

CITY OF MOBILE
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Minutes of the Meeting
June 11, 2007

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m. by Chair, Bunky Ralph.

MHDC Staff member Aileen de la Torre called the roll as follows:

Members Present: Tilmon Brown, Carlos Gant, Harris Oswalt, Cameron Pfeiffer, Bunky Ralph, Jim Wagoner, Barja Wilson.

Members Absent: Robert Brown, Michael Mayberry,

Staff Members Present: Aileen de la Torre, Anne Crutcher.

| <u>In Attendance</u> | <u>Mailing Address</u> | <u>email address</u> |
|----------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|
| Lynda Burkett | 3169 Midtown Park So. 36606 | |
| Mike Clark | 114 N. Lafayette Street | |
| Catherine Sisson | 109 Beverly Court | |
| H. Don Bowden | | |
| Eric Chitty | 1552 Monterey Place | |
| Brent Blankenship | 18 Semmes Avenue | |
| Richard Raypon | P.O. Box 190764 Mobile 36619 | |
| Mike Barnes | 2368 Pass Rd., Biloxi, MS 39532 | |

Tilmon Brown moved to approve the minutes of the last meeting as emailed. The motion was seconded by Jim Wagoner and unanimously approved.

Tilmon Brown moved to approve the mid-month Certificates of Appropriateness. The motion was seconded by Craig Roberts and unanimously approved.

MID-MONTH APPROVALS

- 1. Applicant's Name:** Carson and Brandy Strickland
Property Address: 1007 Savannah Street
Date of Approval: May 8, 2007
Repair/replace rotten siding with wood to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Paint residence in the following Benjamin Moore colors:

 - Body – Santo Domingo Cream, 274
 - Trim – White
 - Porch Deck and Shutters – Black
 - Porch Ceiling – In Your Eyes Blue, 715
 - Fish Scales in Gable – Spanish Red, 1301
- 2. Applicant's Name:** Ashley Sharer
Property Address: 1721 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: May 8, 2007
Install new roof using Corning shingles in Williamsburg Gray
- 3. Applicant's Name:** Stephanie DeAnda
Property Address: 70 North Reed Avenue
Date of Approval: May 8, 2007
Repair damaged wood privacy fence with boards to match existing in material, profile and dimension.
- 4. Applicant's Name:** Dharam Pannu
Property Address: 204 North Franklin Street

Date of Approval: May 9, 2007
Paint touch up to match existing colors.

5. **Applicant's Name:** Tony Atchison
Property Address: 551 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: May 10, 2007
Within the next 30 days: remove east portion of rotten canopy, seal lunette in east elevation, stow fallen ironwork, board two second story windows in rear ell, paint all boards red and remove rotten wood on rear ell eave. Develop full renovation plan once clear title is obtained.
6. **Applicant's Name:** Saralee Lambert
Property Address: 1304 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: May 10, 2007
Paint exterior in the following Sherwin Williams colors:
 - Body – Burlap, SW6137
 - Trim – Muslin, SW6133
7. **Applicant's Name:** Patricia Felis
Property Address: 206 South Broad Street
Date of Approval: May 10, 2007
Repair roof with materials to match existing in material, profile, color and dimension.
8. **Applicant's Name:** Fat Daddy's
Property Address: 224 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: May 10, 2007
Repair the exterior masonry as necessary. Strip and refinish all the exterior Mahogany wood. Paint building in the following colors:
 - Body – BLP Poindexter Hill Cream, RC22
 - Window Hoods, Cornice Accents, Brackets, Keystones – BLP Stuyvesant Grove Tan, RC14
 - Pilasters – Benjamin Moore Yorktown Green, HC133
 - Medallion Interiors – Gold
 - Iron Balcony, Iron Posts – BLP Bellingrath Green
9. **Applicant's Name:** Bowen Maintenance
Property Address: 18 North Julia Street
Date of Approval: May 14, 2007
Replace rotten siding with materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Repaint building in the existing colors.
10. **Applicant's Name:** John Mallory
Property Address: 300 George Street
Date of Approval: May 15, 2007
Repaint the residence in the same color scheme as the residence at 1062 Church Street:
 - Body – Green
 - Trim – White
11. **Applicant's Name:** Barbara Sims
Property Address: 154 Macy Place
Date of Approval: May 16, 2007
Repair rear property line of fence with 5'-0" privacy fence to match existing fence on north and south sides.
12. **Applicant's Name:** Jan Dabney
Property Address: 1707 Laurel Street
Date of Approval: May 16, 2007

Repair damaged roof on the garage and re clad it with metal panels to match existing metal panels.

- 13. Applicant's Name:** Ormandos Jackson
Property Address: 305 Marine Street
Date of Approval: May 18, 2007
Repaint building trim in a Hunter Green from Glidden. The brick will remain unpainted.
- 14. Applicant's Name:** Hunter Compton
Property Address: 200 Dexter Avenue
Date of Approval: May 18, 2007
Repair/replace rotten wood on garage with materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Repaint in the following Sherwin-Williams colors:
- Body – Full Moon, SW6679
 - Trim – White
- 15. Applicant's Name:** Walker Brothers Investments
Property Address: 558 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: May 18, 2007
Remove the plywood from the building and repair/replace all the rotted wood throughout the exterior with materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Repaint in the existing colors.
- 16. Applicant's Name:** Walker Brothers Investments
Property Address: 476 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: May 18, 2007
Replace the boards on the third story windows of the west elevation and paint them to match the building. Repair the broken transom on the west elevation with a transom to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Replace the missing vent on the north elevation with a new wood vent.
- 17. Applicant's Name:** Jerry Paul Foy and Donnie Crammond
Property Address: 1363 Brown Street
Date of Approval: May 21, 2007
Repaint the residence and rear workshop in the following Benjamin Moore colors:
- Body – Platinum Gray, 71
 - Trim – Wickham Gray, HC171
 - Accents – Garrison Red, HC66
- 18. Applicant's Name:** WRICO Signs/Quiznos
Property Address: 1500 Government Street
Date of Approval: May 21, 2007
Install one 31 SF reverse channel lit wall sign with the Quiznos name. The colors will be red and green to match the restaurant's corporate color scheme.
- 19. Applicant's Name:** David McConnell
Property Address: 150-164 Government Street
Date of Approval: May 21, 2007
Replace two window sashes to match existing in dimension and profile.
- 20. Applicant's Name:** Michelle Brown
Property Address: 1200 New St. Francis Street
Date of Approval: May 22, 2007
Replace the rotted porch decking and other wood elements throughout the exterior with new wood to match existing in profile and dimension.
- 21. Applicant's Name:** Robert Dueitt Construction/Joe Zoghby
Property Address: 7 North Claiborne Street

Date of Approval: May 22, 2007

Repair rotten wood as necessary with new wood to match existing in dimension and profile. Paint exterior in the existing color scheme.

22. Applicant's Name: Edith Kay Previto

Property Address: 68-70 South Royal Street

Date of Approval: May 22, 2007

Repair stucco and continue banding to match 68 South Royal. Add black fabric to existing awning frame.

23. Applicant's Name: Norman and Louisa Stockman

Property Address: 11 North Reed Avenue

Date of Approval: May 22, 2007

Repaint the residence to match the existing colors.

24. Applicant's Name: Advanced Construction

Property Address: 1203 Selma Street

Date of Approval: May 24, 2007

Repair/replace rotten siding, porch elements and fascia as necessary. New materials must match existing in profile, dimension and material.

25. Applicant's Name: Nicholas A. Vrakelos

Property Address: 56 LeMoyné Place

Date of Approval: May 24, 2007

Repair and/or replace damaged and deteriorated wood cornice, soffit and fascia as necessary with new materials to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Paint new materials to match existing color scheme. Install new roof with architectural grade shingles either in black, weathered wood or charcoal gray. This COA replaces the COA dated July 7, 2006.

26. Applicant's Name: Tuan Titlestad

Property Address: 206 Marine Street

Date of Approval: May 24, 2007

Level foundation. Repair rotten wood as necessary with new materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Paint new materials to match existing colors.

27. Applicant's Name: Mobile Opera/Mobile Symphony

Property Address: 257 Dauphin Street

Date of Approval: May 25, 2007

Prep and repaint the exterior in the existing colors, which are outlined in the COA dated July 10, 2001.

28. Applicant's Name: Sean Coley

Property Address: 159-161 Dauphin Street

Date of Approval: May 25, 2007

Repair broken glass and broken ceiling and perform general maintenance, matching the existing in profile, dimension, materials and color.

29. Applicant's Name: Brent Blankenship

Property Address: 18 Semmes Avenue

Date of Approval: May 29, 2007

Construct an 8'-0" by 12'-0" storage shed in the rear of the property per MHDC stock plans.

30. Applicant's Name: Debbie Hicks

Property Address: 1402 Blacklawn

Date of Approval: May 29, 2007

Install a wood handicapped access ramp at the rear of the residence. Ramp will not be visible from the street.

NOTICES OF VIOLATION and MUNICIPAL OFFENSE TICKETS

No NOVs or MOTs were issued.

NEW BUSINESS

- 074-07-CA:** 1552 Fearnway
Applicant: Bowden Architecture
Request: Install a new brick drive and motor court.

TABLED. Certified Record attached.

- 075-07-CA:** 1201 Springhill Avenue
Applicant: Franklin Primary Health Center, Inc
Request: Install a 6'-0" iron fence with two 12'-0" wide gates.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached

- 076-07-CA:** 261 South Ann Street
Applicant: Scott Phillips
Request: Update the garage apartment and reconfigure parking.

APPROVED WORK ON BUILDING. PARKING TABLED. Certified Record attached.

- 077-07-CA:** 1705 Conti Street
Applicant: Francis Forrest
Request: Demolish the residence.

DENIED. Certified Record attached.

- 078-07-CA:** 114 North Lafayette Street
Applicant: James M. Clark
Request: Continue the existing fence, stepping down to 6'-0" and 3'-0".

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

- 079-07-CA:** 959 Dauphin Street
Applicant: John and Joy Klotz
Request: Replace the chain link fence with a 3'-0" and 5'-0" picket fence.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

- 080-07-CA:** 1805 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Charles Howard and Jim Wagoner
Request: Replace the metal garage doors with new metal garage doors.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

- 081-07-CA:** 1559 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Mark and Denise Burks
Request: Replace the metal handrail with a new wood handrail to match existing.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

9. **082-07-CA:** 109 Beverly Court
Applicant: Catherine Sisson
Request: Add a rear shed roof dormer.

APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. Certified Record attached.

10. **083-07-CA:** 18 Semmes Avenue
Applicant: Brent Blankenship
Request: Replace the 1x4 tongue and groove porch decking with 1x6 tongue and groove porch decking.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

11. **084-07-CA:** 1500 Government Street
Applicant: Quality Signs
Request: Install two 30 SF signs.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

12. **085-07-CA:** 57 North Monterey Street
Applicant: Douglas Kearley
Request: Replace a non-historic fixed window with a pair of French doors with transom.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

13. **086-07-CA:** 153 Houston Street
Applicant: Travis Foote
Request: Paint the brick porch.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

OTHER BUSINESS and ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Review Board resolution. The Review Board voted to modify the existing fee schedule for applications. There will be a \$5.00 charge for applications. Applications before the Board will cost \$15.00. There will no longer be any sign deposit refund to the applicant.
2. Discussion on a compromise for 805 Church Street. After much discussion, the Board felt it did not want to take any compromise position with regard to the work done in contradiction to Review Board approvals.

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

APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS CERTIFIED RECORD

074-07-CA: 1552 Fearnway
Applicant: Bowden Architecture
Received: 05/14/07 (+45 Days: 06/28/07)
Meeting: 06/11/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Install a driveway.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this one-story brick Ranch residence was built in 1948. It is located in the Fearnway area of the Old Dauphin Way district, which is notable as a local example of picturesque town planning.

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 located on Fearnway, which was developed as a suburban outgrowth of the City Beautiful Movement. Though the City Beautiful Movement used Beaux Arts monumental architecture, it also relied on beautiful settings. This was translated in suburban planning to a simplified planning tool generally using large lots with deep setbacks in a park like setting. Though not all houses in Fearnway maintained the generously sized lots, the front yards of all the structures are an important characteristic of the neighborhood. In many cases, front drives were not part of the plan or were only minor intrusions leading to rear parking that was also often accessible by rear alleyways. Vehicular access to the majority of residences along this side of the street is from rear alleys.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state that driveways and parking areas should have a “design, location and materials [that are] compatible with the property. The appearance...should be minimized through good site planning and design [and] screened from view by the use of low masonry walls, wood or iron fences or landscaping.”
- C. The proposed work will install a new brick drive and motor court per the submitted site plan. A new 13’-8” curb cut will be installed and a brick sidewalk will lead to the backyard.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the proposed drive and motor court will impair the historic integrity of the building and the district.

The proposed driveway/motor court will be landscaped and use brick pavers; however, its location in front of the residence and its large size will have a substantial negative impact on the property. Additionally, as mentioned above, Fearnway was developed in the picturesque mold. The pastoral quality of the street and the separation of vehicular and pedestrian traffic are important characteristics.

Staff recommends denying the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Eric Chitty and architect Don Bowden were present to discuss the application. Don Bowden took exception to the 1948 date of the house, stating that it appeared more like a ranch house from the 1970s. The house has once served as the parsonage for Dauphin Way Methodist church. He also stated that the installation of the motor court is part of a long range plan to integrate the house more fully into the area. The plan is to install working shutters and other modifications to the house to make it more compatible with adjacent Craftsman houses. The motor court will have a berm at the front and be landscaped. There is no existing driveway and the narrow alley in the rear is only marginally useful. There is a safety issue in unloading children in the alley. In response to a Review Board comment that a driveway could be constructed on the adjacent vacant lot also owned by Mr. Chitty was not something the owner wanted to consider. Mr. Bowden pointed out that the elevation of the two lots is very different and that one lot is approximately 3.5 ft. higher at the rear. In response to a Review Board suggestion to install a short driveway on one side of the property, Mr. Chitty responded that the car would have to be backed out onto Fearnway. The house is closer than 10 ft. from the side property line making the installation of a driveway to the rear impossible. 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 to table the application until the next meeting stating that an elevation, a landscape plan, and a site plan that includes dimensions should be provided. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswald and unanimously approved.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

075-07-CA: 1201 Springhill Avenue
Applicant: Franklin Primary Health Center Inc
Received: 05/15/07 (+45 Days: 06/30/07)
Meeting: 06/11/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-3
Project: Install a 6'-0" iron fence around the property.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this one-story brick commercial building was built in 1950.

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 chain link fence along the east side of the property, a brick wall along the rear and a landscaped border along the front. The parking lot is behind the building.
- 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 classic steel fence with spear topped posts per the submitted site plan.
 - 2. Install two 6'-0" by 12'-0" black classic steel vehicular gates at Michael Donald Avenue (east).

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

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

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 Jim Wagoner and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Harris Oswald moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Him Wagoner and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 06/11/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

076-07-CA: 261 South Ann Street
Applicant: Scott Phillips
Received: 05/17/07 (+45 Days: 07/01/07)
Meeting: 06/11/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Non-Contributing (Garage Apartment) and Contributing (Main Residence)
Zoning: R-1
Project: Update garage apartment and reconfigure parking.

BUILDING HISTORY

Previous records in MHDC's files date this garage apartment to 1945, although a one-story structure with a 259 South Ann Street address appears on this site on the 1925 Sanborn map. It is difficult to tell, however, if it is the current building. The garage is now part of 261 South Ann Street. The main residence has been used as multiple units since at least 1925.

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 was an apartment. It is currently vacant, as is the main residence. Both buildings are currently being converted into condominiums.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines call for renovations to be sympathetic to the age and style of the building. They also state that parking areas should have a "design, location and materials [that are] compatible with the property. The appearance...should be minimized through good site planning and design [and] screened from view by the use of low masonry walls, wood or iron fences or landscaping."
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
 - 1. Convert the garage apartment into a two-story townhouse per the submitted plan.
 - a. Construct a balcony on the 2nd story with tongue and groove hardwood decking and a Colonial handrail.
 - b. Replace the 3/1 windows on the 2nd floor with paired French double doors with 12 true divided lights each.
 - c. Construct a patio on the 1st story with Herringbone brick pavers and a Colonial picket fence with gate.
 - d. Replace the garage doors on the 1st floor with paired French double doors with 12 true divided lights each.

- e. Remove the existing exterior stairs and door on the south elevation.
 - f. Open new window holes on the north, south and east for new wood 6/6 sash windows with true divided lights.
 - g. Match all new window and door trims to existing.
 - h. Locate the new HVAC unit at the rear of the building.
2. Reconfigure the parking for the property per the submitted plan.
- a. Enlarge the 21'-0" wide curb cut at South Ann Street to 24'-0" wide.
 - b. Enlarge the existing concrete driveway at South Ann Street to allow four 8'-0" by 18'-0" parking spaces.
 - c. Enlarge the 8'-0" wide curb cut at Texas Street to 24'-0" wide.
 - d. Enlarge the existing gravel parking pad at Texas Street to allow three 8'-0" by 18'-0" parking spaces.
 - e. Install a brick walk from the street to the garage building.
 - f. Install a 6'-0" dog-eared wood privacy fence to separate the parking area from the garage building.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that there are elements to the proposed work that will impair the historic integrity of the building and the district.

Rather than installing new windows in the proposed openings on the north, south and east elevations, the applicant should reuse the windows removed from the west elevation. The handrail should match that of the main building. Staff feels that the remainder of the work proposed for the garage apartment will not impair the building or the district. It is currently a non-contributing outbuilding to the main residence with little defining character.

The areas being proposed for parking are already being used as such. The proposed condominium project will have either four or five units. The proposed amount of parking is seven spaces – four at South Ann Street, which will only be minimally enlarged, and three at Texas Street, which will be paved with an alternate material such as gravel or grasscrete to reduce its impact. The privacy fence falls within the standards of the Design Review Guidelines.

Staff recommends that Item C.1(f) be amended to have the applicant reuse the existing removed windows. Staff recommends that new elements, including the handrails, match the existing elements of the main residence. Staff recommends approving the remainder of the application.

The applicant will need to speak with Traffic Engineering and Right-of-Way regarding the curb cuts. The applicant will also need to speak with Urban Forestry regarding any tree removal.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Owner Scott Phillips and his representative, Lynda Burkett, were present to discuss the application. Ms. Burkett stated that the applicant would be willing to reuse the existing 3/1 windows and to have the railing match the existing railing. She also stated that the owners wanted to have a 3 ft. picket fence with plantings that would extend from the front corner of the house to the sidewalk. The paving would be gravel or grasscrete pavers in the proposed parking area only; the existing parking area is concrete that will remain. The project consists of 5 condos with one parking place required per condo. There will actually be 7 spaces.

In response to a Board request to narrow the curb cut, Ms. Burkett responded that Traffic Engineering had not been contacted. There was also a question regarding the dimension of the proposed parking places that should be clarified with Traffic Engineering.

There was no one else to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Staff had no comments from city departments to read into the record but received one call from the public that was in favor of the project.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no additional 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 with the following amendment in C.1.f. That existing 3/1 light windows be reused in the new openings on the north, south and east. 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 for work on the building with the applicant returning with a revised landscape plan showing the driveway and fence. The motion was seconded by Craig Roberts and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 06/11/08.

APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS CERTIFIED RECORD

077-07-CA: 1705 Conti Street
Applicant: Francis Forrest
Received: 05/21/07 (+45 Days: 07/05/07)
Meeting: 06/11/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Demolish residence.

BUILDING HISTORY

This one-story frame late Victorian cottage was built circa 1910. In 1984, Mr. Charlie Vaughn, who was the owner at the time, constructed an addition to the residence with the help of MHDC's Free Design Clinic.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 44-79 of the Mobile City Code – Demolition/Relocation of structures within the Historic Districts:

- (a) *Required findings; demolition/relocation.* The board shall not grant certificates of appropriateness for the demolition or relocation of any property within a historic district unless the board finds that the removal or relocation of such building will not be detrimental to the historical or architectural character of the district. In making this determination, the board shall consider:
- (1) The historic or architectural significance of the structure;
 - (2) The importance of the structure to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;
 - (3) The difficulty or the impossibility of reproducing the structure because of its design, texture, material, detail or unique location;
 - (4) Whether the structure is one of the last remaining examples of its kind in the neighborhood, the county, or the region or is a good example of its type, or is part of an ensemble of historic buildings creating a neighborhood;
 - (5) Whether there are definite plans for reuse of the property if the proposed demolition is carried out, and what effect such plans will have on the architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological, social, aesthetic, or environmental character of the surrounding area.
- (b) *Content of applications.* All applications to demolish or remove a structure in a historic district shall contain the following minimum information:
- (1) The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
 - (2) The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;

- (3) Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
 - (4) Description of the options currently held for the purchase of such property, including the price received for such option, the conditions placed upon such option and the date of expiration of such option;
 - (5) Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
 - (6) Financial proof of the ability to complete the replacement project, which may include but not be limited to a performance bond, a letter of credit, a trust for completion of improvements, or a letter of commitment from a financial institution; and
 - (7) Such other information as may reasonably be required by the board.
- (c) *Post demolition or relocation plans required.* In no event shall the board entertain any application for the demolition or relocation of any historic property unless the applicant also presents at the same time the post-demolition or post-relocation plans for the site.

STAFF REPORT

- A. Currently, 1705 Conti Street is in a decrepit state. Ms. Marion Forrest, the current owner, considered renovating the property, but she found that the deterioration was too extensive and costly. The City recently declared the property a public nuisance, and it has directed that the owner repair or demolish the building.
- B. In considering demolitions, the Design Review Guidelines refer to **Section 44-79 of the Mobile City Code**, discussed above.
- C. The proposed work will demolish the existing residence and either sell or donate any salvageable elements.

RECOMMENDATION

Until recently, a family member lived in the home, but did not adequately maintain it. Since vacating the property, there has been no other attempt by Ms. Forrest to improve upon or reuse the property or sell the residence. In addition, there are no definite post-demolition plans.

As a contributing building to the Old Dauphin Way Historic District, the demolition or removal of this building would result not only in an impairment of the historic structure, but also the historic district. Staff recommends denial of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Forrest, brother of the applicant, was present to discuss the application. He stated that there were no specific plans for the reuse of the property, but that the house is in extremely poor condition and cannot be restored. This assessment was made by roofers, not an architect or engineer. The property has not been for sale and his brother wants to retain ownership of the lot. His brother would be willing to donate the house and have it moved off the lot.

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

Staff had a recent comment from the public in opposition to the demolition. No city departments had any comment 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 impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines and that the application be denied. He also added that the applicant should work with Staff for a period of 60 days to find another solution that demolition. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswalt and unanimously approved.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

078-07-CA: 114 North Lafayette Street
Applicant: James Clark
Received: 05/23/07 (+45 Days: 07/07/07)
Meeting: 06/11/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Install a privacy fence around the property.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this one-story brick Ranch was built circa 1955.

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 an 8’-0” wood privacy fence along the north property line.
- 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” wood privacy fence along the east property line per the submitted site plan to match the existing 8’-0” fence in material and profile.
 - 2. Install a 3’-0” wood privacy fence along the east and south property lines per the submitted site plan to match the existing 8’-0” fence in material and profile.

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

Mr. Clark was present to discuss the application. He stated that the current fencing request would complete all the fencing proposed for the property. The 6 ft. fence would mimic the design of the 8 ft. fence.

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, 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: 06/11/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

079-07-CA: 959 Dauphin Street
Applicant: John W. and Joy Klotz
Received: 05/23/07 (+45 Days: 07/07/07)
Meeting: 06/11/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-1
Project: Repair and extend the existing picket fence.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this two-story side-hall town house has elements of Italianate and Greek Revival throughout its interior/exterior. It was built in 1859 for Lieutenant Colonel Charles Stewart and his family. The Neo-Classical front porch was added in 1909.

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 on the north and east sides of the parking pad and a chain link fence on the south side.
- 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. Repair the 5'-0" picket fence with materials matching in material, profile and dimension.
 - 2. Replace the chain link fence with a new 40'-8" wood picket fence to match existing.
 - a. It will be 3'-0" tall to 20'-0" from the west lot line and 5'-0" tall for the remaining 20'-8".
 - b. It will not impact the south neighbor's windows.

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 proposed fence falls within the standards of the Design Review 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

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 Jim Wagoner and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 06/11/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

080-07-CA: 1805 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Charles Howard and Jim Wagoner
Received: 05/23/07 (+45 Days: 07/07/07)
Meeting: 06/11/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Conflicts of Interest: Jim Wagoner, as owner of the property, recused himself from discussion and voting on the application.
Project: Replace the existing metal garage doors with new metal garage doors.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this two-story frame Victorian residence was built circa 1910.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. The current garage doors are standard multi-panel metal doors.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “wood or metal garage doors should be simple in design and compatible with the main building.”
- C. The proposed work will replace the current metal 16-panel garage doors with white Coachman 4-layer steel doors – Series One, Model C11. The spade lift handles and strap hinges will be black.

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 new garage door is compatible to the main residence.

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, 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: 06/11/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

081-07-CA: 1559 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Mark and Denise Burks
Received: 05/29/07 (+45 Days: 07/13/07)
Meeting: 06/11/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Replace the damaged handrail with a new handrail.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this two-story frame residence with a circular porch 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. The east-side stairs leading to the second floor are a non-historic addition to the residence. The existing metal handrails are in poor condition.
- 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 existing metal handrail on the east side of the residence with a new wood handrail that matches the existing rails on the rest of the 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 existing non-historic stairs are not original to the residence and the handrail is in poor condition. The new rail will match that of the rest of the residence.

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

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 Cameron Pfeiffer 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 Cameron Pfeiffer and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 06/11/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

082-07-CA: 109 Beverly Court
Applicant: Catherine Sisson
Received: 05/29/07 (+45 Days: 07/13/07)
Meeting: 06/11/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Add a rear shed roof dormer.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this two-story brick Colonial Revival residence was built in 1931.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. The Sissons are renovating the top floors of the residence to create more space for their family. In order to meet current building and fire codes, the existing stairs and attic must be reconfigured. This includes additional access and ventilation for the attic space.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines call for renovations to be sympathetic to the age and style of the building.
- C. The proposed work will add a shed roof dormer on the rear elevation of the residence. All new materials will match existing materials to include the wood lap siding, wood trim, wood corner boards and shingle roof. The windows will be wood casements with true divided lights.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the changes will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district. The dormer is a small addition that will be minimally seen and all the new materials will match existing materials. Also, as can be seen in the submitted floor plan, the shape and pitch of the dormer has been dictated by the interior.

Staff recommends approving the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Ms. Sisson was present to discuss the application.

The Board questioned Ms. Sisson regarding the 6 light casement windows chosen for the dormer and suggested that 3/1 sash windows might be more appropriate.

Ms. Sisson commented that the windows must satisfy fire code egress requirements since there will be a bed upstairs. She would be amenable to using 3/1 sash providing the fire code requirements were met.

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 Oswalt and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application as revised 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 Oswalt and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 06/11/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

083-07-CA: 18 Semmes Avenue
Applicant: Brent Blankenship
Received: 05/29/07 (+45 Days: 07/13/07)
Meeting: 06/11/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Replace rotted porch decking.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this two-story frame residence was built in 1928.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. The porch decking for this residence is rotted and was recently removed in order to install new decking.
- 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 rotted 1x4 tongue and groove wood porch decking with 1x6 tongue and groove wood porch decking.

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 new decking is a minimal change that will not significantly alter the characteristics of the building.

Staff recommends approving the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Brent Blankenship was present to discuss the application. In response to Board questioning, he responded that he simply preferred the wider 1 x 6 tongue and groove boards to the standard 1 x 4. He explained that the work is in progress. He was not aware that he needed Board approval for the work.

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 Oswalt 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

Harris Oswalt 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 Cameron Pfeiffer and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 06/11/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

084-07-CA: 1500 Government Street
Applicant: Quality Signs/Wow Café and Wingery
Received: 05/29/07 (+45 Days: 07/13/07)
Meeting: 06/11/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: LB-2
Project: New Signage.

BUILDING HISTORY

This contemporary masonry shopping center was built in 2004.

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 has ten storefronts. Under a previous review, the Board allotted the two anchor stores 64 SF of signage and each of the remaining eight storefronts 30 SF of signage. The proposed Wow Café and Wingery will take up two storefronts.
- 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 29 SF wall sign with individual aluminum reverse channel lit letters per the submitted specifications.
 - 2. Install one 30 SF wall sign with individual aluminum reverse channel lit letters per the submitted specifications.
 - 3. The total sign package is approximately 59 SF.

RECOMMENDATION

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

Guidelines concerning size, materials and lighting. Also, the applicant has split the sign into two parts in order to fit them within the building's existing sign panels.

Staff recommends approving the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

A representative of the sign company was present and explained that the standard WOW sign was modified for this location. Owners of the business were also present.

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 Harris Oswald 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 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: 06/11/08.

APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS CERTIFIED RECORD

085-07-CA: 57 North Monterey Street
Applicant: Douglas Kearley
Received: 05/29/07 (+45 Days: 07/13/07)
Meeting: 06/11/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Replace a window with a pair of French doors.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this two-story frame Sidehall residence was built circa 1908.

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 fixed 6'-0" wide non-historic wood window located at the rear porch where the doors are proposed.
- 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 existing fixed 6'-0" wide non-historic wood window with a pair of Spanish cedar French doors with transoms.
 - 1. The doors will be true divided light with 15 panes of tempered glass each.
 - 2. The doors will be 6'-0" wide (3'-0" each) to fit within the existing window opening.
 - 3. The trim and casing will match existing trims and casings.

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 doors will be replacing a non-historic window at the rear of the property and will fit within the width of the existing opening. Also, the material and profile of the doors will match existing elements.

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

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 Jim Wagoner and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 06/11/08.

APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS CERTIFIED RECORD

086-07-CA: 153 Houston Street
Applicant: Travis Foote
Received: 05/29/07 (+45 Days: 07/13/07)
Meeting: 06/11/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Paint the brick on the front porch.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this one-story frame bungalow was built circa 1920. It has undergone a number of changes throughout the years, including vinyl siding, a rear addition and altered windows.

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 being renovated. A previous Certificate of Appropriateness reflects the work being done, although the paint colors and placement were to be determined at a later date. The paint colors were chosen without staff knowledge, and while staff does not object to the colors, we would have made it known that unpainted brick must remain unpainted.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state that the “painting of unpainted brick is...inappropriate in most cases.”
- C. Paint the brick on the front porch with the High Tea accent color. The porch is currently painted the same Rookwood Terra Cotta color as the body of the residence, and staff has received a complaint from a neighbor regarding the color of the porch.

RECOMMENDATION

As a rule, the Board does not allow historically unpainted brick to be painted, so staff would normally recommend that the application be denied. However, the Design Review Guidelines does allow for rare exceptions to the rule. Based on this, staff feels the application should be approved due to two factors:

- Removing the paint from the brick could prove to be more damaging than leaving it on. There could also be a sizeable amount of paint left even after cleaning it.
- According to Mr. Foote, there was a considerable amount of masonry repair necessary. After repairing the brick and repointing the mortar, he found that the new work did not match the old.

Staff recommends allowing the paint to remain on the brick, but repainting it in the High Tea accent color in order to break up the amount of Rookwood Terra Cotta on the residence.

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 at length whether the paint should be removed and the brick returned to its unpainted state. There was also discussion about whether the paint could be thoroughly removed. Since sandblasting techniques would damage the brick, a chemical peel would be required. There was concern that even a chemical peel could ultimately do more damage than the painting had done in the first place. The Board decided to vote on the application as a simple repainting.

FINDING OF FACT

Harris Oswalt 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 Oswalt 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 Craig Roberts and approved with Bunky Ralph voting in opposition.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 06/11/08.