

CITY OF MOBILE
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

Minutes of the Meeting
May 24, 2007

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:07 p.m. by Chair, Bunky Ralph. Aileen de la Torre called the roll as follows:

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

In Attendance

Mailing Address

Greg Dreaper	119 North Julia Street
Margaret Ash Rushing	1106 Selma Street
Vivian Ash	1108 Selma Street
Buz Rummel	1002 Charleston Street
Pete Vallas	108 Lanier Avenue
Douglas Kearley	10 Wisteria Avenue
David Owen	113 North Julia Street
Wayne Goolsby	118 North Julia Street
Ray Floyd	Advantage Sign Company

David Tharp moved to approve the last meeting minutes as emailed. The motion was seconded by Tilmon Brown and unanimously approved. Michael Mayberry moved to approve the mid-months. The motion was seconded by Joe Sackett and unanimously approved.

MID-MONTH APPROVALS

1. **Applicant's Name:** Terri Williams
Property Address: 253 St. Anthony Street
Date of Approval: April 24, 2007
Repaint building in the existing colors.
2. **Applicant's Name:** David Rasp
Property Address: 72 South Royal Street
Date of Approval: April 24, 2007
Remove recently built block and stuccoed wall and rebuild it in the proper location. Wall is to be 8 foot in height or lower. Wall to have stuccoed finish.
3. **Applicant's Name:** David Pettway
Property Address: 118 North Lafayette Street
Date of Approval: April 24, 2007
Repaint building in the existing colors.
4. **Applicant's Name:** Sign-A-Rama
Property Address: 156 St. Anthony Street
Date of Approval: April 25, 2007
Install a new 6 SF double-faced (3 SF per side) metal plaque with the company name and address engraved upon it. It will hang from a decorative black metal post and bracket and be placed at the front of the building facing St. Anthony.
5. **Applicant's Name:** Chris Miller
Property Address: 1120 Selma Street
Date of Approval: April 25, 2007
Install a 14'-0" by 22'-0" wood deck with custom handrails off the kitchen at the rear of the residence per the submitted plans and photographs. The finished side of the rail currently faces the inside of the deck; however, per email correspondence, Mr. Miller will give a finished treatment to the side of the rail that faces outside.
6. **Applicant's Name:** Doug Otto
Property Address: 53 South Julia Street
Date of Approval: April 27, 2007
Paint exterior in the following Devoe colors: Body – Deer Hill, Trim – Sail White, Shutters and Porch – Black, Door – Midtown Red.

7. **Applicant's Name:** Murray Thames Contractor
Property Address: 913 Augusta Street
Date of Approval: April 27, 2007
 Repair/replace rotted wood throughout the exterior as necessary with materials that match existing in material, profile and dimension. Prep and repaint in the existing color scheme.
8. **Applicant's Name:** Neese Properties LLC
Property Address: 126 Margaret Street
Date of Approval: April 30, 2007
 Repair the wood stairs along the side of the house with materials that match existing in material, profile and dimension. Add a rail to the stairs per MHDC stock rail plans that will be no taller than 42". Add a rail to the front porch per MHDC stock plans that will be no taller than 36". Paint the stairs and rail in white and green to match the existing color scheme.
9. **Applicant's Name:** Masters Roofing and Repair
Property Address: 1767 Old Shell Road
Date of Approval: April 30, 2007
 Re-clad roof with 30-year dimensional shingles in Slate Black.
10. **Applicant's Name:** Neese Properties LLC
Property Address: 59 North Julia Street
Date of Approval: April 30, 2007
 Repair/replace rotted wood throughout the exterior as necessary with materials that match existing in material, profile and dimension. Repaint in the existing color scheme. Repair the iron posts and rails on the front porch with new ironwork in a design that is the same or similar to existing. Raise the second story rails to 42" and add an iron rail to the first story that will be no taller than 36".
11. **Applicant's Name:** Eugene Morgan
Property Address: 158 South Warren Street
Date of Approval: May 1, 2007
 Repair to rotten wood as necessary with new wood to match existing in dimension and profile. Repaint in existing color scheme. Replace awnings to match existing.
12. **Applicant's Name:** Samuel Perloff
Property Address: 1120 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: May 2, 2007
 Repair existing driveway using materials to match existing. Paint residence in the following colors: Body – White, Trim – Forest Green.
13. **Applicant's Name:** Advanced Construction
Property Address: 1561 Bruister Street
Date of Approval: May 2, 2007
 Install new 3-tab Charcoal color shingles.
14. **Applicant's Name:** Clay, Massey and Associates/Fred South
Property Address: 509 Church Street
Date of Approval: May 2, 2007
 Repaint portions of the building in the existing colors.
15. **Applicant's Name:** Paula and Wayne Thorpe
Property Address: 1651 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: May 2, 2007
 Install a dark green canvas awning at the rear of the residence to partially cover the deck. The awning is 4'-0" deep by 6'-8" wide by 2'-0" high with an 8" scalloped edge. Repaint the residence in the following BLP colors: Body – Palmetto Street Bronze, Trim, Shutters, Porch and Underneath Lattice – Monroe Street Green, Front, Back and Screen Doors – Claiborne Street Red, Windows – DeTonti Square Off White.
16. **Applicant's Name:** WRICO Signs/Willstaff Worldwide
Property Address: 9 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: May 2, 2007
 Replace the existing ACO sign with a new 24 SF double-faced (12 SF per side) wood Willstaff sign with sandblasted letters. It will be Teal and Purple and mounted at the location of the current sign.

17. **Applicant's Name:** Sharyn Bohannon
Property Address: 201 South Georgia Avenue
Date of Approval: May 2, 2007
 Replace the current rotted wood garage door with a new wood-clad overhead door per the submitted photograph. The garage door will be painted white.
18. **Applicant's Name:** Todd Drummond
Property Address: 709 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: May 4, 2007
 Paint exterior in the following Benjamin Moore colors: Wall – HC98, Providence Olive or HC 107-Gettysburgh Gray, Trim – 957, Feather Down (cream), Accent – HC85, Fairview Taupe, Shutters – HC 74, Valley Forge Brown.
19. **Applicant's Name:** Rennie Brabner
Property Address: 303 North Conception Street
Date of Approval: May 4, 2007
 Repair/replace rotted wood throughout the exterior as necessary with materials that match existing in material, profile and dimension. Re-glaze and replace the windowpanes as necessary with materials that match existing in material, profile and dimension. Repaint in the following colors: Windows – Colonial White, Ironwork – Black, Balcony Underside – White, Deck – Gray.
20. **Applicant's Name:** Charles and Natalie Bell
Property Address: 152 South Monterey Street
Date of Approval: May 7, 2007
 Repaint the residence in the following Valspar American Traditions colors: Body – Cincinnatian Hotel Olivia Blue, 4003-7B, Trim – White, Accents – Cincinnatian Hotel Filson Blue, 4003-8B.
21. **Applicant's Name:** Holmes and Holmes, Architects
Property Address: 114 St. Emanuel Street
Date of Approval: May 7, 2007
 Remove two pieces of redundant electrical conduit at the southwest corner of Christ Church Cathedral. Install a small gas-fired boiler and HVAC unit on the south side of the Cathedral, adjacent to the existing transformer and HVAC unit. Extend the current planting along the south side of the Cathedral to screen the new units, matching the existing planting in type and height.
22. **Applicant's Name:** Allison Peebles
Property Address: 107 Ryan Avenue
Date of Approval: May 7, 2007
 Repair/replace termite damaged wood throughout the exterior as necessary with materials that match existing in material, profile and dimension.

NOTICES OF VIOLATION and MUNICIPAL OFFENSE TICKETS

1. **Notice of Violation:** Walker Brothers Investments
Property Address: 558 Dauphin Street
Date of Violation: May 2, 2007
 Lack of maintenance/neglect.
2. **Notice of Violation:** Clyde Helmer
Property Address: 453 Dauphin Street
Date of Violation: May 2, 2007
 Lack of maintenance/neglect.
3. **Notice of Violation:** Joe Jordan/Carl Shorbrough
Property Address: 401 Dauphin Street
Date of Violation: May 2, 2007
 Lack of maintenance/neglect.
4. **Notice of Violation:** Mobile County School Board
Property Address: 14 St. Emanuel Street
Date of Violation: May 2, 2007
 Lack of maintenance/neglect.

5. **Notice of Violation:** Irvin Grodsky
Property Address: 7 North Hamilton Street
Date of Violation: May 2, 2007
 Lack of maintenance/neglect.
6. **Notice of Violation:** Walker Brothers Investments
Property Address: 470-476 Dauphin Street
Date of Violation: May 2, 2007
 Lack of maintenance/neglect.
7. **Notice of Violation:** Tony Atchison
Property Address: 551 Dauphin Street
Date of Violation: May 2, 2007
 Lack of maintenance/neglect.
8. **Notice of Violation:** David Naman
Property Address: 251 Dauphin Street
Date of Violation: May 2, 2007
 Lack of maintenance/neglect.
9. **Notice of Violation:** Ken Henderson
Property Address: 259 St. Francis Street
Date of Violation: May 2, 2007
 Lack of maintenance/neglect.
10. **Notice of Violation:** Mary Naman
Property Address: 223 Dauphin Street
Date of Violation: May 2, 2007
 Lack of maintenance/neglect.
11. **Notice of Violation:** David Naman
Property Address: 108 Dauphin Street
Date of Violation: May 2, 2007
 Lack of maintenance/neglect.
12. **Notice of Violation:** Scott Gonzales
Property Address: 4 St. Emanuel Street
Date of Violation: May 2, 2007
 Lack of maintenance/neglect.
13. **Notice of Violation:** MGMS Inc
Property Address: 16 South Royal Street
Date of Violation: May 2, 2007
 Lack of maintenance/neglect.

OLD BUSINESS

1. **059-07-CA:** 1509 Government Street
Applicant: Advantage Sign Company/Wavenet
Request: New signage.

APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. Certified Record attached.

NEW BUSINESS

1. **066-07-CA:** 351 Conti Street
Applicant: Clearwire Corporation
Request: Install three microwave antennas and an equipment cabinet on the building roof.

APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. Certified Record attached.

2. **067-07-CA:** 1311 Old Shell Road
Applicant: Shanee Johnson
Request: Install a picket fence at the front yard and a privacy fence at the rear yard.

DENIED. Certified Record attached.

3. **068-07-CA:** 107 Ryan Avenue
Applicant: Allison Peebles
Request: Multiple renovations.

APPROVED WITH EXCEPTION OF SHED. Certified Record attached.

4. **069-07-CA:** 1005 Selma Street
Applicant: Harold Rummel
Request: Turn a front porch door into a window.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

5. **070-07-CA:** 1106 Selma Street
Applicant: Margaret Ash Rushing
Request: Enclose an addition and install a picket fence.

APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. Certified Record attached.

6. **071-07-CA:** 115-117 North Julia Street
Applicant: Springhill Avenue Corporation
Request: Construct eight new town homes.

APPLICATION WITHDRAWN. Although the application was withdrawn, neighbors were present to oppose the project. They complained about the number of units proposed for the site as well as the proposed design. Staff explained that a PUD would be required, so neighbors must oppose the proposed use at the Planning Commission. When the application reappears before the ARB, the chair may call a Design Review Committee if necessary.

7. **072-07-CA:** 1950 Government Street
Applicant: Lipscomb Signs/Woodlands Bank
Request: New signage.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

8. **073-07-CA:** 1111 Government Street
Applicant: Elbert Wingfield
Request: Construct a new outdoor seating area.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

OTHER BUSINESS and ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. New Quiznos sign at 1500 Government Street.
 - Staff explained that there had been an error in calculating signage at Shoppes of Midtown. The intention was to allot 30 SF of signage to each of 8 tenants. Two tenants remain and each will be allotted 30 SF.
2. Windows for 709 Dauphin Street.
 - Wood windows will be retained and plywood will be kept on site to satisfy hurricane wind requirements.
3. Discussion on mid-month approval items.
 - This discussion will be held over until the next meeting.

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

059-07-CA: 1509 Government Street
Applicant: Advantage Sign Company/Wavenet
Received: 04/09/07 (+45 Days: 05/25/07)
Meeting: 04/23/07
Resubmitted: 05/08/07
Meeting: 05/24/07

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’-4” tall and 9’-4” wide. The materials have not been called out and there is some confusion as to the size of the individual tenant panels.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that there is not enough information to make an informed decision. Per telephone conversation, staff is aware that the applicant will be attending the meeting in order to clarify the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Roy Floyd of Advantage Signs was present to discuss the application. He explained that the monument design has been altered to reflect the Board’s requirements. The monument will have brick base and sides and will have a straight top made of aluminum. There will be individual slide out panels with vinyl lettering. The sign will have ground lighting. The brick will not match the narrow brick on the building but will be painted to match the building.

The Board expressed concern that the brick would not match the narrow 1960s brick on the building. In response to Board inquiry, Mr. Floyd responded that he had done a cursory search but had found none.

There was also a question regarding the manner in which the sign would be lighted. The applicant explained that the light would be in a housing on the ground.

Regarding the size of the sign, Board members questioned Staff about the way Urban Development measures signage. Staff responded that a regular geometric figure is drawn around the sign message to measure its size. In the case of this sign, the applicant has measured each sign panel to figure the total signage.

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

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no additional Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

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 Tilmon Brown 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 approved with David Tharp voting in opposition.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 05/24/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

066-07-CA: 351 Conti Street
Applicant: Clearwire Corporation
Received: 05/11/07 (+45 Days: 06/25/07)
Meeting: 05/24/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Install three microwave antennas and an equipment cabinet on the building roof.

BUILDING HISTORY

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

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. There are currently a number of antennas on the roof of the building, which can only be seen from high elevations.
- B. There are no specific guidelines regarding cell towers and antennas, so the Architectural Review Board examines each application on a case-by-case basis.
- C. The proposed plans include the following:
 - 1. Place an antenna with three 2’-0” diameter microwave dishes on the roof per the submitted plans.
 - a. The antenna will be mounted on the northeast corner of the penthouse building.
 - b. The antenna will rise approximately 5’-0” above the penthouse building roofline.
 - 2. Place a Clearwire equipment cabinet on the roof per the submitted plans.
 - a. The cabinet will be mounted on the east side of the penthouse building.
 - b. The cabinet will rise approximately 2’-0” above the parapet wall of the main roof and be minimally seen from the street.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information contained in the application, the proposed work should not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district. There are a number of other antennas on the roof of comparable size.

Staff recommends approving the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Richard Silverman representing Clearwire Corporation was present to discuss the application. He stated that three dishes would be affixed to a pole on the penthouse. The dishes would be about the same size as a home TV antennae dish. The equipment would be located on the west side of the penthouse with the antenna on the southwest corner of the penthouse. The antennae uses microwave technology.

One Board member questioned that microwave technology was on the way out and questioned what would happen to the equipment once it was no longer used.

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 as amended: C.1.a: The antenna will be mounted on the southwest corner of the penthouse building; and C.2.a: The cabinet will be mounted on the west side of the penthouse building. 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 impair the historic integrity of the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued conditioned on removing the equipment when it is no longer in use. The motion was seconded by Tilmon Brown and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 05/24/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

067-07-CA: 1311 Old Shell Road
Applicant: Shanee Johnson
Received: 04/30/07 (+45 Days: 06/14/07)
Meeting: 05/24/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Install a picket fence around the front yard and a privacy fence around the rear yard.

BUILDING HISTORY

This one-story masonry residence was built in 2006

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 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 work includes the following:
 - 1. Install a 4'-0" tall Brunswick Scallop vinyl fence around the front of the property per the submitted plans and photographs.
 - 2. Install a 6'-0" tall Princeton Lattice Top vinyl fence and gate around the rear yard per the submitted plans and photographs.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that there are elements to the request that will impair the historic integrity of the district. Although the height and location of the proposed fences fall within the standards of the Design Review Guidelines, the vinyl material is inappropriate. Staff recommends an alternative material for the proposed fences.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Neither the applicant nor his representative was present to discuss the application. Greg Dreaper, a resident of Julia Street, spoke against the use of vinyl fencing in the historic district. He also stated that he had been disappointed in the new construction approved by 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

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

Jim Wagoner moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does impair the historic integrity of the district according to the Guidelines and that the application be denied. The motion was seconded by Cameron Pfeiffer and unanimously approved.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

068-07-CA: 107 Ryan Avenue
Applicant: Allison Peebles
Received: 05/03/07 (+45 Days: 06/17/07)
Meeting: 05/24/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Ashland Place
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Multiple renovations.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, Alan Denby built this one-story Craftsman in 1921. It has undergone numerous alterations throughout the years, including a two-story garage addition at the rear in 2006.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This residence is currently undergoing extensive repairs due to recent termite damage.
- 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. Close the existing front door and install a wood window to match the existing windows in material, profile and dimension per the submitted plans.
 - 2. Reopen the existing enclosed front doorway and install a salvaged wood Bungalow-style door per the submitted plans.
 - 3. Renovate the existing storage shed at the alley side of the property to better match the look of the main residence per the submitted plans.
 - 4. Install a lattice wood fence at the south and west property line to match the one at the north property line per the submitted plans.
 - 5. Install a lattice fence and arbor at the south side of the front of the house to match the arbor and fence at the north side per the submitted plans.

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. Because the new door will be installed where a door opening already exists, it is likely that the door configuration at the front porch had already been altered at some point in time. A window that matches the existing windows will replace the current front door. The remaining proposed work will match the existing elements of the residence.

Staff recommends approving the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Architect Douglas Kearley was present to discuss the application. He explained that the lattice fence on the south and west property lines would be 6 ft. in height. The fence and arbor on the south side would vary between 4 ft. and 5 ft.

Pete Vallas, who resides at 108 Lanier Avenue, spoke in opposition to working on the shed. He explained that the shed had recently been brought in without Review Board approval. He had called and complained to both MHDC Staff and 311 about the shed. He stated that alterations to a building that had been installed without a permit should not be allowed; and, as an architect, he felt the proposed alterations would not be economically feasible and would not be able to be done as submitted. When the shed was moved in, it was located on the property line; it has since been moved over 8 ft.

The Board asked Mr. Kearley about the vinyl window in the shed. Mr. Kearley responded that it would remain although the Board could specify another type of window to be used. In response to concerns expressed by Board members and the public, he suggested

that the new shed be approved contingent on the existing one being removed. Mr. Kearley asked if the shed could be built from stock MHDC plans. The Board answered in the affirmative.

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

Jim Wagoner expressed concern over the outbuilding and suggested that the applicant submit a new application for the outbuilding. David Tharp suggested that the owner moved in the shed to provide materials for the new shed. Cameron Pfeiffer stated that the Board could not speculate on the intentions of the applicant.

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 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 impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued for all work items in the application except the shed. The motion was seconded by Michael Mayberry and approved with David Tharp and Tilmon Brown voting in opposition. There was general consensus among the Board that the new shed should be removed.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 05/24/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

069-07-CA: 1005 Selma Street
Applicant: Harold Rummel
Received: 05/03/07 (+45 Days: 06/18/07)
Meeting: 05/24/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Turn a front porch door into a window.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this one-story late Victorian residence was built circa 1890, and it appears on the 1904 Sanborn map with a front porch that extends the width of the front façade. At some point, the chamfered west bay of the front façade was extended forward to partially enclose the front porch. It is likely that a second door to the porch was added at that time.

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. As mentioned above, there are two doors leading to the front porch, one of which was added when the bay was extended.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines call for renovations to be sympathetic to the age and style of the building.
- C. The proposed work will replace the second door, located at the east side of the west bay of the front façade, with a window that will match the existing windows 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. Although the second door has likely also reached historic status, the door opening will only be partially enclosed, therefore maintaining the solid to void proportion of the front façade. Staff recommends approving the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Rummel was present to discuss the application. He stated that the transom and casing of the current door would be removed. The door transom height matches the window height, so the new window will be at the height of other windows. Mr. Rummel stated that he was returning the house from use as a duplex to single family residential use. He amended his application by asking to install a 4 ft. wood picket fence painted white at the front of the house. After some discussion with the Board he reduced the height of the proposed picket fence to 3 feet.

The Board asked about a possible dating for the door and framing to be removed. Although there is no specific evidence, Staff reported that it probably dated from WWII.

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 Michael Mayberry 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 Joe Sackett and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 05/24/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

070-07-CA: 1106 Selma Street
Applicant: Margaret Ash Rushing
Received: 05/04/07 (+45 Days: 06/19/07)
Meeting: 05/24/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Enclose an addition. Install a picket fence.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this one-story late Victorian residence with Bungalow elements was built in 1910. It has undergone numerous alterations, including the addition of a small room at the southeast corner of the residence and having the rear porch enclosed.

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, there is a small shed-roof addition on the southeast corner of the residence that was constructed later than the original residence. There is currently no fence around the front of the property, although a Certificate of Appropriateness was issued to install a 3'-0" fence with pointed (Gothic-style) pickets in May 2004.
- 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. Install a 4'-0" wood picket fence around the front of the property; the style of the pickets has not been determined, but they will be one of the appropriate styles listed in the Design Review Guidelines.
 - 2. Enclose the addition at the southeast corner of the residence per the submitted plans; all elements will match existing, including new lap siding to match the rest of the house.

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 addition is not original to the residence and it is already mostly enclosed. Also, the fence conforms to the standards of the Design Review Guidelines. Staff recommends approving the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

The owner was present to discuss the application. She stated that the 6 x 13 addition would be for a closet. She stated that she would move the door and transom to the rear in place of a window. There was discussion about whether the window would be rectangular or diamond shaped. The applicant stated that she had wanted to make the window 4 panes. She also stated that the picket fence would have pointed pickets. 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

Handrails approved on a mid-month basis by Staff were felt to be inappropriate for the house. The Board stated that it would examine allowances for mid-month approvals by Staff at the next meeting. One Board member stated that he objects to fences higher than 3 ft. for the first 25 ft. behind the right of way in residential areas. In particular, a 4 ft. fence is high when the massing and scale of the house is taken into consideration.

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 adding fact 2a: The window will be 2/2. The motion was seconded by David Tharp and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Jim Wagoner 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 with the condition that the picket fence be 3 ft. in height. The motion was seconded by Mike Mayberry and approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 05/24/08.

APPLICATION WITHDRAWN
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF COMMENTS

071-07-CA: 115-117 North Julia Street
Applicant: Springhill Avenue Corporation
Received: 05/07/07 (+45 Days: 06/21/07)
Meeting: 05/24/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Construct 8 new town homes.

BUILDING HISTORY

There is currently a vacant lot on these two properties.

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 is currently a vacant lot. Staff has received many calls of concern regarding the proposed construction.
- B. The Guidelines for New Residential and Commercial Construction state “the goal of new construction should be to blend into the historic district but to avoid creating a false sense of history.”
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
 - 1. Construct eight new affordable town homes – two buildings with four residences each – per submitted plans.
 - a. The buildings will sit in an L-shape on the lot per submitted plans and have floating slab foundations.
 - b. They will be clad in Ole Virginia brick per submitted plans.
 - c. The front doors will be wood with one light and two decorative panels per submitted plans.
 - d. The rear doors will be steel fiberglass with six decorative panels per submitted plans.
 - e. The windows will be vinyl-clad wood 6/1 sashes per submitted plans.
 - f. There will be a stoop with three steps leading to each of the front and rear doors per submitted plans.
 - g. Ornamentation consists of a water table and iron vents at the foundation.
 - h. There will be 16 parking spaces on a lot in the center of the property; the lot will be asphalt or a concrete aggregate per submitted plans.
 - 2. Extend the existing privacy fence on the south side per the requirements of Urban Development.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that there are elements to the request that will impair the historic integrity of the district. As submitted, the proposed town homes lack the detailing and ornamentation that would have them blend into the historic district per the standards of Mobile’s guidelines for new construction in historic districts. Among the problems that the staff has noted are the solid to void proportions of the buildings – particularly the side elevations – the lack of porch detailing and the lack of detail around the windows and doors. Most importantly, the drawings are not to scale.

As mentioned above, staff has received numerous calls from the residents of Julia Street about the design of the town homes. Staff recommends tabling the application to allow the applicant to propose a better design for the proposed residences.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

072-07-CA: 1950 Government Street
Applicant: Lipscomb Signs/Woodlands Bank
Received: 05/08/07 (+45 Days: 06/22/07)
Meeting: 05/24/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Facing Government (Sign Review Only)
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-3
Project: New Signage.

BUILDING HISTORY

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

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This building was formerly a bank, although it has been vacant for some time. There is currently no sign on it.
- 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 work includes the following:
 - 1. Install one 21 SF wall sign on the Government Street elevation with individual internally lit plastic cabinet letters and logo per the submitted specifications.
 - 2. Install one 3 SF unlit post sign at the property entrance per the submitted specifications.
 - 3. Install two approximately 1 SF vinyl door signs at the building entrance per the submitted specifications.
 - 4. The total sign package is approximately 26 SF.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the wall 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. Staff recommends alternative lighting/materials for Item C1. Staff recommends approving Items C2&3.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Neither the applicant nor his representative was present to discuss the application. Staff explained that the application had been modified so that the materials for the Government Street wall sign had been changed to reverse channel lit. The remainder of the application stayed the same. 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 with the following amendment: C.1: Install one 21 SF reverse channel lit wall sign on the Government Street elevation. 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 district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Michael Mayberry and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 05/24/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

073-07-CA: 1111 Government Street
Applicant: Elbert Wingfield
Received: 05/13/07 (+45 Days: 06/27/07)
Meeting: 05/24/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-2
Project: Construct a new outdoor seating area.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this one-story Ranch commercial building was constructed in 1972 as a Western Sizzlin'. It has since been Gulf Seafood, Mobile Country Buffet and Saucy Q. It has undergone some minor alterations.

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 building is currently the Saucy Q restaurant. It has been minimally altered a number of times throughout the years. There is currently no outdoor seating. The location for the proposed work is the grassy area at the Government Street side of the building.
- 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. Level the slope of the grassy knoll.
 - 2. Pour a concrete slab that will abut the north side of the building and leave 6'-0" of green space on the other three sides.
 - 3. Install a door on the right side of the north elevation leading to the seating area; it will match the main entrance door.
 - 4. Install a 4'-0" tall black iron fence with simple square posts around the seating area with a 4'-0" tall gate on the east side leading to the parking lot.

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. Staff recommends approving the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Elbert Wingfield was present to discuss the application. He explained that 6 ft. of green space would remain around the seating area. The oak tree would 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

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

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. The motion was seconded by Tilmon Brown and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 05/24/08