

CITY OF MOBILE
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Minutes of the Meeting
September 10, 2007

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m. by Chair Bunky Ralph. MHDC Staff member called the roll as follows:

- **Members Present:** Tilmon Brown, Carlos Gant, Michael Mayberry, Harris Oswalt, Bunky Ralph, Craig Roberts, Barja Wilson and alternate Andrew Martin.
- **Members Absent:** Robert Brown, Cameron Pfeiffer and Jim Wagoner.
- **Staff Present:** Aileen de la Torre, Anne Crutcher, Devereaux Bemis and John Lawler.

<u>In Attendance</u>	<u>Mailing Address/Email Address</u>
Green Suttles	4110 Moffett Road 36618/ green.suttles@CSEeng.com
Pam Sterrett	Sterrettch@aol.com
George Bendeck/Ron Blich	757 St. Charles Avenue, NOLA70130
Lynn Clapper	1501 Old Shell Road 36604
Bob Hanks	200 South Warren Street 36602
Maria Goolsby	118 North Julia Street 36604
John Dendy	dendyarch@zebra.net
Mark Willis	1721 Conti Street 36604/ mkwadjr@aol.com
Syd Snyder	4110 Moffett Road 36618/ sid.snyder@CSEeng.com
Fr. Bry Shields	1501 Old Shell Road 36604
Greg Dreaper	119 North Julia Street 36604/ gdreaper@hotmail.com
Marie Dyson	203 South Dearborn Street 36602
Spencer Watts	swats@mplonline.org
Mike Piercy	P.O. Box 492, Mobile 36602

Minutes of the last meeting were held over for approval at the next meeting.

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

MID-MONTH APPROVALS

1. **Applicant's Name:** Suzanne Cleveland
Property Address: 957 Church Street
Date of Approval: August 14, 2007
Paint building in the existing color scheme.
2. **Applicant's Name:** Mary Simmons
Property Address: 114 Michael Donald (Herndon) Avenue
Date of Approval: August 14, 2007
Paint building in the following Sherwin Williams color scheme:
 - Body – Roycroft Bronze Green, SW 2846
 - Trim and Door – Roycroft Vellum, SW 2833
 - Accent – Aurora Brown, SW2837
3. **Applicant's Name:** Stephen Milling
Property Address: 10 South Julia Street
Date of Approval: August 15, 2007
Install a new Charcoal or Weathered Grey dimensional shingle roof.

4. **Applicant's Name:** Sims Family
Property Address: 200 Roper Street
Date of Approval: August 17, 2007
 Repaint residence in the existing color scheme.
5. **Applicant's Name:** Noelle B's/MH3
Property Address: 19 Conception Street
Date of Approval: August 20, 2007
 Install one 3'-0" x 4'-0" double-faced, projecting, sandblasted cedar sign, painted per submission on file in MHDC office. Install two 7½" x 24" window vinyl signs with logo to match logo on main sign.
6. **Applicant's Name:** Ken Baggette
Property Address: 12 LeMoyne Place
Date of Approval: August 21, 2007
 Repaint residence in the existing color scheme:
- Body – Yellow
 - Trim – White
 - Shutters – Dark Green
7. **Applicant's Name:** Alan Ivy
Property Address: 1009 Savannah Street
Date of Approval: August 21, 2007
 Repaint residence in the existing color scheme.
8. **Applicant's Name:** The CM Group
Property Address: 908 Palmetto Street
Date of Approval: August 21, 2007
 Demolish non-historic rear addition. Remove porch infill. Replace rail to match existing.
9. **Applicant's Name:** Kathy Welch
Property Address: 202 Rapier Avenue
Date of Approval: August 21, 2007
 Paint exterior in the following Benjamin Moore colors:
- Body – Alexandria Beige, HC-77
 - Shutters and Foundation – Clinton Brown, HC-67
 - Window Sashes – Hathaway Peach, HC-53
 - Porch Ceiling – Van Allen Green, HC-120
10. **Applicant's Name:** Robert Peck
Property Address: 200 Rapier Avenue
Date of Approval: August 24, 2007
 Repair/replace as needed rotten wood throughout the exterior with materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Repaint residence in the existing color scheme.
11. **Applicant's Name:** David Charles
Property Address: 959 Charleston Street
Date of Approval: August 24, 2007
 Paint residence in the following color scheme:
- Body – Grayish-Green/Olive
 - Trim – White
 - Shutters and Doors – Bellingrath Green

12. Applicant's Name: Chris Bowen
Property Address: 1101 Selma Street/1106 Elmira Street
Date of Approval: August 28, 2007
Exterior renovations to match existing building design. Repair mansard roofs. Re-roof with matching shingles.
Repair windows to function. Paint all trim to match existing.

13. Applicant's Name: Noah and Hali Whetstone
Property Address: 164 South Georgia Avenue
Date of Approval: August 31, 2007
Remove non-historic rear deck.

14. Applicant's Name: Jimenez and Associates, Inc
Property Address: 1151 Springhill Avenue
Date of Approval: August 31, 2007
Repair/replace rotted wood throughout the exterior with materials to match existing. Repair/replace damaged concrete with materials to match existing. Install a wood handicapped access ramp. Paint windows white.

NOTICES OF VIOLATION and MUNICIPAL OFFENSE TICKETS

No Notices of Violation or Municipal Offence Tickets were written since the last meeting.

OLD BUSINESS

1. **139-07-CA:** 308 St. Louis Street
Applicant: John Dendy and Associates
Request: Allow the alteration of the original fenestration plan.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

B. NEW BUSINESS

2. **143-07-CA:** 1257 Selma Street
Applicant: Allison and Hodge Alves
Request: Install a metal roof on the garage.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

3. **144-07-CA:** 301 Government Street
Applicant: Maura Garino
Request: Construct a shed.

DENIED. Certified Record attached.

4. **145-07-CA:** 115-117 North Julia Street
Applicant: Springhill Avenue Corporation
Request: Construct eight new townhouses.

DENIED. Certified Record attached.

5. **146-07-CA:** 54 South Lafayette Street
Applicant: Mary Schalin
Request: Add a dormer.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

6. **147-07-CA:** 701 Government Street
Applicant: Jay Isacks
Request: Pave and landscape parking area.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

7. **148-07-CA:** 1721 Conti Street
Applicant: Mark Willis
Request: Replace the windows.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

8. **149-07-CA:** 105 Beverly Court
Applicant: Melissa and Jake Epker
Request: Construct a two-story garage.

DENIED. Certified Record attached.

9. **150-07-CA:** 1107 Elmira Street
Applicant: Ormandos Jackson
Request: Renovate residence and add a dormer.

DENIED. Certified Record attached.

10. **151-07-CA:** 64 South Water Street
Applicant: Riverview Plaza Hotel
Request: Install new signs.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

11. **152-07-CA:** 1501 Old Shell Road
Applicant: Reverend Bry Shields
Request: Construct a new science building.

TABLED. Certified Record attached.

12. **153-07-CA:** 153 Government Street
Applicant: Goodwin, Mills and Cawood
Request: Construct a new courthouse building.

DENIED. Certified Record attached.

13. **154-07-CA:** 274 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Mike Piercy
Request: Replace windows.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

14. **155-07-CA:** 202 Government Street
Applicant: Zito-Russell Architects
Request: Renovate building.

APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. Certified Record attached.

15.156-07-CA: 910 Selma Street
Applicant: Douglas Kearley
Request: Renovate residence.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

16.157-07-CA: 204 Conti Street/22 South Conception Street
Applicant: Tilmon Brown
Request: Renovate building.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

OTHER BUSINESS and ANNOUNCEMENTS

There was no other business or announcements.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

139-07-CA: 308 St. Louis Street
Applicant: John Dendy and Associates
Received: 08/13/07 (+45 Days: 09/27/07)
Meeting: 08/27/07
Resubmitted: **08/27/07**
Meeting: **09/10/07**

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: DeTonti Square
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Alter the initial fenestration pattern.

BUILDING HISTORY

This two-story masonry commercial building was the Mobile Fixture warehouse. The Board approved a plan in August 2006 to redevelop it into 21 residential condominiums. The majority of the building lies outside of the district; however, a small section at the northeast side is in DeTonti Square.

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 new windows located at the north elevation were originally slated to be twin sash windows. However, to add interior light and to produce a fenestration more in scale with wall proportions, the building owners added another window to each pair to increase the total size per loft unit. Concerned with the alteration to the original plan, staff asked the owners to present the change to the Board. According to the letter from John Dendy, the architect on the project, “[t]he windows tested to meet the code requirements for wind loading provided approvals for only two combined (twinned) units, so the mull adjacent to the third window unit needed to be structural.” There was some concern about the strip of EIFS separating the windows, so the Board tabled the application at the last meeting to give Mr. Dendy time to present an elevation showing how the windows will look if the strip is painted to match the window.
- 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.” The Design Review Guidelines call for renovations to be sympathetic to the age and style of the building.
- C. The applicants are requesting that the new window plan be approved per the submitted plans. It will be painted Sherwin Williams Otter (SW6041), which is a dark range color complimentary to the color of the metal window frames.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the alteration will not impair the historic integrity of the district. The additional window matches the existing windows that were approved in the original plan.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

John Dendy was present to discuss the application. He stated that painting the mullion required for wind load requirements will hopefully duplicate the original appearance approved by the Board. There were no comments from the public to enter into the record. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to enter 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 Harris Oswalt and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 09/10/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

143-07-CA: 1257 Selma Street
Applicant: Allison and Hodge Alves
Received: 08/17/07 (+45 Days: 10/01/07)
Meeting: 09/10/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Conflict of Interest: Tilmon Brown recused himself from voting on the application since the MHDC holds an easement on the property and the application will be required to come before the MHDC Properties Committee of which he is chair.
Project: Replace the shingle roof on the detached garage with metal panels.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this two-story frame Sidehall was built circa 1907. The two-story frame garage building is a contemporary addition to the property.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This garage building is currently roofed with Timberline architectural shingles.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “[roof] materials should be appropriate to the form and pitch and color” of the building.
- C. Mr. and Mrs. Alves are proposing to replace the Timberline architectural shingle roof of the garage building with 26 Gauge PBR or PBU metal panels in a silver-white color.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the work will not impair the historic integrity of the district. As mentioned above, the garage building is a contemporary addition to the property. Also, its gable roof has a shallow pitch.

Staff recommends approving the application; however, because this building has an easement, the Properties Committee will need to review this plan before work commences.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Neither the applicant nor his representative was present to discuss the application. There were no comments from the public to enter into the record.

Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to enter into the record. However, Staff did explain to the Board that the MHDC holds an easement on the property and that the request will also need to be presented to the MHDC's Properties Committee. The decision of the Properties Committee will supersede the Board's decision.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswalt and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 09/10/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

144-07-CA: 301 Government Street
Applicant: Maura Garino
Received: 08/17/07 (+45 Days: 10/01/07)
Meeting: 09/10/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Construct a storage shed on the property.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this 16-story masonry building was built as a Sheraton circa 1975. It has A major rehabilitation was recently completed on the building and it is now a Holiday Inn.

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 a parking area surrounded by a masonry wall along Church and Jackson Streets where the shed structure is proposed.
- 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. Ms. Garino is proposing to construct a 12’-0” x 24’-0” storage per the submitted stock plans from Lowe’s at the Church and Jackson Street corner of the rear parking area for the hotel.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the work will impair the historic integrity of the district. The type of shed being proposed is an inappropriate structure that does not complement the design of the main building.

Staff recommends the applicant install a more appropriate shed.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Neither the applicant nor his representative was present to discuss the application. There were no comments from the public to enter into the record. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to enter into the record.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed that the proposed shed was not appropriate for this visible urban location. A more appropriate structure should be proposed.

FINDING OF FACT

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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 Andrew Martin and unanimously approved.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

145-07-CA: 115-117 North Julia Street
Applicant: Springhill Avenue Corporation
Received: 08/20/07 (+45 Days: 10/04/07)
Meeting: 09/10/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-1
Project: Construct 8 new townhouses.

BUILDING HISTORY

There is currently a vacant lot on these two properties.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. As mentioned above, this is currently a vacant lot. Staff has received many calls of concern regarding the proposed construction.
- B. The Guidelines for New Residential and Commercial Construction state “the goal of new construction should be to blend into the historic district but to avoid creating a false sense of history.”
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
 - 1. Construct eight new affordable townhouses – two buildings with four residences each – per the submitted plans.
 - a. The buildings will sit in an L-shape on the lot and have brick floating slab foundations.
 - b. They will be clad in Hardiplank siding.
 - c. The front and rear doors will be wood with six decorative panels.
 - d. The windows will be vinyl-clad wood 1/1 sashes.
 - e. The east elevation will have a partial-width porch with a cantilevered hood, wood steps and wood handrails leading to paired front doors.
 - f. There will be stoops with rails, steps and awnings at the north, south and west elevations.
 - g. Ornamentation will be minimal, consisting of a water table and iron vents at the foundation, brackets at the eaves, wood and window trim and handrails.
 - h. There will be 12 parking spaces on the north side of the property; the lot will be concrete aggregate.
 - 2. Extend the existing privacy fence on the south side per the requirements of Urban Development.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff believes that the site plan for the buildings is more appropriate for the neighborhood. The two buildings create an L and one of the principal façades is fronted to face Julia Street. Also, the parking area has been reduced to 12 spaces that sit at the back of the lot. The design of the buildings is still of some concern, however. Their scale and mass require much more movement and plasticity through better detailing and/or by stepping each unit. Staff believes that each unit should read separately from the others.

Staff is aware that Ms. Sterrett is trying to build quality affordable housing in this neighborhood. Accordingly, a suggestion has been made that Ms. Sterrett could look into Katrina Cottages or something similar, which can provide

affordable housing while not forfeiting architectural character. Also, although the ARB does not deal with zoning and use, staff would like to make the Board aware that the neighborhood is still largely opposed to having such a large number of units on these lots.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Ms. Sterrett and her architect were present to discuss the application. Ms. Sterrett submitted a revised elevation earlier in the day. This revision has more detail and takes its inspiration from the eclectic mix of architectural styles in the neighborhood. The revised site plan has the submitted elevation facing Julia Street. One and ½ parking places per unit is required by the City and there will be 12 parking places provided on site. Zoning allows 10 units on the site and 8 are proposed. Each unit will have a front and rear door. The rear elevation will be the same as previously submitted. The architect explained that he did not have time to revise all of the drawings prior to the meeting.

As at previous meetings where this project was reviewed, there were people from the neighborhood in attendance.

Greg Dreaper spoke stating that he lives to the north of the project. He stated that the most recently submitted elevation is better than previous submissions. However, he felt that many things were left out of the drawings--drawings of architectural details, indication of the porch stoops, introduction of foliage that will not screen the complex from the neighbors, fencing that is not indicated on the drawings, etc. He continues to be concerned about traffic issues on the street.

Another neighbor, Jim Torbert, stated that the project has too much density for the site and neighborhood.

In response to the neighbors, the architect stated that the stoops are indicated on the drawings, and two 6 ft. high privacy fences that already exist are indicated on the drawings. In addition, the dwarf magnolia is slow growing but will be there for years. Since a large oak provides shade canopy at the entrance, it was not felt that oversize plantings were needed on the site.

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed that the recent elevation was greatly improved over previous submissions. The Board would like to see complete elevations with more drawings of details.

Tilmon Brown stated that he continues to feel that there are too many units proposed for the site. He considers that the density will impair the historic district. Staff informed the Board that the City Attorney believes that if the Board finds that too many units will impair the house or the district, the ARB has the authority to deny the application. The Attorney felt that the law did not restrict the type of impairment.

Mr. Brown explained that there are many 4-plexes sprinkled throughout the historic districts that blend with adjacent single-family residential areas and something like these small complexes should be considered for this site.

The architect stated that, if the application were to be denied, that it should have been denied initially so that his client would not have gone to the additional expense of coming back to the Board repeatedly. Chair Bunky Ralph stated that the Board and particularly Mr. Brown had objected to the number of units in the past.

FINDING OF FACT

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does impair the historic integrity of the district according to the Guidelines and that the application be denied. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswalt and was approved with Carlos Gant voting in opposition.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

146-07-CA: 54 South Lafayette Street
Applicant: Mary Schalin
Received: 08/20/07 (+45 Days: 10/04/07)
Meeting: 09/10/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

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

BUILDING HISTORY

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

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. There are dormers on the south, east and west sides of the roof.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines call for renovations and new additions to be sympathetic to the age and style of the building. The Guidelines also state, “[a]ccessory roof elements not original to the structure...shall be located inconspicuously.”
- C. Ms. Schalin, who is representing the owners, is proposing to construct a dormer on the north side of the roof that will match the south side dormer in material, design, dimension and scale.

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. Dormers are a typical and historic manner of expanding living space into attics. Also, all the new materials will match existing materials. Staff recommends approving the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Neither the applicant nor his representative was present to discuss the application.
There were no comments from the public for the record.
Staff had no comments from the public or city departments for the record.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board questioned Staff about the window to be placed in the dormer. Staff stated that it would match the window in the other dormer.

FINDING OF FACT

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and public hearing, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion was seconded by Carlos Gant 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 conditioned on all elements of the new dormer matching the existing dormer. The motion was seconded by Barja Wilson and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 09/10/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

147-07-CA: 701 Government Street
Applicant: Jay Isacks
Received: 08/21/07 (+45 Days: 10/05/07)
Meeting: 09/10/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Surface and landscape the parking lot.

BUILDING HISTORY

This lot has been empty of buildings and used as the parking area for the library for a number of 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. As mentioned above, this is currently the parking area for the library.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state “[t]he appearance of parking areas should be minimized through good site planning and design...[p]arking areas should be screened from view by the use of low masonry walls, wood or iron fences or landscaping.”
- C. Ms. Isacks is proposing to surface and landscape the rear parking lot per the submitted plans.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the work will not impair the historic integrity of the district. The area is already being used as parking and the proposed plan will minimize the lot through heavy landscaping.

Staff recommends approving the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Jay Isacks was present to discuss the application. He stated that traditional Southern plants were chosen for the landscaping. Some planting islands had been introduced into the parking area to break it up and the parking surface would be asphalt.

There were no comments from the public to enter into the record.

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 09/10/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

148-07-CA: 1721 Conti Street
Applicant: Mark Willis
Received: 08/22/07 (+45 Days: 10/06/07)
Meeting: 09/10/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Replace windows.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this one-story frame Bungalow was constructed circa 1925.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This residence currently has 6/1 wood sashes on the first floor and Jalousies in the front dormer.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “[o]riginal window openings should be retained as well as original window sashes and glazing...where windows cannot be repaired, new windows must be compatible to the existing.”
- C. Mr. Willis is proposing to replace the existing windows with 6/1 insulated, aluminum-clad Pella Architect Series sash windows in order to improve the energy efficiency of the residence.

RECOMMENDATION

Although the Board has typically not approved glued-on muntins for rehabilitation projects in the past, examples can be found in the historic districts. Staff will defer to the Board’s decision.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Willis was present to discuss the application along with a representative from Pella windows. The representative pointed out the features of the window—larger bottom rail, more muntin detail, foam spacer between glass panes and an aluminum finish. He stated that 7/8” was the smallest muntin offered by Pella. Windows would be 6/1 sash. It was pointed out by the Board that the profile was not historic. Pella had no other narrower muntin profiles to offer in their windows. There were no comments from the public to enter into the record. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to enter into the record.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Tilmon Brown stated that the issue of replacing true divided light wood windows with insulated windows with glued on muntins has been the topic of much discussion recently.

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 Barja Wilson and approved with Bunky Ralph dissenting.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 09/10/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

149-07-CA: 105 Beverly Court
Applicant: Melissa and Jake Epker
Received: 08/23/07 (+45 Days: 10/07/07)
Meeting: 09/10/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Replace the one-story carport with a two-story carport.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this one-story brick Colonial Revival residence was constructed circa 1940 for Ben F. Adams.

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 one-story wood frame carport at the northwest corner of the lot.
- 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. Demolish the existing one-story carport.
 - 2. Construct a new two-story carport.
 - a. It will sit on the existing footprint and **will not** be attached to the main residence as shown in the submitted plans.
 - b. It will have Hardiplank siding and shingles to match the main residence.
 - c. Ornamentation includes overhanging eaves, brackets, French doors leading to a small balcony with wood handrails, windows to match the main residence and columns.
 - d. Mr. and Mrs. Epker are currently undecided as to whether or not they are going to enclose the first floor as a garage or leave it open as a carport.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff feels that the two-story garage will not impair the integrity of the building or district, as these types of garages are common in this neighborhood. However, staff believes that some of the design elements should better match the Colonial Revival style of the main residence, such as, for example, using gable returns as opposed to overhanging eaves and brackets, which are more typical in Craftsman homes.

Should the Epkers choose to enclose the first floor, specifications for the garage door will need to be submitted to staff before installation.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Neither the applicant nor his representative was present to discuss the application. There were no comments from the public to enter into the record. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to enter into the record.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed that the design of the garage did not blend with the style of the house. It was the consensus of the Board that the garage should complement the design and scale of the house.

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 Andrew Martin and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Craig Roberts 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 Michael Mayberry and unanimously approved.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF COMMENTS

150-07-CA: 1107 Elmira Street
Applicant: Ormandos Jackson
Received: 08/23/07 (+45 Days: 10/07/07)
Meeting: 09/10/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Renovate existing residence. Construct an addition.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this one-story frame residence was built circa 1880 and modified circa 1910. It has undergone numerous alterations since then and suffered considerable damage in Hurricane Katrina when a tree fell on it.

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 has been vacant for some time and was damaged in Katrina. Mr. Jackson recently received funds through the Hurricanes Katrina and Rita grant program in order to return the residence to a habitable condition.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines call for renovations and new additions to be sympathetic to the age and style of the building. The Guidelines also state, “[a]ccessory roof elements not original to the structure...shall be located inconspicuously.”
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
 - 1. Replace the rear stoop with a 30’-10” x 21’-0” one-story addition with porch per the submitted plans.
 - a. Foundation will be brick piers with wood lattice to match existing.
 - b. Siding will be wood lap to match existing.
 - c. Roof will be fiberglass shingles to match existing.
 - d. Windows will be wood 6/6 sashes with true divided lights to match existing.
 - e. The rear porch will have wood posts with capitals and handrails to match existing on the front porch.
 - f. Design elements such as the trim, fascia, roof overhang, etc will match existing.
 - 2. Renovate the interior and exterior of the existing residence per the submitted plans.
 - a. Interior elements will be remodeled and updated.
 - b. The tree will be removed from the property.
 - c. The foundation will be leveled.
 - d. Wood elements throughout the exterior will be repaired or replaced with materials to match existing including the windows, floor joists, siding, trim, foundation lattice and privacy fence.
 - e. The residence will be painted (colors to be determined).
 - f. The front door will be an appropriate style and verified with staff prior to installation.
 - 3. Add a dormer to the east side of the residence with materials to match existing per the submitted plans.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the work will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district. The proposed renovation and new addition will match the existing design and materials. However, the dormer should have gable returns. Staff does not review interior work.

Staff recommends approving the application with the gable returns in the dormer.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Neither the applicant nor his representative was present to discuss the application.

There were no comments from the public to enter into the record.

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed that the two front doors should remain. There are many such houses in the districts and Staff generally recommends that both doors remain. One of the doors can be permanently closed and even covered over on the interior.

There was discussion concerning the roofline changes and the introduction of a second floor under roof.

The Board discussed that this roofline change would impair the historic building. Katrina money will not be able to be used for this extreme alteration to the structure.

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 Andrew Martin and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Michael Mayberry 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 Andrew Martin and unanimously approved.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

151-07-CA: 64 South Water Street
Applicant: Riverview Plaza Hotel
Received: 08/23/07 (+45 Days: 10/07/07)
Meeting: 09/10/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Sign Ordinance
Classification: Out of District
Zoning: B-4
Project: Install signage for the Riverview Plaza Hotel.

BUILDING HISTORY

The Riverview Plaza Hotel was constructed in the latter part of the twentieth century.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. The Riverview is currently undergoing a major rehabilitation project.
- 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 one 186 SF single-faced internally illuminated cabinet wall sign at location one.
 - 2. Install one 31 SF single-faced, 9’-10½” tall aluminum monument sign with reverse channel lit letters at location two.
 - 3. Install one 264 SF single-faced aluminum wall sign with reverse channel lit letters at location three.
 - 4. Install one 40 SF single-faced aluminum wall sign with reverse channel lit letters at location four.
 - 5. The total sign package is approximately 521 SF; the Board cannot approve more than 64 SF.

RECOMMENDATION

The signs for this large hotel complex have been grandfathered in previous variances. Also, the proposed sign package totals less than what has been approved previously. However, there are certain elements to this application that does not comply to the standards of the Sign Design Guidelines. The materials and lighting of the large wall sign at location one is an internally illuminated plastic cabinet sign. Additionally, at almost 10’-0 tall, the monument sign is roughly twice what the Board generally approves. The remaining signs fall within the standards of the Sign Design Guidelines.

Staff recommends that the applicant lower the monument sign to 5'-0" tall and use alternate lighting and materials for the wall sign at location one.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Representatives from the Riverview Hotel were present to discuss the application. They stated that the hotel was not in a historic district. They explained that the signs on the tower were internally lit plastic and maintenance of any other type of sign 380 ft. in the air would be impossible. They also stated that a 5 ft. high monument sign would not be visible from Water Street. The applicants stated that the Renaissance hotel colors were red and gray.

There were no comments from the public to enter into the record.

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board asked about variances that would be required for signs in excess of 64 sq. ft. allowed by the Sign Ordinance.

Staff stated that the hotel would be working under previous sign variances and that the size of the current sign package was less than that allowed by previous variances.

The Board asked what was done in the case of the Holiday Inn internally lit sign. They were told that the ARB had denied it, but that the Board of Zoning Adjustment had allowed it. There was also considerable discussion about the size of the monument sign.

FINDING OF FACT

Michael Mayberry 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

Michael Mayberry moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Carlos Gant and approved with Bunky Ralph and Tilmon Brown voting in opposition.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 09/10/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

152-07-CA: 1501 Old Shell Road/60 North Catherine Street
Applicant: Reverend W. Bry Shields
Received: 08/23/07 (+45 Days: 10/07/07)
Meeting: 09/10/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Construct a new science building.

BUILDING HISTORY

A circa 1950 two-story brick building was recently demolished on this lot as part of McGill-Toolen's master expansion plan.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. As mentioned above, a circa 1950 two-story brick building was recently demolished on this lot as part of McGill-Toolen's master plan to upgrade the campus facilities and curriculum.
- 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 applicant is proposing to construct a new science building per the submitted plans.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff feels that the applicant should address the following items:

- The addition of much more landscaping to the parking area along Catherine Street;
- Better elevations that give a sense of what the building will look like;
- Roofing material samples as well as samples of any other materials called out, such as the stucco finish;
- Any architectural details on the building such as windows, ironwork, etc;
- The large areas of blank wall with only small window openings.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Father Shields and member of the architectural firm were present to discuss the application. They presented details of the project in booklet form to the Board. The architect stated that the building would have a smooth true stucco exterior with an Elastomeric finish.

There were no comments from the public to enter into the record.
Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to enter into the record.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board judged that it would require time to review all of the materials submitted at the meeting and would like to table the application until the September 24th meeting. There was concern on the part of the applicant that if the application to the Board were tabled until the 24th , it would interfere with their appearance before the Planning Commission on September 20th. The Board assured the applicant that it would not.

FINDING OF FACT

There was no finding of fact.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Tilmon Brown moved to table the application until the September 24, 2007 meeting in order to review all the submitted materials. The motion was seconded by Andrew Martin and unanimously approved.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

153-07-CA: 153 Government Street (alternately 109 Government and 151 Government)
Applicant: Mobile County/Goodwin, Mills and Cawood
Received: 08/27/07 (+45 Days: 10/11/07)
Meeting: 09/10/07

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. Although a new plan was submitted, the Board still had a number of concerns regarding the new construction. Another Design Review Subcommittee met on Wednesday, 22 August 2007 in order to address those concerns. 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 with an exterior finish of brick with pre-cast concrete ornamentation.
 - 2. A metal standing seam pitched roof and membrane covered flat roof.
 - 3. Aluminum windows with pre-cast concrete sills and headers with a monumental entry facing Government.

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, but the Board still had a number of concerns and the plans were denied. Subsequently, another Design Review Subcommittee met on Wednesday, 22 August 2007.

The applicants have addressed some of the issues that were brought before the subcommittee. The south (rear) elevation is better detailed, although it still lacks a pedestrian scale. And the east and west elevations are still lacking in definition. Primarily, staff is still concerned with the extreme regularity of the façade and the proportions of the

elements on the façade. The scale and mass of this building requires much more movement and plasticity in order for it to fit within the context of the historic Old Southern Market and Christ Church Cathedral. Also, the garage doors at the south elevation are still drawn as coiling doors, which is inappropriate.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Nick Holmes, Jr., Nick Holmes III and a representative from Goodwin, Mills and Cawood were present to discuss the application.

Nick Holmes III, in reacting to Staff comments, stated that he feels the building is contextual. He feels that the building is plastic with 5 planes on the north façade and 5 different planes on the east and west elevations. He stated that they have compromised a great deal by adding window openings on the entire south side of the building. He further pointed out that the coiling doors on the south elevation will be changed to panels, but the change was not reflected on the drawing. He also felt that the building was only one story taller than Christ Cathedral. Historically the view of the Cathedral was limited since the area was very dense with buildings. The road to the south of the building is not a pedestrian roadway but a service corridor. The street was created when the courthouse took access and parking from the church. Nick further stated that the height of the building could not be changed without jeopardizing the growth and functioning of the County. Security is the reason for funneling all people visiting the building through the front entrance. The dumpster will be removed and the trash facilities of Government Plaza utilized. Mr. Holmes explained that the reserve parking would be used sporadically. There will be secure parking for the judge and parallel parking for police and prisoners.

Tilmon Brown questioned Nick Holmes about whether it would be better to remove the existing post tension slab foundation in order to be free to design the building in another way. Mr. Holmes responded that it would not be cost effective. In addition, the building design would not change that dramatically.

Bob Hanks asked about the location of the LeVert House and was informed that it would be located at the new entrance as indicated on the plans.

Christ Church submitted a letter objecting to the design of the building including its height, location of the dumpster, the “service side” look of the south elevation and reserved parking places on the south side that restrict vehicular and pedestrian traffic.

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no additional Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

Michael Mayberry 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 Carlos Gant and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Michael Mayberry 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 died for lack of a second.

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 should be denied. The motion was seconded by Andrew Martin and unanimously approved.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

154-07-CA: 274 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Mike Piercy
Received: 08/27/07 (+45 Days: 10/11/07)
Meeting: 09/10/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street Commercial
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Conflict of Interest: Tilmon Brown recused himself from voting on the application since the MHDC holds an easement on the property and the application must be reviewed by the MHDC's Properties Committee of which he is chair.
Project: Replace the fixed windows with sash windows. Install a new canopy.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this two-story masonry commercial building was constructed circa 1893. As with most of the downtown commercial buildings, the first floor storefront has been significantly altered a number of times.

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 a new restaurant. There are currently two fixed windows in the first floor storefront.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, "[t]he size and placement of new windows...should be compatible with the general character of the building." The Guidelines also state that fabric canopies (awnings) are appropriate.
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
 - 1. Replace the fixed storefront windows with wood 1/1 sashes to fit within the openings.
 - 2. Replace the rollout canopy with a permanent canopy in the same green and white color scheme.

RECOMMENDATION

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

Staff recommends approving the application; however, because this building has an easement, the Properties Committee will need to review this plan before work commences.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

The applicant was present to discuss the application. He explained that the change in storefront configuration is needed for the take out restaurant he proposes for the first floor of the building. He has agreed to restore the storefront windows if he vacates the building.

After some discussion with the Board, the applicant agreed to replace the existing straight awning with an awning of the same design.

There were no comments from the public to enter into the record.

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no additional Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

Harris Oswald moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report adding fact C.3: the awning will be a straight permanent canopy. The motion was seconded by Barja Wilson and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 09/10/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

155-07-CA: 202 Government Street
Applicant: Zito Russell Architects
Received: 08/27/07 (+45 Days: 10/11/07)
Meeting: 09/10/07

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. Another application was made 07/07, but it was denied due to the coiled garage doors and the vents. The applicants have now submitted a new application addressing the concerns of the Board.
- 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 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 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 and doors at both the Government and Conception Street façades.
 - a. The Government façade will have full-length fixed aluminum-clad windows, a 10-light door, new light fixtures and a vent with iron grill to match the garage within existing openings per the submitted drawings.
 - b. The Conception façade will have fixed single-light aluminum-clad windows, a 10-light door, new light fixtures and vents with iron grills to match the garage within existing openings per the submitted drawings.
 - 3. Install iron gates at both the Government and Conception Street garage openings per the submitted drawings.
 - 4. 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 the work will not impair the historic integrity of the district. While the Board felt the balcony and door/window treatments were appropriate in the previous meeting, they

were concerned with the void that would be created by the coil garage doors and vents. They believed an iron gate and new vent treatments would be a better solution. The applicant addressed those concerns with the new design.

Staff recommends approving the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Neither the applicant nor his representative was present to discuss the application.

There were no comments from the public to enter into the record.

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board felt that it needed to know more about whether the gate was open air or whether the iron was mounted on material. The Board also wanted more information on the swing of the gate.

The Board decided to give Staff authority to approve the gate and the vent.

FINDING OF FACT

Harris Oswalt moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion was seconded by Michael Mayberry and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Harris Oswalt moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued once Staff has approved the gate and vent. The motion was seconded by Craig Roberts and unanimously approved.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

156-07-CA: 910 Selma Street
Applicant: Douglas Kearley/Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund
Received: 08/27/07 (+45 Days: 10/11/07)
Meeting: 09/10/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Renovate the residence.

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. This residence is currently in fair to poor condition. The Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund recently purchased the property as part of their effort to revitalize this area.
- 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” 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. Repair/replace the rotted wood throughout the exterior as needed with materials to match existing.
 - 2. Reopen existing windows that had been enclosed to install new wood 6/6 sash windows with true divided lights.
 - 3. Enclose one front window with lap siding to match existing and reconfigure a second front window to match existing.
 - 4. Enclose one rear door with lap siding to match existing and remove the masonry steps.
 - 5. Install new wood landing, steps and hood at the back door.
 - 6. Reclad the roof with Timberline shingles.
 - 7. Install operable wood shutters.
 - 8. Level and repoint the brick piers with lime mortar.
 - 9. Paint with colors to be submitted at a later date.
 - 10. Install MARC lattice at the foundation.
 - 11. Install a 6’-0” wood privacy fence.
 - 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

Neither the applicant nor his representative was present to discuss the application.

There were no comments from the public to enter into the record.

Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to enter into the record. Staff explained that the driveway would be Bahamian limestone and that the 6 ft. privacy fence would be capped.

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 Andrew Martin 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 Andrew Martin and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 09/10/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

157-07-CA: 204 Conti Street
Applicant: Tilmon Brown
Received: 08/27/07 (+45 Days: 10/11/07)
Meeting: 09/10/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street Commercial
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Conflict of Interest: Tilmon Brown recused himself from discussion and voting on the application since he has a financial interest in the project.
Project: Multiple renovations.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this two-story masonry commercial building was constructed circa 1920.

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 former commercial building is being renovated into residential living spaces.
- 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 cantilevered balconies on the south and east elevations per the submitted plans.
 - a. The balconies will have industrial I-beams as support.
 - b. They will have glass walls for railing.
 - 2. Install new canopies at the entrances per the submitted plans.
 - 3. Repair existing windows and install 6/1 wood sashes with true divided lights where needed per the submitted plans.
 - 4. Install one 12-light single French door with transom at each balcony per the submitted plans.
 - 5. Enclose the storefronts and install wood doors with two lights, two decorative panels and transoms on the first floor per the submitted plans.
 - 6. Paint building (colors to be submitted at a later date).

RECOMMENDATION

Staff feels that the proposed plan for the second floor will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district. While some of the existing windows will be enlarged to create doors onto the balcony, the solid

to void ratio is still maintained. Also, staff believes the modern interpretation of the balcony is appropriate. However, staff is concerned about the proposed plan for the first floor and feels that there are some things the Board should consider before making a decision. Although the first floor storefronts have been altered throughout the years, staff believes some connection to the original purpose of the building and/or the floor tiles at the entrances should be maintained.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Green Suttles and other interested parties were present to discuss the application. Mr. Suttles explained that the owners will maintain the middle inset entry on Conception but have eliminated the remaining entryways. He also stated that the balcony will be 6 ft. deep and that there are three options for the balcony railing—glass, cable or steel. They would like to have the glass railing but there are problems with cost and practicality. The brackets will be smaller than originally proposed. The awning will be metal, however, the color has not been determined. Exterior colors will be submitted at a later date. Lighting will be contemporary.

There were no comments from the public to enter into the record.

Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to enter 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 adding the following amendments: 1: the central door on Conception will be inset; 2: the canopy will be metal; 3: colors will be approved by Staff; brackets will be smaller than originally proposed. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswalt and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 09/10/08.