The proposed sign package includes the following:
 - 1. Install two 56 SF aluminum wall signs with individually mounted reverse channel lit letters at location one, totaling 112 SF.
 - 2. Install one 92 SF non-illuminated aluminum wall sign with individually mounted letters at location two.
 - 3. Install seven 20 SF non-illuminated fiberglass wall signs at location three, totaling 140 SF.
 - 4. Install one 13 SF non-illuminated aluminum wall sign with individually mounted letters at location four.
 - 5. Install one 2 SF non-illuminated sticky vinyl door sign at location five.
 - 6. Place all of the new signs at the locations of the current signs per the submitted plans.
 - 7. The total sign package is approximately 359 SF; the Board cannot approve more than 64 SF.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the proposed sign package will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district. The proposed signs are the new Regions logos that will be replacing the old ones at the same locations and with a similar square footage. The proposed materials and lighting fall within the standards of the Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile.

Staff recommends that the Board approve the sign materials and design, and support the total square footage. The applicant will need to receive a variance from the Board of Zoning Adjustment for the amount of signage.

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 explained that the new signs were the same size as the existing signs they would replace. Only the logo was different. 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

David Tharp moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the materials and design of the proposed signs do not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued once the amount of signage is approved by the Board of Zoning Adjustment. The Board encourages approval of the amount of signage by the BOA. The motion was seconded by Tilmon Brown and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 05/07/08. CoA to be issued once variance is obtained.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

065-07-CA: 1108 Old Shell Road
Applicant: Mobile Revolving Fund
Received: 04/23/07 (+45 Days: 06/07/07)
Meeting: 05/07/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Conflicts: Tilmon Brown and Cameron Pfeiffer recused themselves from discussion and voting on the application since they are Board members. Aileen de la Torre disclosed that she also serves on the Revolving Fund.
Project: Install a privacy fence.

BUILDING HISTORY

This residence is two buildings that were combined into one. According to previous records, they were built circa 1900. However, during renovation it was discovered that parts of both buildings are peg construction, which indicates a much earlier construction date.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This residence, which as mentioned above is two buildings that were combined into one, has been recently renovated. There is currently no fence around the property.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines say fences should "complement the building and not detract from it." Furthermore, the Guidelines state that a wood picket fence is an appropriate option.
- C. The proposed fence will be a 6'-0" tall wood privacy fence with dog-eared posts that will run along the rear property line from the northeast corner to the northwest corner of the lot.

RECOMMENDATION

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff explained that a 6 ft. dog-eared wood privacy fence would be constructed along the rear of the property. 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

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 Harris Oswald and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 05/07/08.