

CITY OF MOBILE
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Minutes of the Meeting
August 13, 2007

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:03 p.m. by Chair, Bunky Ralph.

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

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

Members Absent: Robert Brown, Michael Mayberry.

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

<u>In Attendance</u>	<u>Mailing Address/Email Address</u>
Dallas De Villbis	63 Etheridge Street
Ray Hudson	550 Eslava Street
Don Johnson	965 Church Street
Pete Vallas	108 Lanier Avenue
Lynn Clapper	1501 Old Shell Road
Rev. Bry Shields	1501 Old Shell Road
Don Williams	for 550 Eslava Street
Bradley Donaghey	1501 Old Shell Road
Greg Hazard	565 Government Street/greg2e2rco1.com
Christ Coumanis	9 N. Monterey Street
Lucy Barr	for 211 Lanier Avenue

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

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

MID-MONTH APPROVALS

- Applicant's Name:** Terry and Yvonne Edeker
Property Address: 59 North Monterey Street
Date of Approval: July 11, 2007
Renewal of CoA dated 04-10-06. Finish attic and build four dormers 28'-6" back from the edge of the front porch behind the chimneys with wood shake siding. North and south elevation dormers are 14'-0" x 4'-6" with triple 9-lite wood casements and a shed roof tying into the main roof 1' below the ridgeline. Front (east) elevation dormer is 6'-0" x 2'-6" with a wood 18-lite window and hipped roof. Rear (west) elevation dormer is 8'-6" x 6'-6" with a pair of 6-lite wood casements and a hipped roof. *(Do not paint dormers charcoal to make them disappear.)*
- Applicant's Name:** Hale and Hughes
Property Address: 501 Church Street
Date of Approval: July 13, 2007
Level porch and repair three primary columns on the lower porch to match existing. Repair/replace rotten and damaged wood throughout the exterior, including trim, sills joists, porch decking, railing, brackets, posts, eaves, cornice, siding, with materials to match existing. Repaint in the existing color scheme.
- Applicant's Name:** Anne Little
Property Address: 16 North Reed Avenue
Date of Approval: July 13, 2007

Replace rotten wood as needed with materials to match existing. Repaint in the existing color scheme with the exception of the front and back porches, which will be painted in a light green. Replace two broken windowpanes.

4. **Applicant's Name:** JLSwit LLC
Property Address: 210 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: July 13, 2007
Renewal of CoA dated 08-26-05. Increase exterior walls at rear to two story height matching brick as closely as possible. Install new roof system using modified bitumen and metal parapet.
5. **Applicant's Name:** The Galvez Company
Property Address: 271 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: July 13, 2007
Repaint overhead and walls of the entrance in the existing color scheme.
6. **Applicant's Name:** Theresa Williams
Property Address: 123 Bush Street
Date of Approval: July 17, 2007
Replace decking to match existing using 1x4 tongue and groove. Paint to match existing. Repair loose brick lattice between piers under porch by resetting existing bricks in mortar.
7. **Applicant's Name:** Mark Dabbs
Property Address: 1564 Monterey Place
Date of Approval: July 19, 2007
Replace rotten fascia boards with boards to match existing. Repaint in the existing color scheme.
8. **Applicant's Name:** Roy Burns
Property Address: 1160 Church Street
Date of Approval: July 19, 2007
Replace rotten fascia boards with boards to match existing. Repair roof leaks with materials to match existing.
9. **Applicant's Name:** Scott Electric Sign Company/AT&T
Property Address: 1500 Government Street
Date of Approval: July 19, 2007
Install a 22 SF aluminum wall sign with reverse channel (halo) lit letters.
10. **Applicant's Name:** Julie Vasquez/Samurai J
Property Address: 167 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: July 19, 2007
Install a red cloth awning at the front door of the building with a 30 SF Samurai J graphic sign.
11. **Applicant's Name:** Liberty Roofing Company
Property Address: 1611 Government Street
Date of Approval: July 23, 2007
Replace rotten wood as necessary with materials to match existing in profile, dimension and material.
12. **Applicant's Name:** Fred South
Property Address: 210 Roper Street
Date of Approval: July 23, 2007
Replace rotted wood elements on the exterior to include porch decking, handrails, soffit and fascia with materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Paint to match existing.
13. **Applicant's Name:** Debra Snyder
Property Address: 306 Chatham Street
Date of Approval: July 27, 2007
Repair chimneys using an appropriate mortar mixture and pointing to match existing.

14. **Applicant's Name:** John and Joy Klotz
Property Address: 350 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: July 27, 2007
Paint in the existing color scheme:
- Stucco – Devoe Sutton, 2M52D
 - Storefront and Pilasters – Devoe Cloversweet, 2H8P, and Glidden Basic Beige
 - Bulkhead, Door and Bases – Devoe Delta Fog, 1M60E, Devoe Adam, 1U53B, and Ironstone, 2H12P
15. **Applicant's Name:** Hastings Read
Property Address: 1225 Selma Street
Date of Approval: July 30, 2007
Paint residence and teahouse in the following BLP color scheme:
- Body – Palmetto Street Bronze
 - Trim – White
16. **Applicant's Name:** Kiker Roofing Company
Property Address: 400 Government Street
Date of Approval: July 30, 2007
Reroof chancellery with materials to match existing. Repair roof of Cathedral.
17. **Applicant's Name:** Chris Carroll
Property Address: 253 Dexter Avenue
Date of Approval: July 30, 2007
Repair wood as necessary to match existing. Paint in the following Sherwin Williams color scheme:
- Body – Cityscape
 - Trim – White
 - Porch Ceiling – Light Blue

NOTICES OF VIOLATION and MUNICIPAL OFFENSE TICKETS

- 1. Notice of Violation:** Jason Fowler and Jason McKenzie
Property Address: 30 South Lafayette Street
Date of Violation: July 18, 2007
Work without Board approval.
- 2. Notice of Violation:** Linda La and Hiep Bui
Property Address: 61 South Ann Street
Date of Violation: July 18, 2007
Work without Board approval.
- 3. Notice of Violation:** David McDonald
Property Address: 913 Government Street
Date of Violation: July 18, 2007
Work without Board approval.
- 4. Notice of Violation:** Ronald and Ruth Suggs
Property Address: 354 Regina Street
Date of Violation: July 18, 2007
Work without Board approval.
- 5. Notice of Violation:** Lafayette and Government Properties LLC
Property Address: 1412 Government Street
Date of Violation: July 18, 2007

Work without Board approval.

6. Notice of Violation: Owen Drey
Property Address: 18 North Monterey Street
Date of Violation: July 27, 2007
Work without Board approval.

7. Municipal Offense: Ronald and Ruth Suggs
Property Address: 354 Regina Street
Date of Ticket: August 2, 2007
Work without Board approval.

8. Municipal Offense: Lafayette and Government Properties LLC
Property Address: 1412 Government Street
Date of Ticket: August 2, 2007
Work without Board approval.

OLD BUSINESS

1.052-05-CA: 223 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Mary and Bill Monahan
Request: Reconfigure the current storefront.

APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. Certified Record attached.

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

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

NEW BUSINESS

3. 116-07-CA:965 Church Street
Applicant: Donald Johnson/Robert Perry
Request: Replace and extend rotted fence and gate. Add an arbor over the gate.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

4. 117-07-CA:701 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Holmes and Holmes, Architects
Request: New Construction.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

5. 118-07-CA:913 Government Street
Applicant: William Tennyson
Request: Allow a Chicago-style window to replace the plate-glass display window.

DENIED. Certified Record attached.

6. 119-07-CA:308 Michigan Avenue
Applicant: Traci Bishop
Request: Replace siding and windows on the back porch. Install a canopy over the back door.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

7. 120-07-CA:61 South Ann Street
Applicant: Coleman Landscaping Service
Request: Allow pergola over driveway to remain.

TABLED. Certified Record attached.

8. 121-07-CA:1054 Church Street
Applicant: Douglas Kearley
Request: New Construction.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

9. 122-07-CA:301 Marine Street
Applicant: Douglas Kearley/Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund
Request: Multiple renovations.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

10. 123-07-CA:30 South Lafayette Street
Applicant: Jason Fowler
Request: Allow new front door to remain. Install a transom over the front door.

DENIED. Certified Record attached.

11. 124-07-CA:202 Government Street
Applicant: Zito Russell Architects
Request: Multiple renovations.

DENIED. Certified Record attached.

12. 125-07-CA:9 North Monterey Street
Applicant: Christ Coumanis
Request: Install handrails.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

13. 126-07-CA:63 Etheridge Street
Applicant: Kim DeVilbiss
Request: Install a new shed. Perform maintenance to residence.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

14. 127-07-CA:108 Lanier Avenue
Applicant: Pete Vallas
Request: Add a dormer.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

15. 128-07-CA:210 Rapier Street
Applicant: Don Williams

Request: Construct an 8'-0" x 12'-0" gazebo.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

16. 129-07-CA:565 Government Street

Applicant: Allen Industries/Paradigm Investment Group

Request: Install signage for a new Hardees restaurant.

APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

17. 130-07-CA:211 Lanier Avenue

Applicant: Lucy Barr Designs/Mr. and Mrs. Sumner Adams

Request: Construct two one-story additions.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

18. 131-07-CA:1501 Old Shell Road

Applicant: Bry Shields

Request: Demolish Brothers Residence at 60 North Catherine Street to construct a new science building.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

19. 132-07-CA:153 Government Street

Applicant: Mobile County/Goodwin, Mills and Cawood

Request: Build a new courthouse annex using the existing building shell.

DENIED. Certified Record attached.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:50 p.m.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

052-04/05-CA: 223 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Mary and Bill Monahan
Received: 05/09/05 (+45 Days: 06/24/05)
Meeting: 05/23/05
Resubmitted: 07/30/07 (+45 Days: 09/13/07)
Meeting: 08/13/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Reconfigure the current storefront.

BUILDING HISTORY

Architect W.H. Hammond designed this three-story masonry commercial building circa 1899. The first floor façade was significantly altered in the late 1920s/early 1930s with the addition of Carrara glass.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This building is currently vacant. As mentioned above, the first floor was significantly altered circa 1930 with the addition of Carrara glass and none of the original storefront is extant. The Board approved the work in 2005 on the condition that the Carrara glass and tile in the vestibule remain; however, the work was never begun. Mr. Monahan recently received an MOT regarding the condition of the Carrara glass.
- B. The Lower Dauphin Street Commercial District Design Guidelines, in reference to buildings that have had their original design significantly altered state, “[t]hese buildings generally have a plain front with no ornamentation or detail, and fail to relate well to adjacent historic buildings. For a situation in which the original detail has merely been hidden by a covering, the guidelines encourage removal of the covering and restoration of the original design. Where detailing has been removed, an entirely new design compatible with older adjacent buildings or a façade reconstruction based on photo documentary evidence is encouraged. If removal of an applied modern storefront will damage the underlying historic fabric of the façade, or the newer façade has achieved historic status (50 years or older), then removal is discouraged.”
- C. The proposed plan is to proceed with the work approved by the Architectural Review Board on May 23, 2005. The architectural blue prints and all permits are the same as when they were originally

approved. Mr. Monahan is also asking the Board reconsider the decision to keep the Carrara glass. The work includes the following:

1. Replace the Carrara glass with scored stucco to match the existing stucco on the upper floors and wood fixed windows per the submitted plans.
2. Replace the glass retail display area with a pair of 42” high eating counters constructed on a 6” thick stucco bulkhead separated by a 5’-0” wide ingress/egress opening per the submitted plan. The bulkhead will have operable wood and glass shutters.
3. Paint the building in the following Benjamin Moore color scheme:
 - a. Body – Manor Blue
 - b. Trim – China White

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that there are elements to the application that will impair the historic integrity of the district. Staff feels that some or all of the Carrara glass should be retained. Leaving the glass would not impact the proposed design. Staff also feels that the tile floor in the vestibule should be retained and repaired.

Staff recommends approving the application with the aforementioned conditions.

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. However, Staff explained that the applicant was issued a Notice of Violation for the broken storefront Carrara glass that had been damaged for some time. The downtown sweep for violations to City code had precipitated the recent NOV.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Tilmon Brown stated that he done some internet research and Carrara glass was still available for restoration purposes. The cost of replacing the damaged glass versus repairing the areas of the storefront where the glass had been removed with a true stucco system were comparable. Staff stated that Mr. Monahan had been given information on Carrara and Vitriolite glass. The Board discussed the importance of retaining the Carrara glass as well as the entrance floor tile since they had attained historic importance.

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 Harris Oswalt and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Cameron Pfeiffer 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 following conditions: that the Carrara glass and tile from the front entrance floor be retained.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 08/13/08.

**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
Resubmitted: 07/30/07 (+45 Days: 09/13/07)
Meeting: 08/13/07

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. The Board recently denied this application due to the attached garage and the 8’-0” wall. Mr. Williams altered the application to address the Board’s concerns.
- 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 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 12’-0” wide.
 - 3. Install a 6’-0” tall stucco wall at the existing wood fences (to be removed) per the submitted plans.

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 plans reflect the concerns staff and the Board had regarding the application. The current front door will remain and more appropriate rear doors will be installed in the new addition. The curb cut has been reduced to 12'-0" wide and the fence has been lowered to 6'-0" tall. The garage, although still attached due to the size of the lot and setback issues, has been redesigned to appear detached.

Staff recommends approving the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Engineer Don Williams and owner Ray Hudson were present to discuss the application. Mr. Williams explained that there were no site coverage issues. In response to Board requirements from the last meeting, the fence has been lowered to 6 feet and the driveway has been narrowed. Based upon setbacks and the existence of a storm drain and plantings in the right of way, the garage cannot be completely detached. Placing the garage further north on the lot makes using the drive more difficult and potentially interferes with the storm drain. A single car garage does not meet the owner's requirements. A recess has been created to visually separate the garage from the main building. The roof structure has not been isolated due to the drainage problems that would create.

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 some discussion with Staff regarding the zoning and required setbacks. Staff informed the Board that, although the lot is currently zoned R-1, RB setbacks were preserved in the area when it was down zoned. That zoning would require a setback of 5 or 0 ft. from the property line.

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. Harris Oswalt seconded the motion that was 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. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswalt and the motion was approved with 3 members voting in opposition.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 08/13/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

116-07-CA: 965 Church Street
Applicant: Donald Johnson/Robert Perry
Received: 07/16/07 (+45 Days: 08/30/07)
Meeting: 08/13/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Replace and extend rotted fence and gate. Add an arbor over the gate.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this one-story frame Victorian residence was built circa 1904.

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 4’-0” wood picket fence with flat boards similar to the Italianate balustrades found throughout the districts surrounding the backyard. The boards are rotten.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “[fences] should complement the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District. The height of solid fences in historic districts is generally restricted to six feet...the finished side of the fence should face toward public view.”
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
 - 1. Replace the rotted wood fence and gate with a new fence and gate per the submitted photographs, using the existing posts.
 - 2. Extend the fence 10’-0” along the side of the house per the submitted site plan.
 - 3. Install a wood arbor at the gate per the submitted photograph.
 - 4. Repair the walkway with concrete to match existing.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the work will not impair the historic integrity of the district. The fence falls within the standards of the Design Review Guidelines and the extension will follow the existing proportions. In addition, the arbor over the gate is a common landscape features and the walkway work consists of minor maintenance.

Staff recommends approving the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Owner Don Johnson was present to discuss the application. He explained that the fence and arbor would be wood.

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 Cameron Pfeiffer and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 08/13/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

117-07-CA: 701 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Holmes and Holmes, Architects
Received: 07/19/07 (+45 Days: 09/03/07)
Meeting: 08/13/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: New construction.
Conflicts of Interest: Tilmon Brown revealed that he had dealings with Mr. Drummond in the past but did not have any current relationship with Mr. Drummond or any financial interest in the project.

BUILDING HISTORY

This is currently an empty lot that once held commercial buildings.

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 empty lot at the corner of Dauphin and South Washington is approximately 55’-0” x 88’-0”.
- 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 plan includes the following:
 - 1. Build four three-story townhouses per the submitted plans on an empty lot that will complement the existing historic buildings of the Carriage Works development, of which this new construction is a part.
 - a. The townhouses, which will face South Washington Avenue, will have a 0’ setback from both South Washington and Dauphin.
 - b. The house will rest on a concrete slab foundation to allow for parking at the first floor on the west elevation; the north, south and east elevations will have a brick course to delineate the foundation from the building.
 - c. The siding will be painted brick and the roof will be flat.
 - d. The windows will be 9/9 aluminum-clad sashes with glued on muntins, unpainted brick soldier courses and sills and operable wood shutters.
 - e. There will be rectangular recesses along the south elevation mimicking windows in order to maintain the fenestration pattern of the building.
 - f. The east (front) and north elevations will have entryways with ornamental brick surrounds and iron gates leading into painted stucco vestibules.

- g. The west (rear) elevation will have eight painted metal paneled garage doors with unpainted brick soldier courses.
- h. There will be cantilevered balconies at the second floor of the north, east and west elevations with iron rails; the balconies at the north and east elevations will have a pairs of 10-lite French doors with glued muntins.
 - i. There will be a balcony at the second floor of the east elevation with iron rails, iron columns, poured concrete bases and pairs of 10-lite French doors with glued muntins.
 - j. Ornamentation includes brick courses, recessed brick panels, a brick cornice with aluminum cap, aluminum gutters, aluminum downspouts and wall sconces.
2. Install an 8'-0" iron and brick fence with an iron gate, light fixtures to match the wall sconces and 9'-0" square brick posts per the submitted drawing and site plan.
3. Install a small section of 6'-0" privacy fence to separate each residence.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that there are elements to the new construction that will 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 foundation and rectangular footprint, are proportional to buildings typical of the district. It has iron balconies, an "important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture." Ornamentation such as the brick courses and recessed panels, the brick and aluminum cornice and iron features "relate to the historic context" of the district. Staff feels that because this is new construction, the proposed sash windows with glued on muntins, which have been chosen to meet building code requirements for impact resistance as well as protection from nearby noise, will not impair the integrity of the district. However, the proposed iron and brick fence can be no taller than 8'-0" in height. With the caps, the fence comes to 9'-0" tall (the light fixtures are not included in the height restriction). The detail sheet for the railings was not included in the submission.

Since this is new residential construction in an urban setting, there is little precedent for staff to gauge the Board's interpretation of the guidelines. Staff feels several items should be considered before final approval is given.

- The fence should be lowered to no taller than 8'-0" including the caps
- The soldier course at the base of the building and the stringcourse between the second and third floors appear under-scaled.
- Much of the detailing does not extend to the rear (west) elevation.
- The number and shape of the lights in the windows (vertical rectangles are appropriate).
- The color of the brick and paint.
- The lack of windows in the south elevation.

The applicant will need to contact Traffic Engineering and Right-of-Way regarding any proposed curb cuts or setback issues.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Owner Todd Drummond and architect Nick Holmes III were 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 requested that Mr. Holmes respond to the Staff recommendations in the Staff Report. Mr. Holmes explained that the fence as proposed does not meet code. Fence posts will be reduced in height to 7'9" to the top edge of the concrete and the iron portions lowered proportionately to approximately 7 ft. in height. He commented that while the usual window light pattern of many historic downtown buildings is 6/6, they had chosen to use 9/9 for this building. He added that the south elevation does not have actual fenestration since it is on the property line and window openings cannot be added so recessed panels are introduced to break up the elevation. He also explained that panels under the balcony on the east (Washington Ave.) elevation will be removed, however, the shutters will remain. Lights will not be put on the parking lot fence posts as proposed.

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 amendment to factC.2.: "Install a brick and iron fence with posts that are 7'9" and iron that is 7' in height." 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 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: 08/13/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

118-07-CA: 913 Government Street
Applicant: William Tennyson
Received: 07/17/07 (+45 Days: 08/31/07)
Meeting: 08/13/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-B
Project: Install a Chicago-style window within the plate-glass display window opening.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this one-story frame building was built in the 1860s and expanded by 1904. Old city directories indicate this building was an office circa 1903, although evidence exists that it may have been a servant's quarters in the 1800s. It has undergone a considerable amount of mostly unsympathetic work throughout the years, including a new front façade with plate-glass display windows and a brick and iron porch.

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. Mr. Tennyson received a CoA for work on the residence in March, including the replacement of the front plate-glass display windows with two sash windows to match existing throughout the rest of the house. However, due to structural and aesthetic concerns the building owner instead chose to install a Chicago-style window (a center display with two sashes on either side) on the front of the residence within the existing opening. However, staff received a complaint from an Oakleigh Garden Historic District resident that the building was not being built as approved, and an NoV was issued on July 17, 2007.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “[t]he type, size and dividing lights of windows and their location and configuration on the building help establish the historic character of a building.” The Guidelines also call for renovations to be sympathetic to the age and style of the building.
- C. Mr. Tennyson is requesting that the Board allow the current window to remain.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the window will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district. As mentioned above, this building has undergone considerable changes throughout the years, including reconfiguring the front façade sometime in the 1960s. However, the building form is that of an early 20th century cottage, in which a Chicago-style window would be

inappropriate. Even though the storefront windows impaired the character of the building, changing one impairment for another simply creates a different impairment. If there is a desire to change the windows, an application with a drawing using sash windows would be appropriate.

Staff recommends denying 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

The Board questioned Staff regarding the appropriateness of the window for the structure. Staff responded that the building was originally a Late Victorian structure that had been altered. The window, appropriate for certain commercial uses, is not used residentially. Two sash windows that matched other openings on the building would be more appropriate.

FINDING OF FACT

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion was seconded by Cameron Pfeiffer and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does impair the historic integrity of the district according to the Guidelines and that the application be denied and that the windows required in the mid-month CoA be installed. The motion was seconded by Craig Roberts and approved with Harris Oswald voting in opposition.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

119-07-CA: 308 Michigan Avenue
Applicant: Traci Bishop
Received: 07/19/07 (+45 Days: 09/02/07)
Meeting: 08/13/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Leinkauf
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Replace siding and windows on the back porch. Install a canopy over the back door.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, George Harris built this one-story masonry residence with Classical and Mediterranean architectural elements in 1914 as a rental unit.

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 back porch of this residence was enclosed a number of years ago with inappropriate materials.
- 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” and “[t]he type, size and dividing lights of windows and their location and configuration on the building help establish the historic character of a building.” The Guidelines also state that fabric canopies (awnings) are appropriate.
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
 - 1. Replace the aluminum siding on the first floor of the enclosed porch with wood siding to match the rest of the residence in material, profile and dimension.
 - 2. Replace the aluminum windows on the first floor of the enclosed porch with wood windows to match the rest of the residence in material, profile and dimension.
 - 3. Install a green and white striped cloth canopy over the back door.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the changes will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district. The proposed work 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. Staff explained that the previous owners of the residence had applied for a marker and addressing the problems with the rear addition was part of the requirement for marking.

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 Harris Oswald and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 08/13/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

120-07-CA: 61 South Ann Street
Applicant: Coleman Landscaping Service
Received: 07/24/07 (+45 Days: 09/07/07)
Meeting: 08/13/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Allow pergola over driveway to remain.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this one-story frame Bungalow was built circa 1930.

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. A pergola was recently installed over the driveway of this residence. A complaint from a fellow resident of the Old Dauphin Way Historic District prompted staff to investigate. Because the pergola is considered an accessory structure, staff decided to issue the applicant a Notice of Violation for failure to obtain Board approval for the work.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “[a]n accessory structure...includes, but is not limited to garages, carports, pergolas, decks, pool covers, sheds and the like...[t]he structure should complement the design and scale of the main building.”
- C. The applicant is requesting the Board allow the pergola to remain.

RECOMMENDATION

A pergola is usually used as a garden feature often attached or in close proximity to the main building. They are also used to mark entrances as an arbor in a fence. In this case the pergola is over the driveway, giving the appearance of an open carport. Since the house is a bungalow, a pergola would be an appropriate landscape feature, but not an appropriate carport. Staff believes the pergola can remain as part of a suitable landscape plan.

Staff recommends tabling the application until a full landscape plan can be developed, but for no longer than two months.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Coleman_ was present to discuss the application. He stated that to his knowledge there is no overall landscape plan for the property. He was simply asked to construct the pergola over the driveway. There was no one else to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Staff had several comments from the public, however, they were not related to the pergola. They dealt with the owners routinely parking on the front lawn. Staff had no comments from city departments to read into the record.

BOARD DISCUSSION

In discussion with Staff, it was determined that pergolas are a feature often associated with Bungalows. However, Board members felt that the pergola was over-scaled for the house. If vines were grown on the pergola or if it was painted a darker color, perhaps it would be less prominent. Board members felt that a discussion with the owners is warranted prior to making a decision

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 David Barr. Following some additional discussion, the motion was withdrawn. Jim Wagoner moved to table the application so that the owners could appear before the Board. The motion was seconded by Tilmon Brown and unanimously approved.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

121-07-CA: 1054 Church Street
Applicant: Douglas Kearley
Received: 07/19/07 (+45 Days: 09/02/07)
Meeting: 08/13/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: New construction.

BUILDING HISTORY

This is an empty lot where once stood residences.

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 empty lot on Church Street is approximately 57’-0” x 120’-0”. Behind it sits the StorageMax.
- 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 plan includes the following:
 - 1. Build a two-story single-family residence per the submitted plans on an empty lot.
 - a. The house will face Church Street and have a 15’-0” front setback and 5’-0” rear and side setbacks.
 - b. It will rest on a 2’-0” raised slab foundation with a masonry course to delineate the foundation.
 - c. The siding will be sand-finish stucco on the first floor and Hardiplank on the second floor.
 - d. The roof will be a medium-pitch front gable with architectural shingles.
 - e. The windows will be a combination of 6/6 and 6/9 wood sashes, wood casements and a wood storefront system at the rear porch, all with glued muntins and operable wood shutters.
 - f. The doors will be a combination of a four-paneled wood door and transom for the front and three wood doors with six lights, two decorative panels and transoms at the side porch.
 - g. The west elevation will have an iron gate leading into a storage area and a masonry chimney.
 - h. The front of the east elevation will have a two-story porch with wood columns and handrail; the upper portion will be enclosed.

- i. The back of the east elevation will have a one-story porch with cantilevered wood columns.
 - j. Ornamentation includes a half-moon louvered vent in the gable, window and door surrounds, masonry courses and a gabled hood with brackets at the front door.
2. Build an 8x10 shed at the rear of the property with a design and materials to match the main residence.
3. Install a 6'-0" masonry wall with iron gate and a 6'-0" privacy fence with wood gate per the submitted plan.
4. Install a Bahamian Limestone driveway and a brick walkway per the submitted plan.

RECOMMENDATION

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

The proposed construction follows the setback and orientation pattern of residences in the vicinity. Its massing and scale, including the foundation and rectangular footprint, are proportional to buildings typical of the district. It has a side balcony similar to several other homes in the neighborhood. Ornamentation such as the window and door surrounds, brackets, ironwork and vents "relate to the historic context" of the district. Staff feels that because this is new construction, the proposed windows with glued on muntins, which have been chosen to meet building code requirements for impact resistance, will not impair the integrity of the district. The proposed fences, driveway and shed fall within the standards of the guidelines.

Staff recommends approving the application. The applicant will need to contact Traffic Engineering and Right-of-Way regarding any proposed curb cuts or setback issues.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Architect Douglas Kearley was present to discuss the application. He explained that the lot on which this house will be built is the last of the Church Street lots to the rear of Storage Max.

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: 08/13/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

122-07-CA: 301 Marine Street
Applicant: Douglas Kearley/Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund
Received: 07/17/07 (+45 Days: 08/31/07)
Meeting: 08/13/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Multiple renovations.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this one-story frame Victorian residence was built circa 1890.

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 in fair condition. The Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund recently purchased the property as part of their effort to revitalize Marine Street.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “[a]ccessory roof elements not original to the structure...shall be located inconspicuously.” The Design Review Guidelines also state, “[fences] should complement the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District. The height of solid fences in historic districts is generally restricted to six feet...the finished side of the fence should face toward public view” and 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.” The Guidelines also call for renovations to be sympathetic to the age and style of the building.
- C. The proposed work includes the following per the submitted plan:
 - 1. Remove the mineral fiber and repair the wood siding underneath as needed with materials to match existing.
 - 2. Install a wood handrail at the front porch.
 - 3. Glass-in the existing rear porch and construct a new one with a design and materials to match existing.
 - 4. Reclad the roof with Timberline shingles in Slate Gray.
 - 5. Install dormers at the east and south elevations with a design and materials to match existing.
 - 6. Enclose an opening at the east elevation.
 - 7. Install operable wood shutters.
 - 8. Repair/replace wood elements throughout the exterior as needed with materials to match existing.
 - 9. Paint with colors to be submitted at a later date and repoint the brick piers with type n mortar.
 - 10. Install MARC lattice at the foundation.
 - 11. Install a 3’-0” wood picket fence at the north and west and a 6’-0” wood privacy fence at the south and east.
 - 12. Install a Bahamian Limestone driveway at the rear of the property.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the work will not impair the historic integrity of the district. The proposed renovation falls within the standards of the Design Review Guidelines.

Staff recommends approving the application. The applicant will need to contact Traffic Engineering and Right-of-Way regarding any proposed curb cuts or setback issues.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Architect Douglas Kearley was present to discuss the application. He stated that the mineral board siding will be removed and that the wood siding underneath is in fair to good condition.

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 Tilmon Brown and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 08/13/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

123-07-CA: 30 South Lafayette Street
Applicant: Jason Fowler
Received: 07/25/07 (+45 Days: 09/08/07)
Meeting: 08/13/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Allow new front door to remain. Install a transom over the front door.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this one-story frame Victorian residence 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. Due to an attempted break-in the front door was badly damaged. As a result, the door would not close or lock properly. Mr. Fowler purchased the current door from an antique shop to replace the damaged door. However, staff received a complaint from a neighbor in Old Dauphin Way that the door was not appropriate to the residence and an NOV was issued.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “[o]ften one of the most important decorative features of a house, doorways reflect the age and style of a building. Original doors and openings should be retained along with any moldings, transoms or sidelights. Replacements should respect the age and style of the building. Doors with leaded or art glass may be appropriate when documentation exists for their use, or when they are compatible with the design and style of the structure.”
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
 - 1. Allow the replacement door to remain.
 - 2. Install a transom above the front doorway similar to the transoms throughout the neighborhood.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that some of the work will impair the historic integrity of the building or the district. The style of the new door is not appropriate to this residence, and staff recommends Mr. Fowler install a more appropriate door.

Transoms are common element for a residence of this era, and are often used to match the height of the windows for a more balanced façade. The proposed transom seeks to create this balance by matching the height of the door with the existing windows. Staff recommends approving the installation of a transom.

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 questioned Staff regarding the appropriateness of adding a transom. Staff responded that the door framing was reeded bull's eye block. A transom would generally be included with this framing type. The proposed door is inappropriate; a door more in keeping with the Victorian style should be used.

FINDING OF FACT

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion was seconded by Cameron Pfeiffer and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does 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 Cameron Pfeiffer and unanimously approved.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

124-07-CA: 202 Government Street
Applicant: Zito Russell Architects
Received: 07/25/07 (+45 Days: 09/08/07)
Meeting: 08/13/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Multiple renovations.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this mid-twentieth century building was originally the Southern Bell Telephone and Telegraph Building. It has undergone a number of alterations throughout the years.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This building is being renovated for the offices of Sullivan-St. Clair. An application was made and approved on 01/06, with the exception of the garage doors. However, though the work was started, it was not completed. It is slated to begin again, but this application is sufficiently changed from the original design to merit a new review.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “[t]he porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture...attention should be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions and decorative details.” The Guidelines also state, “[replacement doors] should respect the age and style of the building” and “[t]he size and placement of new windows...should be compatible with the general character of the building.”
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
 - 1. Install two-story iron galleries at both the Government and Conception Street façades.
 - a. The Government Street balcony will be 48’-0” wide by 10’-0” deep with a metal canopy, vertical metal balusters and metal posts per the submitted drawings.
 - b. The Conception Street balcony will be 26’-0” wide by 10’-0” deep with a metal canopy, a horizontal cable suspension rail and metal posts per the submitted drawings.
 - 2. Install new windows doors and at both the Government and Conception Street façades.
 - a. The Government Street façade will have full length fixed aluminum-clad windows, a 10-light door and a metal vent within the existing openings per the submitted drawings.
 - b. The Conception Street façade will have fixed ribbon windows, metal vents and 10-light doors within the existing openings per the submitted drawings.
 - 3. Install new coiling garage doors at both the Government and Conception Street façades.
 - 4. Install new exterior light fixtures.
 - 5. Repair existing elements, including the wood doors at Government Street, with materials to match existing.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that some of the work will impair the historic integrity of the district. Staff is primarily concerned with the void that will be created by the coil garage doors, and feels that an iron gate would be more appropriate. Staff is also concerned whether the proposed vents will be blowing hot air onto pedestrians and with the void created by the vents. Additionally, staff feels the proposed door on the north side of the Conception Street elevation should match the other doors.

Staff recommends the applicant address these concerns before receiving Board approval.

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 asked Staff whether traffic would be entering and exiting on Government Street. Staff clarified that the building once housed the telephone company. It is L-shaped and traffic would enter on Conception Street and exit onto Government. The applicant will have to confer with Traffic Engineering on the issue of exiting onto Government Street. The large vent on Government Street is required in order to remove CO2 from the parking garage. The Board would like to see a different treatment of the vent.

The Board felt that a more appropriate solution could be found rather than the proposed coiling doors. Board members also had issue with the proportion and detailing of the entrance door. Staff informed the Board that the entranceway already existed on the building.

FINDING OF FACT

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion was seconded by Cameron Pfeiffer and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

125-07-CA: 9 North Monterey Street
Applicant: Christ Coumanis
Received: 07/19/07 (+45 Days: 09/02/07)
Meeting: 08/13/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

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

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this two-story frame American Foursquare was built circa 1909. The front porch has been modified on a number of occasions.

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 front steps currently have no rail. However, photos of the residence show that an iron handrail was attached to the front steps at one time.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “[t]he balustrade of the stairs should match the design and materials of the porch.”
- C. The proposed work will install an iron handrail per the submitted specifications. The new rail is similar to the one that was once on the residence.

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. Although handrails are not original to this style of staircase, ironwork, including handrails and posts, were common updates to Mobile’s older residences in the mid-twentieth century. As is evidenced in previous photos, this residence did have an iron handrail at one time. The proposed handrail is similar in look and will give the same effect as the former one.

Staff recommends approving the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Coumanis was present to discuss the application. He explained that the work will be done by Goodbrad.

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

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 08/13/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

126-07-CA: 63 Etheridge Street
Applicant: Kim DeVilbiss
Received: 07/24/07 (+45 Days: 09/07/07)
Meeting: 08/13/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Install a new shed. Perform maintenance to residence.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this one-story frame residence was built circa 1935.

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 residence formerly had a shed that was severely damaged in Hurricane Katrina. Ms. DeVilbiss recently removed the shed and began to install a new shed per a stock design from Home Depot in its place. However, staff received a complaint from a neighbor in the old Dauphin Way Historic District that the shed was being built without approval and a stop work order was issued.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “[a]n accessory structure...includes, but is not limited to garages, carports, pergolas, decks, pool covers, sheds and the like...[t]he structure should complement the design and scale of the main building.”
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
 - 1. Complete the proposed shed, which sits on the existing foundation of the previous shed.
 - a. The shed will have lap siding to match the residence.
 - b. It will be painted to match the residence.
 - 2. Repaint residence in the existing color scheme.
 - 3. Repair roof with materials to match existing.
 - 4. Repair the walkway with concrete to match existing.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the work will not impair the historic integrity of the district. Although the base of the new shed is a stock design from Home Depot, Ms. DeVilbiss is adding detailing to it to match the main residence. The remaining work consists of minor maintenance.

Staff recommends approving the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Dallas DeVilbiss was present to discuss the application. He explained that a Stop Work order was issued based on a neighbor complaint. It is the site of a former shed and the siding will match the residence.

Mr. DeVilbiss explained that his application included replacing the front concrete walk, doing touch-up painting and roof repair.

The Board questioned Mr. DeVilbiss about the doors to the shed. He indicated that they would be wood as per the design submitted

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 Tilmon Brown 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 Tilmon Brown and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 08/13/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

127-07-CA: 108 Lanier Avenue
Applicant: Pete Vallas
Received: 07/26/07 (+45 Days: 09/09/07)
Meeting: 08/13/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Ashland Place
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Add a dormer.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this one-story masonry English Revival residence was built circa 1937.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This residence is currently undergoing a number of previously approved renovations. However, staff received a complaint from a neighbor in Ashland Place that a dormer was being built without prior approval and a stop work order was issued.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “[a]ccessory roof elements not original to the structure... shall be located inconspicuously.”
- C. The proposed work will add a 10’-5” wide shed-roof dormer with casement windows on the south side of the residence per the submitted drawing. All materials will match existing.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the work will not impair the historic integrity of the district. The proposed dormer falls under the standards of the Design Review Guidelines. It is also located on the south slope between two gables and will only be visible from the south side.

Staff recommends approving the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Pete Vallas was present to discuss the application. He explained that a stop work had been issued by John Sledge, however, Mr. Sledge and Aileen de la Torre had agreed that he could weatherproof the dormer. The application of felt and roofing did not occur until about a week following the stop work order. Mr. Vallas stated that he did not realize that his original building permit has expired and that he would make sure all his permits were in order. He also explained that the dormer will have plain glass, but eventually he would like to have leaded glass. He would like his application to reflect that the casement windows will either have plain or diamond shaped muntins. He did not understand the position of his neighbors who were complaining about the dormer. The dormer is 20 ft more or less from the property line. At ground level there is a good bit of vegetation. The neighbors have a sodium vapor light that was not illuminated until this problem developed. Mr. Vallas also told the Board about a post card that had been circulated complaining about his doing work without approval that he found offensive. There was no one else to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Staff explained that there had been neighbor complaints about the construction of the dormer and that the neighbor had requested that obscure glass be installed in the dormer since it would look directly into their kitchen. Staff had no comments from city departments to read into the record.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board asked Staff if the previous project approved by the Board had been constructed according to plans. Staff explained that windows had been added to both south side gables.

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: casement windows will be single pane or have diamond shaped muntins. The motion was seconded by David Barr and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 08/13/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

128-07-CA: 210 Rapier Avenue
Applicant: Don Williams
Received: 07/30/07 (+45 Days: 09/13/07)
Meeting: 08/13/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Construct an 8'-0" x 12'-0" gazebo.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this two-story frame American Foursquare 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. The residents have recently landscaped their backyard and built a pool. The proposed gazebo is part of the overall landscape plan.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, "[a]n accessory structure...includes, but is not limited to garages, carports, pergolas, decks, pool covers, sheds and the like...[t]he structure should complement the design and scale of the main building."
- C. The proposed work will construct an 8'-0" x 12'-0" gazebo with a shingled hip roof and overhang finish to match the existing house and carport and ornamental metal columns per the submitted design. There will a zero setback from the north property line.

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 gazebo is a small feature within the overall landscape plan and it will not be seen due to the masonry wall.

Staff recommends approving the application. However, the applicant will need to consult Urban Development before construction to obtain a variance on the proposed zero setback.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Don Williams was present to discuss the application. He stated that the gazebo can not be seen from the roadway and it will be joining an existing masonry fence on the property. He will confer with the Urban Development Department on setbacks.

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: 08/13/08.

APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS CERTIFIED RECORD

129-07-CA: 565 Government Street
Applicant: Allen Industries/Paradigm Investment Group
Received: 07/30/07 (+45 Days: 09/13/07)
Meeting: 08/13/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Install signage for a new Hardees restaurant.

BUILDING HISTORY

This masonry commercial building on the former site of the first Jewish house of worship in Alabama was built in the 1990s as a Burger King.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This building is currently vacant. A Hardees restaurant will be moving in within the next year.
- B. The Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile state that signs shall “not obscure the architectural features or openings of a building...shall relate to the design of the principal building on the property...shall be in proportion to the building and the neighboring structures and signs...should match the historic materials of the building...[and] shall use focused, low intensity illumination.”
- C. The proposed sign package includes the following:
 - 1. Install a 43 SF (21.5 SF per face) double-faced monument sign at the location of a previous monument sign. It will be aluminum with vinyl graphics and illuminated with an external spotlight. It will exceed the 5’-0” height limitation.
 - 2. Install two 16 SF wall signs within the north and west gables of the building. They will be aluminum reverse-channel panels with vinyl graphics and illuminated with an external spotlight.
 - 3. Install three 4.5 SF directional signs with no commercial message.
 - 4. The total sign package, which does not include the directional signs, is approximately 75 SF; the Board cannot approve more than 64 SF.
 - 5. The lot is approximately 123’-0” x 193’-0” and the linear front footage of the building is 36’-0”.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that there are elements to the application that will impair the historic integrity of the district. Although the square footage, lighting and materials of the proposed monument sign fall within the standards of the Sign Design Guidelines, the 7’-5” height of the sign exceeds the

5'-0" limit observed by the Board. The remaining signs fall within the standards of the guidelines. However, the applicant will need to present a light and landscape plan for the monument sign before installation.

Staff recommends that the applicant lower the monument sign to 5'-0" tall. Staff recommends that the Board approve the sign materials and design, and support the total square footage. The applicant will need to receive a variance from the Board of Zoning Adjustment.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Greg Hazard was present to discuss the application. He stated that the signage for the site was minimal. He felt that the small amount of permitted signage contributed to the failure of Burger King at this location. He further stated that Hardees has a large breakfast business that will hopefully allow it to succeed in this location. 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

One Board member felt that the proximity of Barton Academy across the street makes the issue of signage all the more important. There was discussion regarding whether the signs proposed for the gables would be interpreted as roof top or wall signs.

Harris Oswald suggested approving only the front gable sign.

Staff quoted the Sign Guidelines that state: "No sign or portion of a sign shall extend above the cornice line at the top of the building face. Roof top signs are prohibited."

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 with a correction to C.1. "Install a 43 sf (21.5 per face) double faced monument sign at the location of the previous monument sign. It will be aluminum with vinyl graphics and illuminated with an external spotlight. It will not exceed the 5' height limitation." 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 district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued for all proposed signage with the exception of the gable wall signs. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswald and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 08/13/08.

APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS CERTIFIED RECORD

130-07-CA: 211 Lanier Avenue
Applicant: Lucy Barr Designs/Mr. and Mrs. Sumner Adams
Received: 07/30/07 (+45 Days: 09/13/07)
Meeting: 08/13/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Ashland Place
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Construct two one-story additions.
Conflicts of Interest: Harris Oswalt disclosed that Sumner Adams is his cousin but that will not conflict with his ability to make an impartial decision in the matter.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this two-story masonry Mission-style residence with Mediterranean influences 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. An application for a two new additions was made and approved in March 2006. However, the plan was never completed. The work is slated to begin again, but this application is sufficiently changed from the original design to merit a new review.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state that new additions should respect the age and style of the building.
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
 1. Attach a 36'-0" x 11'-0" one-story wing to the north side of the residence per the submitted plans.
 - a. The wing will be similar to the wing on the south side.
 - b. It will feature a pair of 2'-6" wide French doors with 12 lights each and a new stoop with steps on the east (front) elevation.
 - c. The design and materials will match existing, including the stucco, roof pitch, barrel roof tiles, eaves, gutters, steps and risers. A removed existing window will be reused on the north side of the addition.
 2. Attach a 29'-3" x 34'-8" one-story wing to the west side of the residence per the submitted plans.
 - a. The wing will feature a 14'-6" tall covered porch with three arches that will mimic the east (front) elevation.
 - b. The design and materials will match existing, including the stucco, roof pitch, barrel roof tiles, eaves, gutters, steps and risers.

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. This is a scaled-back version of a plan approved by the Board last year and falls within the standards of the Design review Guidelines.

Staff recommends approving the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Lucy Barr was present to discuss the application. She explained that the current proposal represented the same concept as the original submission, but at a smaller scale. The construction will be stucco with a tile roof.

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 further 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 Tilmon Brown and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 08/13/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

131-07-CA: 1501 Old Shell Road/60 North Catherine Street
Applicant: Reverend W. Bry Shields
Received: 07/30/07 (+45 Days: 09/13/07)
Meeting: 08/13/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Demolish Brothers Residence at 60 North Catherine to construct a new science building.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this two-story masonry building was built circa 1950 as a part of the McGill-Toolen campus.

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, the Brothers Residence at 60 North Catherine on the McGill-Toolen campus is vacant. According to Fr. Shields, vandals recently tore out all of the windows. The demolition of the Brothers Residence and construction of a new science building is the second phase of a campaign that will upgrade the campus facilities and curriculum.
- B. In considering demolitions, the Design Review Guidelines refer to Section 44-79 of the Mobile City Code, discussed above.
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
 - 1. Demolish the Brothers Residence at 60 North Catherine on the McGill-Toolen campus.
 - 2. Construct a new science building per the submitted plans.

RECOMMENDATION

Although the Brothers Residence was judged a non-contributing building in the original Old Dauphin Way survey conducted in the early 1980s, staff feels that this building can now be considered a contributing element to the historic district. It is a simple building in the Modern style with wings and cornered windows (currently there are only openings, as the windows have been removed).

Staff is primarily concerned with the fact that many recent past structures – those built in the mid-twentieth century that are only now becoming eligible for listing – are being undervalued, and too many will be lost before they are appreciated. Although not a part of this application, staff would like to make note that the proposed construction plan for the campus will also obscure the main building at 1501 Old Shell Road, which is an outstanding example of the mid-twentieth century Modern/International style.

Staff feels that the demolition of this structure will negatively impact the historic integrity of the district and recommends denying the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Rev. Bry Shields and Lynn Clapper were present to discuss the application. Rev. Shields stated that they have a small 20 acre campus and want to remain in the neighborhood. Mrs. Clapper explained that the school wanted to improve its science program. While the school understands the importance of architecture from the 1950s, it would be costly and not very practical to modify the existing building for the science program. There is only one brother living in the facility and, given the small size of the campus, the land on which the building sits would be more effectively utilized for a new building. Mrs. Clapper showed a scheme of the projected campus improvements that would more fully visually blend the two existing campuses into one. The new entrance will be located on Lafayette Street and other facilities will be more centrally located along Lafayette where parking currently exists. She further stated that McGill would return with plans for approval by the Review Board currently being completed by the architect.

When asked by the Board if the Theatre Guild building was part of the project, Rev. Shields stated that it was not.

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

Craig Roberts stated that not all mid-20th century architecture is good and felt that the Brother's residence fit into that category.

Tilmon Brown noted that the new plan showed unscreened parking on Catherine Street and felt that it should be screened. Mrs. Clapper noted that there is currently parking in this location.

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 Jim Wagoner and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 08/13/08.

APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS CERTIFIED RECORD

132-07-CA: 153 Government Street (alternately 109 Government and 151 Government)
Applicant: Mobile County/Goodwin, Mills and Cawood
Received: 07/30/07 (+45 Days: 09/13/07)
Meeting: 08/13/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Contributing (Levert House), Non-Contributing (Court Annex Building)
Zoning: B-4
Project: Build a new courthouse annex using the existing building shell.

BUILDING HISTORY

The courthouse annex was a part of the larger courthouse complex, which was demolished last year. The building was constructed around the 1856 Levert House, an important historical landmark of the city. The Levert House is currently the home of the Mobile Bar Association.

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 courthouse is currently being expanded for offices and county court archives. A Design Review Subcommittee met on Wednesday, 28 March 2007 in order to address concerns that staff and the Board had regarding new construction for this property. A copy of the minutes is included in the supplemental materials.
- 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 add three stories to the existing building shell at 153 Government per the submitted plans, which includes the following:
 1. A CMU and steel structure.
 2. An exterior finish of brick with pre-cast concrete ornamentation.
 3. A metal standing seam pitched roof and membrane covered flat roof.
 4. Aluminum windows with pre-cast concrete sills and headers.
 5. A monumental entry that will face Government.
 6. Brick recesses to mimic the fenestration and break up some of the large expanse of brick wall.

RECOMMENDATION

The courthouse annex is exempt from city jurisdiction save for the MHDC, which has authority based on State enabling legislation. Therefore, all proposed improvements for this address must come through the Architectural Review Board. As mentioned above, the applicants met with a Design Review Subcommittee comprised of members of the Board and MHDC Staff on Wednesday, 28 March 2007 in order to address concerns regarding new construction for this property.

Staff is particularly concerned with the extreme regularity of the façade and the proportions of the elements on the façade. Also, though brick panels have been placed on the south elevation to relieve the large blank face, from the rendering it appears to be insufficient. This is the portion that will be viewed from the steps of Christ Church and from Church Street and should not be ignored. These same critiques apply, in a lesser degree, to the east and west elevations. Staff is also unsure about what the inset marble panel is.

Staff feels that although the applicant did what was asked in the Design Review Subcommittee, the building is still inappropriate in the context of the historic Old Southern Market and Christ Church Cathedral.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Nick Holmes Jr. and a representative of Goodwin, Mills and Cawood were present to discuss the application. Craig Roberts asked about the parcel on the east side and the blank wall on the south side.

Mr. Holmes noted that the south side is broken by the cornice and reveal. There are no window openings because a secure circulation is required. New stairways are incorporated on each end for circulation. It was noted by the Goodwin, Mills and Cawood representative that spandrel panels were initially included in the design but were eliminated due to cost concerns. He further stated that the east elevation shows a placard removed from the demolished courthouse that the County Commission wishes to incorporate in the new building.

Rev. Johnny Cook from Christ Church was present. He stated that the proposed building has four sides that are all equally important and the challenge is to consider all adjacent properties in the design. He pointed out that the south side of the building faces Christ Church and should respect the architecture of that building.

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

Tilmon Brown discussed the importance of Christ Church and the necessity of the new building to present a finished face to the church.

Craig Roberts stressed his respect for Mr. Holmes but felt that the proposed building was not appropriate for the location. He, too, pointed out that all four sides of the building were essentially public facades and each needed to be addressed.

FINDING OF FACT

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion was seconded by David Barr 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 district due in large part to the importance of Christ Church Cathedral and that the application be denied. The motion was seconded by Craig Roberts and unanimously approved.