

CITY OF MOBILE
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

Minutes of the Meeting
July 9, 2007

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:01 p.m. by Chair, Bunky Ralph.

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

Members Present: Tilmon Brown, Michael Mayberry, Harris Oswalt, Bunky Ralph, Craig Roberts, Jim Wagoner.

Members Absent: Robert Brown, Cameron Pfeiffer, Barja Wilson, Carlos Gant.

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

<u>In Attendance</u>	<u>Mailing Address/ Email Address</u>
Don Williams	6300 Picadilly Square Dr. Mobile 36609
Mark Macinnes	959 Palmetto Street Mobile 36604
Ramon Oliver Macinnes	959 Palmetto Street Mobile 36604
Ray Hudson	550 Eslava Street JRHudson300@MSN.com
Lynda Burkett	261 S. Ann Street
William Benbow	304 Little Lower Ave. 36606 billb@dpgulfcoast.com
Max Morey	63 S. Bayou Street
David Crowder	255 S. Cedar Street
Charles Holder	1158 New St. Francis St. Port City Restorationj.com
Linda Snapp	762 Downtowner Loop W. lgsnapp@cglmobile.com

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

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

MID-MONTH APPROVALS

- Applicant's Name:** Jay Turner
Property Address: 68 St. Francis Street
Date of Approval: June 12, 2007
Stain front doors to match existing. Paint ironwork to match existing.
- Applicant's Name:** James Eaton
Property Address: 558 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: June 12, 2007
Replace a broken windowpane on a top floor window of the front elevation.
- Applicant's Name:** Mike Henderson
Property Address: 1304 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: June 12, 2007
Replace existing architectural shingle roof with new 30-yr architectural shingle roof in Weathered Wood.
- Applicant's Name:** John Peebles
Property Address: 202 Government Street
Date of Approval: June 12, 2007
Temporarily place boards to fit within the openings of the building.

5. **Applicant's Name:** Charles Jones
Property Address: 454 Conti Street
Date of Approval: June 13, 2007
Install balustrade on porch to match existing porch railing and stair rails with square spindles. Paint building in the existing color scheme.
6. **Applicant's Name:** Devereaux Bemis
Property Address: 167 State Street
Date of Approval: June 13, 2007
Repair and replace rotten windows as needed matching existing in profile, dimension and material. Repair rear stair and install a new balustrade per MHDC stock design #1.
7. **Applicant's Name:** Raymond and Debra Pelt
Property Address: 107 North Pine Street
Date of Approval: June 14, 2007
Repaint building in the following Valspar color scheme:
 - Body – Montpelier Peach
 - Trim – Sweet Sand
8. **Applicant's Name:** Christopher Peters
Property Address: 401 Church Street
Date of Approval: June 14, 2007
Repair/replace rotten wood as necessary with materials to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Paint building in the existing color scheme.
9. **Applicant's Name:** Mobile Bar Association
Property Address: 153 Government Street
Date of Approval: June 14, 2007
Reroof using black architectural shingles. Roof will match existing.
10. **Applicant's Name:** Carl Thomas/Liberty Roofing
Property Address: 160 Charles Street
Date of Approval: June 15, 2007
Install new charcoal 3-tab fiberglass shingles.
11. **Applicant's Name:** Veets
Property Address: 68-70 South Royal Street
Date of Approval: June 15, 2007
Paint façade in the following BLP color scheme:
 - Body – Old Dauphin Way Gold
 - Trim – Black
12. **Applicant's Name:** Susan Gianelloni
Property Address: 208 South Cedar Street
Date of Approval: June 15, 2007
Install new charcoal 3-tab fiberglass shingles.
13. **Applicant's Name:** Ruth Fremouw
Property Address: 1408 Conti Street
Date of Approval: June 19, 2007
Remove rear storage unit. Repair/replace per City Engineering. Paint residence in the following colors:
 - Body – White
 - Trim – White

- Door and Shutters – Black
14. **Applicant's Name:** Holmes and Holmes Architects
Property Address: 709 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: June 19, 2007
Replace metal windows on Dauphin Street façade with new windows to match existing.
15. **Applicant's Name:** Strategy Inc.
Property Address: 112 South Dearborn Street
Date of Approval: June 21, 2007
Install 3' high white picket fence on the south side at the sidewalk. Fence will not have scalloped edging.
16. **Applicant's Name:** Peter Wallace
Property Address: 1122 Palmetto Street
Date of Approval: June 21, 2007
Paint exterior in the following Benjamin Moore colors:
- Body – Stonington Gray, HC170
 - Trim – White
 - Accents – Essex Green
17. **Applicant's Name:** Slate and Tile Company
Property Address: 70 Etheridge Street
Date of Approval: June 22, 2007
Replace damaged roof tiles with ones that match existing in material, profile, color and dimension. Paint porch in the existing color scheme.
18. **Applicant's Name:** Annette Grow
Property Address: 1114 Palmetto Street
Date of Approval: June 22, 2007
Paint porch deck black.
19. **Applicant's Name:** Hudson Tapia
Property Address: 964 Palmetto Street
Date of Approval: June 25, 2007
Replace existing handrail with 2x4 balusters (per MHDC stock plan #1) with a handrail with turned spindles (per MHDC stock plan #2). Repair/replace porch deck with 1x4 tongue and groove boards. Repaint residence in the following color scheme:
- Body – Hazel (Green/Brown)
 - Trim – White
 - Shutters – Black
20. **Applicant's Name:** Watson Contracting Company
Property Address: 212 South Cedar Street
Date of Approval: June 26, 2007
Replace rotten wood as necessary on siding and porch with materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Paint building in the existing color scheme.
21. **Applicant's Name:** Dandi Dolbear
Property Address: 157 South Jefferson Street
Date of Approval: June 26, 2007
Reroof with materials to match existing – GAF Weathered Wood architectural shingles.

22. **Applicant's Name:** Proactive Medical Building/Extended Family Care
Property Address: 108 North Catherine Street
Date of Approval: June 26, 2007
 Install a 3x5 wood, double-faced sign that will be 4½' high attached to wood posts per the submitted plans.
23. **Applicant's Name:** Judy and Bruce Traub
Property Address: 1417 Brown Street
Date of Approval: June 26, 2007
 Install aluminum gate with opener to replace current wood gate at the back right corner of the house. The design will be DG-6B-A without the diagonal bars and decorative pieces. The gate will be 6' high, 9' wide and painted black. Install a front step handrail per the submitted design. Handrail is to be painted white.
24. **Applicant's Name:** Robert Schwarz
Property Address: 13 North Reed Avenue
Date of Approval: June 26, 2007
 Replace rotten wood as necessary with new materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Paint new materials to match existing color scheme.

NOTICES OF VIOLATION and MUNICIPAL OFFENSE TICKETS

25. **Notice of Violation:** Barbara Ann Jarvis
Property Address: 106 Garnett Street
Date of Violation: June 13, 2007
 Lack of maintenance/neglect.
26. **Notice of Violation:** Ramon and Mark Macinnes
Property Address: 959 Palmetto Street
Date of Violation: June 18, 2007
 Work without Board approval.
27. **Notice of Violation:** Laurie Hill
Property Address: 1112 Selma Street
Date of Violation: June 18, 2007
 Work without Board approval.
28. **Notice of Violation:** Kevin Painter
Property Address: 553 Church Street
Date of Violation: June 26, 2007
 Boarded windows on occupied residence.
29. **Municipal Offence:** David Naman
Property Address: 108 Dauphin Street
Date of Ticket: May 22, 2007
 Lack of maintenance/neglect.
30. **Municipal Offence:** Mary Naman
Property Address: 223 Dauphin Street
Date of Ticket: May 22, 2007
 Lack of maintenance/neglect.

31. **Municipal Offence:** William Townsend
Property Address: 304 North Jackson Street
Date of Ticket: May 22, 2007
Lack of maintenance/neglect.
32. **Municipal Offence:** Mohamed Shakova
Property Address: 16 South Royal Street
Date of Ticket: May 22, 2007
Lack of maintenance/neglect.
33. **Municipal Offence:** Ken Henderson
Property Address: 259 St. Francis Street
Date of Ticket: May 22, 2007
Lack of maintenance/neglect.

OLD BUSINESS

1. **076-07-CA:**261 South Ann Street
Applicant: Scott Phillips
Request: Reconfigure parking area.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

NEW BUSINESS

2. **095-07-CA:**550 Eslava Street
Applicant: Don Williams
Request: Construct an addition and garage. Expand existing driveway. Install masonry wall.

DENIED. Certified Record attached.

3. **100-07-CA:**308 Congress Street
Applicant: Beth Mund
Request: Reconfigure rear steps.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

4. **101-07-CA:**255 South Cedar Street
Applicant: David Crowder
Request: Replace iron rail on balcony with masonry rail. Install a copper gutter.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

5. **102-07-CA:**959 Palmetto Street
Applicant: Mark Macinnes
Request: Reside rear elevation with inverted board and batten.

DENIED. Certified Record attached.

6. **103-07-CA:**28 South Lafayette Street
Applicant: Douglas Kearley
Request: Reconfigure rear shed structure.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

7. 104-07-CA:1604 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Douglas Kearley
Request: Enclose upper rear porch.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

8. 105-07-CA:754 Government Street (West of)
Applicant: Max Morey
Request: Construct a new residence.

APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. Certified Record attached.

9. 106-07-CA:1212 New St. Francis Street
Applicant: Charles Holder
Request: Add two dormers. Install a rear deck or screened porch.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

OTHER BUSINESS and ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Bill Benbow presented the Board with a hurricane shutter that would more closely resemble a wood shutter than other examples on the market. It has a matt finish and could be made more matt.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

**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
Resubmitted: 06/20/07
Meeting: 07/09/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Non-Contributing (Garage Apartment) and Contributing (Main Residence)
Zoning: R-1
Project: 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. The Board approved the building section of the conversion on 06/11/07. The parking section was tabled in order to find a more appropriate solution.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines 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 will reconfigure the parking for the property per the resubmitted plan:
 - 1. Retain the 21'-0" wide curb cut at South Ann.
 - 2. Enlarge existing concrete drive at South Ann to allow three 8'-0" by 18'-0" spaces with materials to match existing.
 - 3. Install a 3'-0" wood picket fence around the parking area.
 - 4. Enlarge the 8'-0" wide curb cut at Texas to 14'-0" wide.
 - 5. Enlarge existing gravel drive at Texas to allow three 8'-0" by 18'-0" spaces with materials to match existing.
 - 6. Install a 3'-0" wood picket fence around the parking area.

RECOMMENDATION

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

The areas being proposed for parking are already being used as such. The proposed condominium project will have four units. The proposed amount of parking is six spaces – three 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. There will also be a large amount of landscaping around the parking areas. The picket fence falls within the standards of the Design Review Guidelines.

Staff recommends approving 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

Lynda Burkett was present to discuss the application. She stated that the landscaping will be both bushes and trees and more irregular in design. Traffic Engineering has given a verbal approval to the parking plan. One unit has been deleted from the project so that only 6 parking spaces will be required. There will be gravel parking on Texas Street, however, Traffic Engineering want the concrete parking area to remain on Ann Street. In response to Board questioning regarding the narrowing of the curb cut, Ms. Burkett responded that cars would have trouble backing out.

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 Craig Roberts 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 Craig Roberts and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 07/09/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

095-07-CA: 550 Eslava Street
Applicant: Don Williams
Received: 06/11/07 (+45 Days: 07/27/07)
Meeting: 07/09/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Construct an addition and garage. Expand existing driveway. Install masonry wall.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, Henry Alexander built this one-story L-shaped frame residence with Victorian elements circa 1895 at 2753 Grant Street. In the summer of 1979 it was moved to 550 Eslava as part of the Church Street East Community Development Block Grant program.

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 rear porch on this residence and existing wood picket and privacy fences surrounding the backyard. The driveway for this residence is located along South Cedar Street; it leads to the backyard.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state that new additions should respect the age and style of the building and that walls “should complement the building...design, scale, placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District. The height...is generally restricted to six feet.”
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
 - 1. Enclose the existing rear porch with a new addition that includes a new bedroom and kitchen area, a covered porch and a double garage per the submitted plans. All new construction will match existing to include:
 - a. Finished floor elevations, wall and ceiling heights.
 - b. Cornice overhang and style, roof pitch and decking material thickness.
 - c. Interior/exterior siding and architectural details.
 - 2. Expand the existing 10’-0” wide driveway to 16’-0” wide.
 - 3. Install a 6’-0” and 8’-0” tall stucco wall at the existing wood fences (to be removed) per the submitted plans.
 - 4. Relocate a Crepe Myrtle within the City Right-of-Way per the submitted plan.

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 or the district.

The height of the proposed wall is 8’-0” tall, which is above the 6’-0” height limit maintained by the Board. Additionally, staff feels that the masonry wall is out of scale with the relatively modest frame residence. A wood privacy fence would be a more appropriate solution. The expanded driveway would also be inappropriate for the residential neighborhood. The

drawing indicates a new front door that is inappropriate for the style of the residence. Staff feels either the current door should remain or a more appropriate door should be installed. Staff also feels more appropriate rear doors should be installed in the new addition. The remaining items will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district.

Staff recommends conditioning the approval with the following changes to the application – install more appropriate doors, retain the 10'-0" wide curb cut, install a more appropriate fence with a 6'-0" height limit. Staff also requests that any windows removed from the existing be reused in the new addition. The applicant will need to speak with Urban Forestry regarding any tree removal.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Engineer Don Williams and owner Ray Hudson were present to discuss the application. Mr. Williams explained that some existing trees would be relocated. There would be double garage doors 16-18 ft. in width. The wall would be constructed of stuccoed concrete block. It would begin at 6 ft. and then rise to 8 ft. as it turned the corner. He stated that it was in character with other houses in the adjacent neighborhood and presented photographs of those properties to the Board. He stated that the pedestrian doors would remain the same.

One Board member discussed the possibility of constructing a porte cochere instead of a garage.

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

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 with the addition of fact C 5. "The front door will remain the same; the back door will be relocated." 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 the application be denied. The motion was seconded by Tilmon Brown and approved with Harris Oswalt voting in opposition. Issues of an attached garage, curb cut width and 8 ft. wall need to be addressed by the applicant.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

100-07-CA: 308 Congress Street
Applicant: Beth Mund
Received: 06/15/07 (+45 Days: 07/31/07)
Meeting: 07/09/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: DeTonti Square
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-B
Project: Reconfigure rear steps.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this one-story frame residence with Victorian elements was built circa 1900 at 971 Springhill Avenue. In 2002 it was moved to 308 Congress for restoration.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. There is currently a rear staircase attached to the residence with no landing and five wood steps facing north. There is a cloth awning covering the area.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “[porch] materials should blend in with the style of the building. The balustrade of the stairs should match the design and materials of the porch.”
- C. The proposed work will turn the existing rear steps from the north to the east and west sides per the submitted plans. There will be a landing the full width of the existing rear double door and all new construction will match the existing steps, including materials and the design of the handrail.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the proposed work that will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district. The new steps will match the existing steps.

Staff recommends approving the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Douglas Kearley was present to discuss the application. He had no additions to 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 Jim Wagoner and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 07/09/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

101-07-CA: 255 South Cedar Street
Applicant: David Crowder
Received: 06/21/07 (+45 Days: 08/05/07)
Meeting: 07/09/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Replace iron rail on balcony with masonry rail. Install a copper gutter.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this two-story masonry residence was built in 1999.

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 iron rail on the balcony with a fleur-de-lis motif. The balcony is supported by two fluted iron posts.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state that new architectural elements should respect the style and age of the building.
- C. The proposed work will replace the existing iron rail with a stone rail per the submitted photograph and add a copper gutter around the edge of the balcony.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the work will not impair the historic integrity of the district. This residence, like the majority of residences in this part of Church Street East, is new construction. However, while staff does not take issue with the design or materials, staff believes the scale of the new materials will overpower the small porch, particularly the iron columns, and feels that the rail should be built more to scale with the existing porch.

Staff recommends approving the application; however, staff also encourages Mr. Crowder to find a more appropriately scaled alternative.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

David Crowder was present to discuss the application. He stated that the new balustrade would be cast stone. He has checked that the first floor columns will support the weight of the new railing. 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 but restated that a railing more in scale with the building should be chosen.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

Craig Roberts 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 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: 07/09/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

102-07-CA: 959 Palmetto Street
Applicant: Mark Macinnes
Received: 06/21/07 (+45 Days: 08/05/07)
Meeting: 07/09/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Reside rear elevation with inverted board and batten.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this one-story frame residence with Victorian elements was built circa 1899. Part of the front porch was enclosed around 1965.

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 rear elevation of this residence was recently sided with inverted board and batten. A complaint from a fellow resident of the Oakleigh Garden Historic District prompted staff to investigate and issue Mr. Macinnes a Notice of Violation for failure to obtain Board approval for the work.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “[t]he exterior material of a building helps define its style, quality and historic period. The original siding should be retained and repaired. Replacement of exterior finishes, when required, must match the original in profile, dimension and material.”
- C. The applicant is asking the Board to allow the new siding to remain.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the work does impair the historic integrity of the house and the district. The siding on the rear elevation is inappropriate for the residence and significantly alters the character of the building.

Staff recommends denying the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

The applicants were present to discuss the application. Mark Macinnes stated that he had been told by neighbors that the back of the house was not under Review Board control. He stated that it would cost \$7,000 to replace the reverse board and batten with siding. He further stated that the original siding was left in place behind the board and batten plywood. He is not financially able to remedy the situation since he has \$25,000 in medical bills uncovered by insurance.

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

Board members stressed that they must adhere to their accepted guidelines and that there is no exception for financial reasons.

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 Michael Mayberry 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 the application be denied. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswald and unanimously approved.

The applicants were told about the appeal process.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

103-07-CA: 28 South Lafayette Street
Applicant: Douglas Kearley
Received: 06/22/07 (+45 Days: 08/06/07)
Meeting: 07/09/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Reconfigure rear shed structure.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, Belle Hansen Taylor built this one and one-half story frame residence circa 1908. Although previous Sanborn maps show an outbuilding on the lot, the existing rear shed is not contemporary to the main residence. The elements on the shed suggest that it was either built in the 1940s or built with materials salvaged from that era.

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. Currently, the rear shed has board and batten siding, wood casement windows and a four-panel wood door. It appears in good condition.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “[t]he appropriateness of accessory structures shall be measured by the guidelines applicable to new construction. The structure should complement the design and scale of the main building.”
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
 - 1. Raise the structure with new brick piers and lattice.
 - 2. Reclad roof in either metal panels to match the main residence or asphalt dimensional shingles.
 - 3. Reclad building in 1x6 wood siding 5” to weather.
 - 4. Repair as necessary rotted or damaged wood elements to include the door, windows and eaves with materials that match existing in material, profile and dimension.
 - 5. Construct a small gabled wood porch per the submitted elevations.
 - 6. Paint shed to match the main house.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the work will not impair the historic integrity of the house or the district. The work is being done on a secondary non-contributing structure.

Staff recommends approving the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Douglas Kearley was present to discuss the application. He had no additions or amendments. There was no one else present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Staff had one comment from the public that opposed the interior plan of the outbuilding stating that it could be used as a second residence on once lot. There were no comments from City departments to read into the record.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

Craig Roberts 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

Craig Roberts 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. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswalt and unanimously approved.

Jim Wagoner moved that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued for the project. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswalt and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 07/09/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

104-07-CA: 1604 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Douglas Kearley
Received: 06/22/07 (+45 Days: 08/06/07)
Meeting: 07/09/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Enclose upper rear porch.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, T.S. Moore built this two-story frame residence with Classical elements in 1908. Its expansive front porch, stained-glass windows and other details reflect the homes of the early 20th century. A 1999 fire damaged much of the rear second story. It was later rebuilt to match the original.

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. Currently, the porch on the second floor is open. The porch on the first floor is enclosed with lattice.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “[w]here rear or side porches are to be enclosed, one recommended method is to preserve the original configuration of columns, handrails and other important architectural features.”
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
 - 1. Install a wall with fixed wood louvered blinds within the existing handrail and columns per the submitted elevations.
 - 2. Install a wood 1/1 double-hung sash window with operable wood shutters on the west side per the submitted elevations.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the work will not impair the historic integrity of the house or the district. The porch enclosure will preserve the original configuration of the existing architectural features.

Staff recommends approving the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Architect Douglas Kearley was present to discuss the application. In response to Board questioning concerning whether shutters would be operable, he stated that they would be operable at the windows. 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

Craig Roberts 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 Jim Wagoner and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 07/09/08.

APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS CERTIFIED RECORD

105-07-CA: 754 Government Street
Applicant: Max Morey
Received: 06/25/07 (+45 Days: 08/09/07)
Meeting: 07/09/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Construct a new residence.

BUILDING HISTORY

This is an empty lot that is part of the former Birch and Hatfield building.

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 an empty lot that is part of the former Birch and Hatfield building.
- 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 will construct a new three-story brick residence per the submitted plans:
 - 1. The foundation will be concrete slab.
 - 2. The exterior will be brick removed from 208 Dauphin Street (Derry’s Ole Tyme Café) with stone quoins along the front façade.
 - 3. The built-up roof will be flat with a brick gabled parapet at the front and rear elevations with cement faced molding.
 - 4. The industrial-style windows will be black-painted steel.
 - 5. The doors will be wood; the doors on the first floor will have transoms.
 - 6. There will be wood swinging garage doors at the front and rear elevations of the first floor.
 - 7. There will be iron balconies at the rear elevation of the second and third floors.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the new construction should not impair the historic integrity of the district.

The proposed construction follows the setback and orientation pattern of buildings in the vicinity. Its massing and scale, including the slab foundation and simple rectangular footprint, are proportional to buildings typical of this part of the district. It has iron balconies on the rear elevation, an “important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture.” Ornamentation such as the industrial-style windows, quoins, parapet and garage doors is inspired by nearby buildings, yet has a contemporary feel. As such, it succeeds in the ultimate goal of guidelines for new construction, which state, “new designs should relate to the historic context yet read as contemporary” as well as “avoid creating a false sense of history.”

However, the Board in the past has rejected the idea of garage doors on Government Street. With the rear entrance, a better design for the façade could be developed and the parking in the rear could remain. Staff also noted a few problems with traditional proportions in the building – the surface to void ratio of the first floor appears too large, the step-up on the façade corner could be larger to provide a more aesthetically accurate ratio; the rear second and third floor doors appear under scaled and too close to the windows; and finally, the rear first floor and cornice proportions mirror those on the front.

Staff recommends denying the application and asking Mr. Morey to redesign the first floor façade and consider addressing the proportion issues mentioned above.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Owner Max Morey and architect Linda Snapp were present to discuss the application. Ms. Snapp stated that the house and garage sit on the property line. Currently there is access from the adjacent property to the east, but if that were to be sold, there would be no access except to Government Street. There is already a curb cut where the garage will be located. The site was formerly used for parking.

One Board member stated that the house is a good compliment to the Switzer house approved previously by the Board. There was concern about having the garage face Government Street. The applicants stated that there is no other option. The issue of using old doors for the garage was discussed.

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

Craig Roberts 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 impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued with the applicant bringing the design of the garage doors and front door to Staff. The motion was seconded by Craig Roberts and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 07/09/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

106-07-CA: 1212 New St. Francis Street
Applicant: Charles Holder
Received: 06/25/07 (+45 Days: 08/09/07)
Meeting: 07/09/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Add two dormers. Install a rear deck or screened porch.

BUILDING HISTORY

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

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This residence is currently vacant and in fair condition. The upstairs is attic space, which Mr. Holder is planning on converting into second floor living space. The chimneys are in poor condition.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “[a]ccessory roof elements not original to the structure...shall be located inconspicuously.” The Guidelines also call for renovations to be sympathetic to the age and style of the building.
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
 - 1. Add two gabled dormers to the east side elevation per the submitted plans and specifications; all new materials and elements will match existing including the wood siding, wood trim, roofing and 2/2 wood windows with true divided lights.
 - 2. Construct either a rear deck or a rear screened-in porch (aluminum screen material) per the submitted plans and specifications; all new materials and elements will match existing including the handrail and roofing.
 - 3. Repair rotted or damaged elements as necessary throughout the exterior per the submitted plans and specifications with materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension including the porch deck, handrails and other wood elements.
 - 4. Reroof the residence in 50-year architectural shingles in Charcoal.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that dormers are a typical and historic manner of expanding living space into attics. However, they should be constructed to have the least impact on the façade as possible. Staff would recommend locating the forward gable back as far as practical to minimize its effect on the

original building. Also, staff feels that there should be gable returns on the dormers and that the chimneys are prominent and character-defining features of the residence. Even if the interior fireplaces are removed, one or both of the chimneys should be repaired and maintained. According to previous conversations, Mr. Holder prefers constructing an enclosed porch at the rear of the residence. Staff has no objection to this item.

Staff recommends approving the application with the recommended changes.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Charles Holder was present to discuss the application. He stated that he wanted to remove the forward chimney. Following Board discussion about the design importance of chimneys, Mr. Holder stated that the forward chimney is in very bad condition, he has received a large estimate to rebuild it and it interferes with the new floor plan. He will repair the chimney to the rear.

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

Craig Roberts 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

Craig Roberts 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 with both the deck and screened porch options approved. The motion was seconded by Michael Mayberry and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 07/09/08.