

CITY OF MOBILE
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Minutes of the Meeting
September 24, 2007

CALL TO ORDER

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

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

| <u>In Attendance</u> | <u>Mailing Address/Email Address</u> |
|-------------------------------|---|
| David McDonald | 913 Government St. |
| Lynn Clapper | McGill Toolen/ ldclap@aol.com |
| Chuck Dixon | 3121 Olde Gate Rd. |
| Nicholas H. Holmes III | |
| Mr. and Mrs. Angus Cooper III | 207 Lanier Ave. |
| Vanessa Jackson | vjackson@mhb.gov |
| Chris Lunsford | cnl@watermark.com |
| Rev. Bry Shields | 180 South St. |
| Ben Cummings | One Houston St. |
| Douglas B. Kearley | 10 Wisteria Ave. |
| Marie Dyson | 203 S. Dearborn St. |
| Celia Lewis | 158 S. Jefferson St. |

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

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

MID-MONTH APPROVALS

1. **Applicant's Name:** Dixon Brothers
Property Address: 501 Church Street
Date of Approval: August 29, 2007
Repair damaged chimney to match existing chimney, using type "N" mortar.
2. **Applicant's Name:** Center for the Living Arts/Peach State, Inc
Property Address: 301 Conti Street
Date of Approval: August 30, 2007
Re-roof building with TPO single-ply membrane roofing to match existing profile. Replace metal gutter/downspout to match existing in color and dimension as necessary.
3. **Applicant's Name:** Cypress Home Improvement LLC
Property Address: 15 South Pine Street
Date of Approval: September 5, 2007
Replace the wood siding on the rear porch enclosure with 105 siding to match existing. Paint in the existing color scheme. Clad the roof of the rear shed in 3-tab shingles in a color to match the color of the main residence.
4. **Applicant's Name:** George Stoudenmire/James Sarhan
Property Address: 100 Houston Street
Date of Approval: September 6, 2007
Addition to be as described on COA dated 4-24-07 with the exception that the addition will be 24'-0" x 24'-0".

5. **Applicant's Name:** Melanie Bunting
Property Address: 1155 Old Shell Road
Date of Approval: September 6, 2007
Repaint building in the following Sherwin Williams color scheme:
 - Body – Downing Sand, SW2822
 - Trim – Downing Stone, SW2821
 - Door/Window Sashes – Downing Slate, SW2819

6. **Applicant's Name:** Norman Herrington
Property Address: 110 Macy Place
Date of Approval: September 7, 2007
Paint building in the following BLP color scheme:
 - Body – Springhill Brown
 - Trim – Ft. Morgan Sand
 - Door – Summerville Red
 - Porch – Savannah Street Dark Brown

7. **Applicant's Name:** Timothy P. Hight
Property Address: 266 Stocking Street
Date of Approval: September 7, 2007
Replace rotten wood as necessary to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Paint building in the following BLP color scheme:
 - Body – Silver Night
 - Trim – White
 - Door – Gray Flannel

8. **Applicant's Name:** Palmetto Properties
Property Address: 304 North Jackson Street
Date of Approval: September 7, 2007
Replace rotten top window with a window to match existing. Paint in the following Sherwin-Williams color scheme:
 - Body – Bunglehouse Grey
 - Trim – White

9. **Applicant's Name:** The Galvez Company, LLC
Property Address: 267 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: September 7, 2007
Replace rotten wood and stucco with materials to match existing. Paint building in existing color scheme.

10. **Applicant's Name:** Building and Maintenance Company
Property Address: 1557 Fearnway
Date of Approval: September 10, 2007
Paint building in existing color scheme. Replace rotten wood siding as necessary with materials to match existing.

11. **Applicant's Name:** Jewl Minnich
Property Address: 1567 Fearnway
Date of Approval: September 10, 2007
Re-roof with 3 tab shingles, charcoal gray in color.

12. **Applicant's Name:** Tony Atchison
Property Address: 551 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: September 10, 2007
Re-roof building with bitumen modified flat roof to match existing.

13. **Applicant's Name:** Greg and Leda Gordon

Property Address: 912 Palmetto Street

Date of Approval: September 10, 2007

Paint residence in the following BLP color scheme:

- Body – Government Street Olive
- Trim – Oakleigh Place Ivory
- Accents – Monroe Street Green

14. **Applicant's Name:** Anne Everitt Little

Property Address: 16 North Reed Avenue

Date of Approval: September 10, 2007

Repair/replace rotten wood throughout the exterior – including siding, trim and porch deck - with materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Paint in the following Benjamin Moore color scheme:

- Body – Mix of Rainforest Foliage (2040-10) and Yellow Green (2033-10)
- Porch Ceiling – Mantis Green (2033-60)
- Porch Deck – Cedar Green (2034-40)

OLD BUSINESS

1. **125-06-CA:** Hope VI Houses, Façade One (Lot 10)
Applicant: Mobile Housing Board/Watermark Design
Request: Construct a new single-family residence.

APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. Certified record attached.

2. **126-06-CA:** Hope VI Houses, Façade Two (Lot 11)
Applicant: Mobile Housing Board/Watermark Design
Request: Construct a new single-family residence.

APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. Certified record attached.

3. **127-06-CA:** Hope VI Houses, Façade Three (Lots 9 and 12)
Applicant: Mobile Housing Board/Watermark Design
Request: Construct a new single-family residence.

APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. Certified record attached.

4. **128-06-CA:** Hope VI Houses, Façade Four (Lots 5 and 8)
Applicant: Mobile Housing Board/Watermark Design
Request: Construct a new single-family residence.

APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. Certified record attached.

5. **129-06-CA:** Hope VI Houses, Façade Five (Lots 1, 2 and 3)
Applicant: Mobile Housing Board/Watermark Design
Request: Construct a new single-family residence.

APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. Certified record attached.

6. **130-06-CA:** Hope VI Houses, Façade Six (Lots 4, 6 and 7)
Applicant: Mobile Housing Board/Watermark Design
Request: Construct a new single-family residence.

APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. Certified record attached.

7. **152-07-CA:**1501 Old Shell Road/60 North Catherine Street
Applicant: Reverend Bry Shields/Blitch Knevel Architects
Request: Construct a new classroom building.

APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. Certified record attached.

NEW BUSINESS

8. **158-07-CA:**1950 Government Street
Applicant: Lipscomb Signs/Woodlands Bank
Request: Install new signs.

APPROVED. Certified record attached.

9. **159-07-CA:**459 Charles Street
Applicant: Eddie Womack
Request: Construct a rear addition.

APPROVED. Certified record attached.

10. **160-07-CA:**913 Government Street
Applicant: William Tennyson
Request: Replace a fixed window with two sash windows.

APPROVED. Certified record attached.

11. **161-07-CA:**151-153 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Douglas Kearley
Request: Rehabilitate the façade and add a balcony.

APPROVED. Certified record attached.

12. **162-07-CA:**944 Conti Street
Applicant: Maverick Designs/Chilton's Fine Art & Framing
Request: Install new signs.

APPROVED. Certified record attached.

13. **163-07-CA:**509 Eslava Street
Applicant: Jim Backes
Request: Replace the brick walk with concrete and extend it to the street.

APPROVED. Certified record attached.

14. **164-07-CA:**207 Lanier Avenue
Applicant: Angus Cooper
Request: Rebuild the front porch and replace the existing rear addition with a new addition.

APPROVED. Certified record attached.

15. **165-07-CA:**163 St. Emanuel Street
Applicant: Holmes and Holmes Architects
Request: Rehabilitate buildings and enclose the rear porches with glass to connect the buildings.

APPROVED. Certified record attached.

16. **166-07-CA:53 Semmes Avenue**
Applicant: Chuck Dixon Home Improvement
Request: Partially enclose the rear porch.

APPROVED. Certified record attached.

17. **167-07-CA:351 Michigan Avenue**
Applicant: Dean and Sue Beasley
Request: Install a wood privacy fence and paint.

APPROVED. Certified record attached.

18. **168-07-CA:1563 Fearnway**
Applicant: Duggan Ellis
Request: Install a wood privacy fence.

APPROVED. Certified record attached.

19. **169-07-CA:16 South Royal Street**
Applicant: Teddy Lee of The Galvez Company
Request: Mothball the building.

DENIED. Certified Record attached.

20. **170-07-CA:159-161 Dauphin Street**
Applicant: Ben Cummings
Request: Rehabilitate the façade and add a balcony.

APPROVED. Certified record attached.

OTHER BUSINESS and ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. John Lawler discussed the Board's denial of the Mobile County Probate Court house. He suggested that the County might appeal to City Council and beyond with the notion that the Review board did not have jurisdiction over governmental bodies. After some discussion, the Board considered that it would not reverse its decision made at the last meeting based upon the fact that State enabling legislation gives the Board authority over governmental bodies.
2. Devereaux Bemis announced that any Board member attending the Traditional Building Conference in New Orleans in October would be reimbursed \$100 by the MHDC.
3. Tom Karwinski was introduced as a new Board member.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

125-06-CA: Hope VI Houses, Façade 1 – Lot 10 on Jefferson Street
Applicant: Mobile Housing Board/Watermark Design Group
Received: 11/13/06 (+45 Days: 12/28/06)
Meeting: 11/27/06
Resubmitted: 09/10/07 (+45 Days: 10/25/07)
Meeting: 09/24/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Conflict of Interest: Carlos Gant, as architect on the project, recused himself from discussion and voting on the application.
Project: Construct two-story residence.

BUILDING HISTORY

This is currently an empty lot.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. Currently, Lot 10 on South Jefferson Street is an empty lot across from the Sav-A-Lot in a commercial area of the Church Street East Historic District. This application was brought before the Board in November 2006. At that time, the Board adjourned its regular meeting and reconvened as the Design Committee. It offered recommendations to the Mobile Housing Board on ways the designs of its Hope VI houses could be slightly modified to be more in keeping with the surrounding historic district. The results of the meeting are iterated in the recommendation section of the staff report.
- 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...by using historic examples as a point of departure it is possible for new construction to...fit into the historic district.”
- C. The plan proposes to construct a two-story single-family residence per the submitted specifications:
1. Build a two-story, frame residence with a 15’-0” building setback typical of the residential setbacks in the district.
 - a. The foundation will be masonry piers with wood lattice insert.
 - b. The siding will be Hardiplank and have 4” trim boards.
 - c. The windows will be 1/1 vinyl-clad sashes or fixed pane in various sizes, some paired.
 - d. The front door will be fiberglass with three lights and two decorative panels at the front elevation.
 - e. The side door will be steel with two decorative panels on the side leading to the driveway.
 - f. The roof will be clad in architectural asphalt shingles.
 - g. The two-story front porch will have wood rails with fiberglass columns, a curved lintel and a concrete stair.
 - h. The graded driveway will be a light-colored concrete.
 - i. Paint colors will be submitted at a later date.

2. Install a concrete sidewalk.
3. Reconfigure curb cuts.
4. Remove any trees that are within the footprint of the new construction.

RECOMMENDATION

As mentioned above, when this application came before the Board in November 2006, they adjourned the regular meeting and reconvened as the Design Committee. It offered recommendations to the Housing Board on ways the designs of its Hope VI houses could be slightly modified to be more in keeping with the surrounding historic district. David Tharp recused himself from discussion on the applications. The recommendations that follow are applicable to applications 125-06-CA through 130-06-CA:

- Setback: The Committee stated that neighbors had expressed concern about building setbacks, which were not defined in the original application.
- Fences: The Committee stated that 6'-0" privacy fences are acceptable. Also, 106 Review will ask the Housing Board to stabilize and repoint the graveyard wall, alleviating the need for fences at the rear.
- Sheathing: The Committee stated that **smooth-faced** Hardiplank is an approved material in new construction.
- Details: The Committee stated that details should be varied. Columns can be fiberglass, but railings must be MHDC approved designs since PVC railings are unacceptable.
- Fenestration: The Committee stated that windows can be vinyl-clad wood and recommended muntins with no more than a 1/8" dimension. Also, window size, placement and number should be addressed since there was a lack of windows in the design.
- Gable Vents: The Committee stated that vents should be larger or rectangular.
- Lattice: The Committee stated that PVC is unacceptable. The applicant should look into MARC lattice.

In addition to the critiques outlined above, there are some items that staff feels should be addressed. Several of the driveways for the proposed residences, notably those on South Jefferson Street, continue into the backyard rather than end at the building, which is inappropriate. Also, the windows are vinyl as opposed to vinyl-clad and some are showing as false windows with fixed shutters. The doors are either steel or fiberglass, which are materials the Board typically does not approve. The residences proposed for Lots 1, 2 and 3 should have larger overhangs, taller fronts and a rear cross gables shorter than the front gables.

Staff recommends approving the application if the Board believes that the following points have been satisfactorily addressed:

- The Board's concerns from the previous application regarding setback, fences, sheathing, details, fenestration, gable vents and lattice.
- Staff's current concerns regarding the driveways, windows and doors.
- The height of the foundation.
- The proposed one-story residences, which appear squatty and underscaled.

The applicant will need to speak with Right-of-Way, Traffic Engineering and Urban Forestry regarding the curb cuts, sidewalks and trees.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Vanessa Jackson of the Mobile Housing Board and Chris Lunsford of Watermark were present to discuss the application. They stated that house designs previously submitted to the Board were modified to address the Board's concerns. They addressed Staff recommendations as follows:

- Setbacks will be in line with adjacent properties;
- Fences will not be included in the application with owners applying for fencing if desired at a later date;
- Hardiplank will be smooth;
- Windows will be vinyl-clad wood;
- There will be no gable vents;

- MHB will use MARC wood lattice;
- Doors will be fiberglass with rear doors metal;
- Shutters would be polymer.
- The city will maintain an easement to repair the cemetery wall with an easement document to be executed prior to the beginning of construction, there will be a base line survey of the wall's condition and the MHB will repair the wall, if damaged during construction, to the base line survey condition.

In addition, they reported that the ceiling heights will be 9 ft. and that the cornice will be hardiplank. Board members expressed concern that the house foundations did not appear to be raised sufficiently for the neighborhood. There was also concern that driveways are built up to avert constructing ramps. Ms. Jackson stated that every house has to be visitable; only one must be handicap accessible. Some of the lots are so narrow that raising the foundation and providing a ramp on the site would not be possible. There was also discussion that there are still not enough windows in some areas of the houses. Areas without windows will have service functions in the houses. Marie Dyson from 203 S. Dearborn stated that the neighborhood had met with the Housing Board on several occasions. She wondered whether a combination of creating raised drives with ramps would be possible to lessen the effect of both. Celia Lewis, a resident of 158 S. Jefferson, complimented the Housing Board for working with the neighborhood. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to enter into the record.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board continued to express concern over the protection of the Church Street Graveyard wall and wanted to ensure that the easement would be signed prior to the beginning of construction. There was also concern that, should owners construct fences in the future, there would be difficulty maintaining and monitoring the easement corridor.

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 Bobby 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 structure or the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued conditioned on the applicant returning with samples of the exterior doors and shutters and that the easement with the City be in place prior to the beginning of construction. The motion was seconded by Craig Roberts and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 09/24/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

126-06-CA: Hope VI Houses, Façade 2 – Lot 11 on Jefferson Street
Applicant: Mobile Housing Board/Watermark Design Group
Received: 11/13/06 (+45 Days: 12/28/06)
Meeting: 11/27/06
Resubmitted: 09/10/07 (+45 Days: 10/25/07)
Meeting: 09/24/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

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

BUILDING HISTORY

This is currently an empty lot.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. Currently, Lot 11 on South Jefferson Street is an empty lot across from the Sav-A-Lot in a commercial area of the Church Street East Historic District. This application was brought before the Board in November 2006. At that time, the Board adjourned its regular meeting and reconvened as the Design Committee. It offered recommendations to the Mobile Housing Board on ways the designs of its Hope VI houses could be slightly modified to be more in keeping with the surrounding historic district. The results of the meeting are iterated in the recommendation section of the staff report.
- 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...by using historic examples as a point of departure it is possible for new construction to...fit into the historic district.”
- C. The plan proposes to construct a two-story single-family residence per the submitted specifications:
1. Build a two-story, frame residence with a 15’-0” building setback typical of the residential setbacks in the district.
 - a. The foundation will be masonry piers with wood lattice insert.
 - b. The siding will be Hardiplank and have 4” trim boards.
 - c. The windows will be 1/1 vinyl-clad sashes or fixed pane in various sizes, some paired, and have operable wood shutters.
 - d. The front door will be fiberglass with three lights and two decorative panels at the front elevation.
 - e. The side door will be steel with two decorative panels on the side leading to the driveway.
 - f. The roof will be clad in architectural asphalt shingles.
 - g. The one-story front porch will have wood rails with fiberglass columns and a concrete stair.
 - h. The graded driveway will be a light-colored concrete.
 - i. Paint colors will be submitted at a later date.
 2. Install a concrete sidewalk.
 3. Reconfigure curb cuts.

4. Remove any trees that are within the footprint of the new construction.

RECOMMENDATION

As mentioned above, when this application came before the Board in November 2006, they adjourned the regular meeting and reconvened as the Design Committee. It offered recommendations to the Housing Board on ways the designs of its Hope VI houses could be slightly modified to be more in keeping with the surrounding historic district. David Tharp recused himself from discussion on the applications. The recommendations that follow are applicable to applications 125-06-CA through 130-06-CA:

- Setback: The Committee stated that neighbors had expressed concern about building setbacks, which were not defined in the original application.
- Fences: The Committee stated that 6'-0" privacy fences are acceptable. Also, 106 Review will ask the Housing Board to stabilize and repoint the graveyard wall, alleviating the need for fences at the rear.
- Sheathing: The Committee stated that **smooth-faced** Hardiplank is an approved material in new construction.
- Details: The Committee stated that details should be varied. Columns can be fiberglass, but railings must be MHDC approved designs since PVC railings are unacceptable.
- Fenestration: The Committee stated that windows can be vinyl-clad wood and recommended muntins with no more than a 1/8" dimension. Also, window size, placement and number should be addressed since there was a lack of windows in the design.
- Gable Vents: The Committee stated that vents should be larger or rectangular.
- Lattice: The Committee stated that PVC is unacceptable. The applicant should look into MARC lattice.

In addition to the critiques outlined above, there are some items that staff feels should be addressed. Several of the driveways for the proposed residences, notably those on South Jefferson Street, continue into the backyard rather than end at the building, which is inappropriate. Also, the windows are vinyl as opposed to vinyl-clad and some are showing as false windows with fixed shutters. The doors are either steel or fiberglass, which are materials the Board typically does not approve. The residences proposed for Lots 1, 2 and 3 should have larger overhangs, taller fronts and a rear cross gables shorter than the front gables.

Staff recommends approving the application if the Board believes that the following points have been satisfactorily addressed:

- The Board's concerns from the previous application regarding setback, fences, sheathing, details, fenestration, gable vents and lattice.
- Staff's current concerns regarding the driveways, windows and doors.
- The height of the foundation.
- The proposed one-story residences, which appear squatty and underscaled.

The applicant will need to speak with Right-of-Way, Traffic Engineering and Urban Forestry regarding the curb cuts, sidewalks and trees.

Conflicts of Interest, Public Testimony and Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date are the same as above.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

127-06-CA: Hope VI Houses, Façade 3 – Lot 12 on Jefferson Street and Lot 9 on Scott Street
Applicant: Mobile Housing Board/Watermark Design Group
Received: 11/13/06 (+45 Days: 12/28/06)
Meeting: 11/27/06
Resubmitted: 09/10/07 (+45 Days: 10/25/07)
Meeting: 09/24/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-4 (Jefferson Street) and R-1 (Scott Street)
Project: Construct two-story residence.

BUILDING HISTORY

These are currently empty lots.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. Currently, Lot 12 on South Jefferson Street is an empty lot across from the Sav-A-Lot in a commercial area of the Church Street East Historic District. Lot 9 on Scott Street is an empty lot at the corner of Scott and Canal Streets in a residential area of the Church Street East Historic District. It abuts the Crystal Ice factory. This application was brought before the Board in November 2006. At that time, the Board adjourned its regular meeting and reconvened as the Design Committee. It offered recommendations to the Mobile Housing Board on ways the designs of its Hope VI houses could be slightly modified to be more in keeping with the surrounding historic district. The results of the meeting are iterated in the recommendation section of the staff report.
- 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...by using historic examples as a point of departure it is possible for new construction to...fit into the historic district.”
- C. The plan proposes to construct two-story single-family residences per the submitted specifications:
1. Build two-story, frame residences with a 15’-0” setback on South Jefferson and a 9’-0” setback on Scott.
 - a. The foundation will be masonry piers with wood lattice insert.
 - b. The siding will be Hardiplank and have 4” trim boards.
 - c. The windows will be 1/1 vinyl-clad sashes or fixed pane in various sizes, some paired.
 - d. The front door will be fiberglass with three lights and two decorative panels at the front elevation.
 - e. The side door will be steel with two decorative panels on the side leading to the driveway.
 - f. The roof will be clad in architectural asphalt shingles.
 - g. The two-story front porch will have wood rails with fiberglass columns and a concrete stair.
 - h. The graded driveway will be a light-colored concrete.
 - i. Paint colors will be submitted at a later date.
 2. Install a concrete sidewalk.
 3. Reconfigure curb cuts.
 4. Remove any trees that are within the footprint of the new construction.

RECOMMENDATION

As mentioned above, when this application came before the Board in November 2006, they adjourned the regular meeting and reconvened as the Design Committee. It offered recommendations to the Housing Board on ways the designs of its Hope VI houses could be slightly modified to be more in keeping with the surrounding historic district. David Tharp recused himself from discussion on the applications. The recommendations that follow are applicable to applications 125-06-CA through 130-06-CA:

- Setback: The Committee stated that neighbors had expressed concern about building setbacks, which were not defined in the original application.
- Fences: The Committee stated that 6'-0" privacy fences are acceptable. Also, 106 Review will ask the Housing Board to stabilize and repoint the graveyard wall, alleviating the need for fences at the rear.
- Sheathing: The Committee stated that **smooth-faced** Hardiplank is an approved material in new construction.
- Details: The Committee stated that details should be varied. Columns can be fiberglass, but railings must be MHDC approved designs since PVC railings are unacceptable.
- Fenestration: The Committee stated that windows can be vinyl-clad wood and recommended muntins with no more than a 1/8" dimension. Also, window size, placement and number should be addressed since there was a lack of windows in the design.
- Gable Vents: The Committee stated that vents should be larger or rectangular.
- Lattice: The Committee stated that PVC is unacceptable. The applicant should look into MARC lattice.

In addition to the critiques outlined above, there are some items that staff feels should be addressed. Several of the driveways for the proposed residences, notably those on South Jefferson Street, continue into the backyard rather than end at the building, which is inappropriate. Also, the windows are vinyl as opposed to vinyl-clad and some are showing as false windows with fixed shutters. The doors are either steel or fiberglass, which are materials the Board typically does not approve. The residences proposed for Lots 1, 2 and 3 should have larger overhangs, taller fronts and a rear cross gables shorter than the front gables.

Staff recommends approving the application if the Board believes that the following points have been satisfactorily addressed:

- The Board's concerns from the previous application regarding setback, fences, sheathing, details, fenestration, gable vents and lattice.
- Staff's current concerns regarding the driveways, windows and doors.
- The height of the foundation.
- The proposed one-story residences, which appear squatty and underscaled.

The applicant will need to speak with Right-of-Way, Traffic Engineering and Urban Forestry regarding the curb cuts, sidewalks and trees.

Conflicts of Interest, Public Testimony and Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date are the same as above.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

128-06-CA: Hope VI Houses, Façade 4 – Lot 5 on Monroe Street and Lot 8 on Scott Street
Applicant: Mobile Housing Board/Watermark Design Group
Received: 11/13/06 (+45 Days: 12/28/06)
Meeting: 11/27/06
Resubmitted: 09/10/07 (+45 Days: 10/25/07)
Meeting: 09/24/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Construct two-story residence.

BUILDING HISTORY

These are currently empty lots.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. Currently, Lot 7 on Monroe Street is an empty lot at the corner of Monroe and Scott Streets in a residential area of the Church Street East Historic District. Lot 5 on Scott Street is an empty lot in a residential area of the Church Street East Historic District. The rear of the lot abuts the Crystal Ice factory. This application was brought before the Board in November 2006. At that time, the Board adjourned its regular meeting and reconvened as the Design Committee. It offered recommendations to the Mobile Housing Board on ways the designs of its Hope VI houses could be slightly modified to be more in keeping with the surrounding historic district. The results of the meeting are iterated in the recommendation section of the staff report.
- 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...by using historic examples as a point of departure it is possible for new construction to...fit into the historic district.”
- C. The plan proposes to construct two-story single-family residences per the submitted specifications:
 - 1. Build two-story, frame residences with a 9’-8” setback on Monroe and a 9’-8” setback on Scott.
 - a. The foundation will be masonry piers with wood lattice insert.
 - b. The siding will be Hardiplank and have 4” trim boards.
 - c. The windows will be 1/1 vinyl-clad sashes or fixed pane in various sizes, some paired, with operable wood shutters.
 - d. The front door will be fiberglass with one light and two decorative panels at the front elevation.
 - e. The side door will be steel with two decorative panels on the side leading to the driveway.
 - f. The roof will be clad in architectural asphalt shingles.
 - g. The two-story partial front porch will have wood rails with fiberglass columns and a concrete stair.
 - h. The will be a two-story bay on one elevation and a one-story bay on the opposite elevation.
 - i. The graded driveway will be a light-colored concrete.
 - j. Paint colors will be submitted at a later date.
 - 2. Install a concrete sidewalk.

3. Reconfigure curb cuts.
4. Remove any trees that are within the footprint of the new construction.

RECOMMENDATION

As mentioned above, when this application came before the Board in November 2006, they adjourned the regular meeting and reconvened as the Design Committee. It offered recommendations to the Housing Board on ways the designs of its Hope VI houses could be slightly modified to be more in keeping with the surrounding historic district. David Tharp recused himself from discussion on the applications. The recommendations that follow are applicable to applications 125-06-CA through 130-06-CA:

- Setback: The Committee stated that neighbors had expressed concern about building setbacks, which were not defined in the original application.
- Fences: The Committee stated that 6'-0" privacy fences are acceptable. Also, 106 Review will ask the Housing Board to stabilize and repoint the graveyard wall, alleviating the need for fences at the rear.
- Sheathing: The Committee stated that **smooth-faced** Hardiplank is an approved material in new construction.
- Details: The Committee stated that details should be varied. Columns can be fiberglass, but railings must be MHDC approved designs since PVC railings are unacceptable.
- Fenestration: The Committee stated that windows can be vinyl-clad wood and recommended muntins with no more than a 1/8" dimension. Also, window size, placement and number should be addressed since there was a lack of windows in the design.
- Gable Vents: The Committee stated that vents should be larger or rectangular.
- Lattice: The Committee stated that PVC is unacceptable. The applicant should look into MARC lattice.

In addition to the critiques outlined above, there are some items that staff feels should be addressed. Several of the driveways for the proposed residences, notably those on South Jefferson Street, continue into the backyard rather than end at the building, which is inappropriate. Also, the windows are vinyl as opposed to vinyl-clad and some are showing as false windows with fixed shutters. The doors are either steel or fiberglass, which are materials the Board typically does not approve. The residences proposed for Lots 1, 2 and 3 should have larger overhangs, taller fronts and a rear cross gables shorter than the front gables.

Staff recommends approving the application if the Board believes that the following points have been satisfactorily addressed:

- The Board's concerns from the previous application regarding setback, fences, sheathing, details, fenestration, gable vents and lattice.
- Staff's current concerns regarding the driveways, windows and doors.
- The height of the foundation.
- The proposed one-story residences, which appear squatty and underscaled.

The applicant will need to speak with Right-of-Way, Traffic Engineering and Urban Forestry regarding the curb cuts, sidewalks and trees.

Conflicts of Interest, Public Testimony and Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date are the same as above.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

129-06-CA: Hope VI Houses, Façade 5 – Lots 1, 2 and 3 on Monroe Street
Applicant: Mobile Housing Board/Watermark Design Group
Received: 11/13/06 (+45 Days: 12/28/06)
Meeting: 11/27/06
Resubmitted: 09/10/07 (+45 Days: 10/25/07)
Meeting: 09/24/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Construct one-story residence.

BUILDING HISTORY

These are currently empty lots.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. Currently, Lots 1, 2 and 3 on Monroe Street are empty lots in a residential area of the Church Street East Historic District. The rears f these lots abut Church Street Cemetery. This application was brought before the Board in November 2006. At that time, the Board adjourned its regular meeting and reconvened as the Design Committee. It offered recommendations to the Mobile Housing Board on ways the designs of its Hope VI houses could be slightly modified to be more in keeping with the surrounding historic district. The results of the meeting are iterated in the recommendation section of the staff report.
- 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...by using historic examples as a point of departure it is possible for new construction to...fit into the historic district.”
- C. The plan proposes to construct two-story single-family residences per the submitted specifications:
 - 1. Build one-story, frame residences with 12’-9” setbacks on Monroe.
 - a. The foundation will be masonry piers with wood lattice insert.
 - b. The siding will be Hardiplank and have 4” trim boards.
 - c. The windows will be 1/1 vinyl-clad sashes in various sizes, some paired, with operable wood shutters.
 - d. The front door will be fiberglass with three lights and two decorative panels at the front elevation.
 - e. The side doors will be steel with two decorative panels on the side leading to the driveway.
 - f. The roof will be clad in architectural asphalt shingles.
 - g. The one-story front porch will have wood rails with fiberglass columns and a concrete stair.
 - h. The will be a rear porch with wood rails and a concrete stair; one residence will have an access ramp.
 - i. The graded driveway will be a light-colored concrete.
 - j. Paint colors will be submitted at a later date.
 - 2. Install a concrete sidewalk.
 - 3. Reconfigure curb cuts.

4. Remove any trees that are within the footprint of the new construction.
- D. Of particular importance in this application are landscape and/or site issues such as fencing. Not only is the cemetery wall abutting the property historically significant and fragile, but there is also the slight possibility of unearthing graves when digging the foundation for these residences. Staff has already received letters of concern regarding these questions.

RECOMMENDATION

As mentioned above, when this application came before the Board in November 2006, they adjourned the regular meeting and reconvened as the Design Committee. It offered recommendations to the Housing Board on ways the designs of its Hope VI houses could be slightly modified to be more in keeping with the surrounding historic district. David Tharp recused himself from discussion on the applications. The recommendations that follow are applicable to applications 125-06-CA through 130-06-CA:

- Setback: The Committee stated that neighbors had expressed concern about building setbacks, which were not defined in the original application.
- Fences: The Committee stated that 6'-0" privacy fences are acceptable. Also, 106 Review will ask the Housing Board to stabilize and repoint the graveyard wall, alleviating the need for fences at the rear.
- Sheathing: The Committee stated that **smooth-faced** Hardiplank is an approved material in new construction.
- Details: The Committee stated that details should be varied. Columns can be fiberglass, but railings must be MHDC approved designs since PVC railings are unacceptable.
- Fenestration: The Committee stated that windows can be vinyl-clad wood and recommended muntins with no more than a 1 7/8" dimension. Also, window size, placement and number should be addressed since there was a lack of windows in the design.
- Gable Vents: The Committee stated that vents should be larger or rectangular.
- Lattice: The Committee stated that PVC is unacceptable. The applicant should look into MARC lattice.

In addition to the critiques outlined above, there are some items that staff feels should be addressed. Several of the driveways for the proposed residences, notably those on South Jefferson Street, continue into the backyard rather than end at the building, which is inappropriate. Also, the windows are vinyl as opposed to vinyl-clad and some are showing as false windows with fixed shutters. The doors are either steel or fiberglass, which are materials the Board typically does not approve. The residences proposed for Lots 1, 2 and 3 should have larger overhangs, taller fronts and a rear cross gables shorter than the front gables.

Staff recommends approving the application if the Board believes that the following points have been satisfactorily addressed:

- The Board's concerns from the previous application regarding setback, fences, sheathing, details, fenestration, gable vents and lattice.
- Staff's current concerns regarding the driveways, windows and doors.
- The height of the foundation.
- The proposed one-story residences, which appear squatty and underscaled.

The applicant will need to speak with Right-of-Way, Traffic Engineering and Urban Forestry regarding the curb cuts, sidewalks and trees.

Conflicts of Interest, Public Testimony and Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date are the same as above.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

130-06-CA: Hope VI Houses, Façade 6 – Lots 4 and 6 on Monroe Street and Lot 7 on Scott Street
Applicant: Mobile Housing Board/Watermark Design Group
Received: 11/13/06 (+45 Days: 12/28/06)
Meeting: 11/27/06
Resubmitted: 09/10/07 (+45 Days: 10/25/07)
Meeting: 09/24/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Construct one-story residence.

BUILDING HISTORY

These are currently empty lots.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. Currently, Lots 4 and 6 on Monroe Street are empty lots in a residential area of the Church Street East Historic District. Lot 9 on Scott Street is an empty lot in a residential area of the Church Street East Historic District. This application was brought before the Board in November 2006. At that time, the Board adjourned its regular meeting and reconvened as the Design Committee. It offered recommendations to the Mobile Housing Board on ways the designs of its Hope VI houses could be slightly modified to be more in keeping with the surrounding historic district. The results of the meeting are iterated in the recommendation section of the staff report.
- 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...by using historic examples as a point of departure it is possible for new construction to...fit into the historic district.”
- C. The plan proposes to construct two-story single-family residences per the submitted specifications:
1. Build one-story, frame residences with 9’-8” setbacks on Monroe and a 12’-0” setback on Scott.
 - a. The foundation will be masonry piers with wood lattice insert.
 - b. The siding will be Hardiplank and have 4” trim boards.
 - c. The windows will be 1/1 vinyl-clad sashes and fixed pane windows in various sizes, some paired, with operable wood shutters.
 - d. The front door will be fiberglass with one light and two decorative panels at the front elevation.
 - e. The side door will be steel with two decorative panels on the side leading to the driveway.
 - f. The roof will be clad in architectural asphalt shingles.
 - g. The one-story front porch will have wood rails with fiberglass columns and a concrete stair.
 - h. The graded driveway will be a light-colored concrete.
 - i. Paint colors will be submitted at a later date.
 2. Install a concrete sidewalk.
 3. Reconfigure curb cuts.
 4. Remove any trees that are within the footprint of the new construction.

RECOMMENDATION

As mentioned above, when this application came before the Board in November 2006, they adjourned the regular meeting and reconvened as the Design Committee. It offered recommendations to the Housing Board on ways the designs of its Hope VI houses could be slightly modified to be more in keeping with the surrounding historic district. David Tharp recused himself from discussion on the applications. The recommendations that follow are applicable to applications 125-06-CA through 130-06-CA:

- Setback: The Committee stated that neighbors had expressed concern about building setbacks, which were not defined in the original application.
- Fences: The Committee stated that 6'-0" privacy fences are acceptable. Also, 106 Review will ask the Housing Board to stabilize and repoint the graveyard wall, alleviating the need for fences at the rear.
- Sheathing: The Committee stated that **smooth-faced** Hardiplank is an approved material in new construction.
- Details: The Committee stated that details should be varied. Columns can be fiberglass, but railings must be MHDC approved designs since PVC railings are unacceptable.
- Fenestration: The Committee stated that windows can be vinyl-clad wood and recommended muntins with no more than a 1/8" dimension. Also, window size, placement and number should be addressed since there was a lack of windows in the design.
- Gable Vents: The Committee stated that vents should be larger or rectangular.
- Lattice: The Committee stated that PVC is unacceptable. The applicant should look into MARC lattice.

In addition to the critiques outlined above, there are some items that staff feels should be addressed. Several of the driveways for the proposed residences, notably those on South Jefferson Street, continue into the backyard rather than end at the building, which is inappropriate. Also, the windows are vinyl as opposed to vinyl-clad and some are showing as false windows with fixed shutters. The doors are either steel or fiberglass, which are materials the Board typically does not approve. The residences proposed for Lots 1, 2 and 3 should have larger overhangs, taller fronts and a rear cross gables shorter than the front gables.

Staff recommends approving the application if the Board believes that the following points have been satisfactorily addressed:

- The Board's concerns from the previous application regarding setback, fences, sheathing, details, fenestration, gable vents and lattice.
- Staff's current concerns regarding the driveways, windows and doors.
- The height of the foundation.
- The proposed one-story residences, which appear squatty and underscaled.

The applicant will need to speak with Right-of-Way, Traffic Engineering and Urban Forestry regarding the curb cuts, sidewalks and trees.

Conflicts of Interest, Public Testimony and Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date are the same as above.

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
Resubmitted: 09/10/07
Meeting: 09/24/07

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 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. The proposed new construction was presented to the Board on September 10, 2007, but it was tabled for lack of information.
- 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." Also, 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. The applicant is proposing to construct a new science building per the submitted plans:
 - 1. It will have a stucco finish painted off-white to match existing McGill buildings.
 - 2. It will have a pre-finished metal Spanish tile system in terra cotta to match existing McGill buildings.
 - 3. It will have Berridge flush metal seam panels in the soffit under the tile roof in terra cotta to match existing McGill buildings.
 - 4. It will have wood brackets under the roof edge painted off-white to match existing McGill buildings.
 - 5. It will have aluminum storm front windows in classic bronze.
 - 6. It will have metal storm louvers in classic bronze.
 - 7. It will have FRP doors with either a partial-width or full-width glass pane in classic bronze.
 - 8. It will have metal protective downspout covers.
 - 9. It will have aluminum ornamental railing in classic bronze.
 - 10. It will have aluminum foundation vents painted off-white to match existing McGill buildings.
 - 11. The grounds and parking area will be landscaped per the submitted plans.

RECOMMENDATION

As an institutional science building, staff feels that the proposed plan works well as a modern interpretation of the Spanish style buildings found throughout the campus. However, staff believes that the windows appear too small in

comparison to the scale and massing of the building. Staff is also unsure of what the chimney-like features on top of the roof are.

Additionally, staff believes that while the proposed landscape plan minimizes the look of the interior parking lots, the proposed head parking in the Right-of-Way is inappropriate for the area. Traffic Engineering concurs with this and will not approve head parking in the Right-of-Way. The applicants must present a new landscape plan.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Rev. Bry Shields and an architect representing the firm of Blich/Knevel architects were present to discuss the application. They stated that the chimneys were actually flues for the fume hoods in the labs. Windows, which will be storefront windows, will be powder coated and detail has been added at the lintel and sill. They are small and located high on the wall due to science lab furniture lining the walls. A color band has been added to the elevation and the stucco will have a sand finish. The roof is standing seam metal with Spanish tile cap creating a traditional look. The building will be 25,000 square feet with mechanical equipment placed in the attic. The roof has the same slope as the Toolen Building.

The applicants reported that they had been to the Planning Commission and were held over until the next meeting. The parking on Catherine Street still needs to be resolved.

Board members wanted to diminish the effect of parking on Catherine Street adjacent to residential areas and suggested that 4 spaces be dropped and the area landscaped.

Rev. Shields said that he would be in favor of doing that. He removed the Catherine Street parking portion of the application until the issue is resolved at the Planning Commission level. He stated that Traffic Engineering expressed the desire for parking to be back in angle parking.

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 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 noting that the parking and landscaping would be removed from the application. The motion was seconded by Bobby 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 for everything except parking and landscaping. The motion was seconded by Robert Brown and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 09/24/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

158-07-CA: 1950 Government Street
Applicant: Lipscomb Signs/Woodlands Bank
Received: 09/06/07 (+45 Days: 10/22/07)
Meeting: 09/24/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

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

BUILDING HISTORY

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

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This building was formerly a bank, although it has been vacant for some time. A 26 SF sign package for this building was approved in May 2007.
- B. The Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and along Government Street state that signs shall “not obscure the architectural features or openings of a building...shall relate to the design of the principal building on the property...shall be in proportion to the building and the neighboring structures and signs...should match the historic materials of the building...[and] shall use focused, low intensity illumination.”
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
 - 1. Replace the 21 SF unlit aluminum wall sign with a 29.8 SF aluminum wall sign with reverse channel lit letters per the submitted specifications on the Government Street elevation.
 - 2. Install one 29.8 SF aluminum wall sign with reverse channel lit letters per the submitted specifications on the Airport Boulevard elevation.
 - 3. The total sign package is approximately 59 SF.

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 signs fall within the standards of the Sign Design Guidelines.

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

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 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: 09/24/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

159-07-CA: 459 Charles Street
Applicant: Eddie Womack
Received: 09/10/07 (+45 Days: 10/25/07)
Meeting: 09/24/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Construct a two-story addition.

BUILDING HISTORY

This one-story brick and vinyl residence was built in 1972.

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 was recently added to the district in the Oakleigh Garden Historic District expansion. It is sided with brick and vinyl and has metal windows. Mr. Womack came before the Board in August 2007, but the proposal was denied because the Board felt the new addition should be better incorporated into the residence.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state that new additions should respect the age and style of the building.
- C. Mr. Womack is proposing to add a 29’-0” x 16’-0” two-story wing to the east side of the residence per the submitted plans:
 - 1. The foundation will be a concrete slab to match existing.
 - 2. It will feature 6/6 vinyl-clad sash windows with wood shutters to match existing and a 6-panel steel door at the rear elevation.
 - 3. It will be a simple rectangular addition with a design and materials to match existing including:
 - a. Brick siding on the first floor with vinyl siding on the second floor on the north and south elevations.
 - b. Vinyl siding on the east (rear) elevation.
 - c. A 4/12 roof pitch with asphalt roof shingles.
 - d. An 8’-0” ceiling height per floor.
 - e. A wood fascia board.
 - 4. There will be a wood balcony with fiberglass columns to match those on the front porch and MHDC stock rails on the east elevation.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the work will not impair the historic integrity of the district. Mr. Womack has incorporated the Board’s concerns into the new design, including removing the gap in the roof and using brick on the first floor. The result is a pop-up effect, which is a common and historic

way if adding living space into a residence. As far as the materials are concerned, this is a newer building, and though the Board generally does not approve the proposed materials, which includes the vinyl siding, in this case they are an existing feature. 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. Staff did inform the Board that the rear door would not be steel, but wood.

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 with the amendment that the rear door will be wood. The motion was seconded by Carlos Gant and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 09/24/08.

APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS CERTIFIED RECORD

160-07-CA: 913 Government Street
Applicant: William Tennyson
Received: 09/10/07 (+45 Days: 10/25/07)
Meeting: 09/24/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-B
Project: Replace a fixed window with two sash windows.

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. An application to allow the window to remain was denied August 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 proposing to replace the center fixed glass of the existing window with two 1/1 sashes to match the end units.

RECOMMENDATION

Though the building originally had an inappropriate window, the alterations originally proposed were correct for the house and the neighborhood. Paired windows similar to what is being proposed for this residence are not uncommon throughout the historic districts. Quadruple windows, though not common or typical, can be found in the districts. The proposed windows are narrow when compared to a normal window opening and staff feels that paired windows may be more appropriate.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Owner David McDonnell, along with his contractor William Tennyson, was present to discuss the application. Mr. McDonald apologized to the Board for not attending the last meeting. He thought that the contractor had taken care of the paperwork. He asked the Board to allow him to replace the Chicago window with 4 windows each 23 inches wide. This would entail as little tear out of the recent work as possible. He had worked on this design with his architect, Darrel Williams. He considered that the building had been severely altered over time, so that it now had little historic significance. In addition, there was no consistency of window types on the building.

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 had no comments on his presentation.

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 Bobby 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 Oswald and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 09/24/08.

APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS CERTIFIED RECORD

161-07-CA: 151-153 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Douglas Kearley
Received: 09/10/07 (+45 Days: 10/25/07)
Meeting: 09/24/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street Commercial
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Conflict of Interest: As Chairman of the Properties Committee, Tilmon Brown recused himself from discussion and voting on the application.
Project: Rehabilitate façade and add a balcony.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this two-story brick commercial building was constructed circa 1836. The significant alteration in the surface treatment of the building occurred circa 1945. Since then the building has been so altered that it was considered non-contributing; however, a 1993 restoration returned the façade to a more appropriate configuration and it is now a contributing part of the district.

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 building is currently vacant, but is being rehabilitated into the Senior Bowl offices and museum.
- 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.” Rehabilitations must respect the age and style of the building.
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
 1. Rehabilitate and reconfigure the north elevation per the submitted plans.
 - a. Elevation A proposes to install two paired wood French doors with three lights and decorative panels on the second floor, relocate the existing entrance doors to the fourth bay of the façade and install single fixed-pane storefront windows with transoms on the first floor.
 - b. Elevation B proposes to install two paired wood French doors with three lights and decorative panels on the second floor and six paired wood French doors with four lights, decorative panels and transoms in between stucco piers on the first floor.
 - c. Elevation C proposes to install two paired wood French doors with three lights and decorative panels on the second floor, relocate the existing entrance doors to the fourth bay of the façade and install single fixed-pane storefront windows with intermediate mullions and transoms on the first floor.
 2. Repair or replace as needed all extant architectural details of the buildings, including the brick, stucco, east elevation windows and doors with materials to [match existing in material, profile and dimension per the submitted plans.
 3. Reopen existing openings along the east elevation and install storefront windows per the submitted plans.

4. Install operable polymer shutters at the second and third floor windows of the east elevation per the submitted plans.
5. Attach metal panels with the Senior Bowl logo within the existing parapets on the north elevation per the submitted plans.
6. Add an iron balcony to the north elevation per the submitted plans.
 - a. All ironwork including brackets, valences, columns, rails and collars will be Lawler designs.
 - b. The roof will be metal standing seam in black.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff feels that the proposed balcony, which is based on historic photographs, is an appropriate treatment for the north elevation. Staff also feels that Elevation Options A and B are the most appropriate options. Also, the proposed windows in Elevation Option C appear to have glued-on mullions, which are inappropriate. Additionally, based on the information in the proposal, there are points that staff feels the applicant should address:

- The proposed shutters on the east elevation should be wood rather than polymer.
- The size of the proposed signs should be specified.
- A materials list along with a color scheme should be submitted.

This building has an easement. The Properties Committee will need to review this plan before work commences.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Architect Douglas Kearley was present to discuss the application. He explained that the applicant prefers Option B, but since no cost estimates have been done, he asked the Board to approve both options A and B. Mr. Kearley explained that the shutters would be polymer and that he had neglected to bring a sample. After some discussion with the Board, he withdrew the shutters and the sign from this application. He will return with these elements at a later date.

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

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 as amended with the removal of C.2.4 and 5. The motion was seconded by Jim Wagoner and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 09/24/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

162-07-CA: 944 Conti Street
Applicant: Maverick Designs/Chilton’s Fine Art & Framing
Received: 08/30/07 (+45 Days: 10/15/07)
Meeting: 09/24/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: New Signage.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this one-story masonry commercial building was built circa 1945.

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 currently has 24 SF worth of signage.
- B. The Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and along Government Street state that signs shall “not obscure the architectural features or openings of a building...shall relate to the design of the principal building on the property...shall be in proportion to the building and the neighboring structures and signs...should match the historic materials of the building...[and] shall use focused, low intensity illumination.”
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
 - 1. Install three 13 SF (totaling 39 SF) unlit aluminum wall signs per the submitted specifications.
 - 2. The total sign package is approximately 63 SF, which includes the existing signs.

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 signs fall within the standards of the Sign Design Guidelines.

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

There was no Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application 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: 09/24/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

163-07-CA: 509 Eslava Street
Applicant: Jim Backes
Received: 09/03/07 (+45 Days: 10/18/07)
Meeting: 09/24/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Replace the brick walk and extend it to the street.

BUILDING HISTORY

This one-story brick residence was built in 1996.

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 was built as part of a new Church Street East subdivision in the 1990s. Currently, the walkway leading from the house to the sidewalk is made of left over bricks from the construction of the house and there is no walk between the sidewalk and the street.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “[I]t is important that the design, location and materials [of drives and walks] be compatible with the property.”
- C. Mr. Backes is proposing to replace the brick walk with a light-colored concrete walkway and extend it to the street.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the work will impair not the historic integrity of the district. The current walkway is composed of non-historic bricks left over from the construction of the house and it has problems with pooling water. Also, concrete walkways can be found extensively throughout the historic districts.

Staff recommends approving the application. Mr. Backes will need to speak with Right-of-Way regarding the proposed walkway extension.

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 questioned Staff regarding whether the existing brick walk would be removed or simply covered. Staff responded that the brick would be removed prior to laying concrete.

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 Jim Wagoner 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 Tilmon Brown and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 09/24/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

164-07-CA: 207 Lanier Avenue
Applicant: Holmes and Holmes, Architects
Received: 09/04/07 (+45 Days: 10/19/07)
Meeting: 09/24/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Ashland Place
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Construct two one-story additions.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this two-story Mediterranean-influenced residence was built circa 1912.

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 non-original two-story masonry wing on the rear of the residence. Also, the front porch has been altered from its original design.
- 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. Remove the front porch as required to rebuild it per the submitted elevations, which are based on original drawings and photographs of the residence.
 - 2. Remove the existing non-original rear addition and carport.
 - 3. Attach a 24’-0” x 40’-0” one-story garage wing to the north side of the residence per the submitted plans.
 - a. The wing will feature two sets of treated wood garage doors with panels and eight lights, 16/1 wood sash windows on the north elevation and wood casements on the west (rear) elevation.
 - b. The design and materials will match existing, including the stucco, roof pitch, barrel roof tiles, eaves, gutters and window configurations.
 - 4. Attach a 60’-0” x 38’-0” two-story wing to the west side of the residence per the submitted plans.
 - a. The wing will feature 9/1 and 16/1 wood sash, casement and multi-paned fixed windows on the west (rear) and south elevations and paired wood French doors with fourteen lights each on the south elevation.
 - b. The design and materials will match existing, including the stucco, roof pitch, barrel roof tiles, eaves, gutters and chimneys.
 - 5. Attach a 14’-0” x 46’-0” one-story porch to the south side of the residence per the submitted plans that will mimic the front porch.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff believes the materials of the proposed addition will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district. Staff is nevertheless concerned about the size of the addition in relation to the original residence. However, Mr. Holmes III met with a Design Review Committee on an

informal basis to discuss the addition and they felt that it would be acceptable because it is all in the rear of the property. Staff also believes that the garage should either be detached or redesigned to look detached.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Architect Nick Holmes III and Angus Cooper were present to discuss the application. Mr. Holmes presented additional photographs showing public views of the house. Although the addition will be large, it will be kept behind the existing house and will be differentiated by plane changes. Mr. Holmes also showed various examples of detached garages in the neighborhood.

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. The motion was seconded by Barja Wilson 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 Barja Wilson and was approved with Tom Karwinski abstaining.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 09/24/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

165-07-CA: 163 St. Emanuel Street
Applicant: Holmes and Holmes, Architects
Received: 09/04/07 (+45 Days: 10/19/07)
Meeting: 09/24/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: H-B
Project: Rehabilitate buildings and enclose rear porches to connect the various buildings.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this main building is a two-story brick Italianate residence built circa 1857.

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 property contains several vacant buildings that will be connected for a proposed hotel. A very large infill and connector plan for this property was approved by the Board in 2005; however, the plan was never completed. The work is slated to begin again, but this application is sufficiently changed and scaled back from the original design to merit a new review.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “[w]here rear or side porches are to be enclosed, one recommended method is to preserve the original configuration of columns, handrails and other important architectural features.” 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.” Rehabilitations must respect the age and style of the building.
- C. Mr. Holmes III is proposing to rehabilitate the property per the submitted drawings. The details of the rehabilitation are outlined in the Certification Application included as supplemental material.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff feels that the current work proposed for the property is a more acceptable infill and connector plan than had been previously approved by the Board. The majority of the work is either reconstructing features that have been removed, such as the rear porches, or repairing and maintaining existing features with materials to match. Also, the glass enclosures follow the standards of the Guidelines by preserving the “original configuration of columns, handrails and other important architectural features.”

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Nick Holmes III was present to discuss the application. The Board inquired whether the owner would be pursuing Investment Tax Credits. Mr. Holmes responded that the Alabama Historical Commission had looked at the plans in 1999, but he did not know. 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

Barja Wilson 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

Craig Robert 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: 09/24/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

166-07-CA: 53 Semmes Avenue
Applicant: Chuck Dixon Home Improvement
Received: 09/10/07 (+45 Days: 10/25/07)
Meeting: 09/24/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Partially fill-in the back porch.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this one-story frame Late 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. There is currently a full-width porch at the rear of the residence.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “[w]here rear or side porches are to be enclosed, one recommended method is to preserve the original configuration of columns, handrails and other important architectural features.”
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
 - 1. Enclose the southwest corner of the porch per the submitted plans.
 - a. It will be an 8’-0” x 8’-0” enclosure resting on the existing brick piers.
 - b. It will have a gable roof that extends from the rear.
 - c. All details and materials will match existing to include the roof shingles, wood lap siding, wood trim, overhanging eaves and 2/2 wood sash windows with true divided lights.
 - 2. Replace the existing concrete steps at the southwest corner with wood steps that will be centered on the new front porch.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff is concerned about the pitch of the roof on the new addition. It appears to be too steep, although that may be because the drawing is not to scale. The remaining plan proposed for the addition is common and typical work in historic districts.

Staff recommends approving the addition with an appropriate roof.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Dixon was present to discuss the application. He stated that the enclosure is for a master bath. He further stated that the pitch of the roof will match the existing pitch and that all materials will match existing materials on the house.

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 Cameron Pfeiffer and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 09/24/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

167-07-CA: 351 Michigan Avenue
Applicant: Dean and Sue Beasley
Received: 09/10/07 (+45 Days: 10/25/07)
Meeting: 09/24/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Leinkauf
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Install a privacy fence and paint.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this one-story frame residence was built circa 1948.

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 wood privacy fence at the south and east boundaries.
- 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. Install a 6’-0” wood privacy fence and gate at the north and west boundaries to match the existing fence per the submitted site plan.
 - 2. Paint the exterior in the Ralph Lauren Vintage Masters color scheme:
 - a. Body – Fairfax Autumn, VM56
 - b. Trim – White

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the fence and paint 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. Mr. and Mrs. Beasley will need to address any setback issues with Urban Development 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

There was no Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 09/24/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

168-07-CA: 1563 Fearnway
Applicant: Duggan Ellis
Received: 09/10/07 (+45 Days: 10/25/07)
Meeting: 09/24/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

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

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this two-story frame Bungalow was built circa 1915.

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 wood privacy fence at the east and west boundaries. The parking lot for Dauphin Way United Methodist Church abuts the Ellis’ backyard.
- 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. Mr. Ellis is proposing to install a 6’-0” dog-eared wood privacy fence on 101’-0” rear property line.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the fence 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 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: 09/24/08.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF COMMENTS

169-07-CA: 16 South Royal Street
Applicant: Teddy Lee with The Galvez Company
Received: 09/10/07 (+45 Days: 10/25/07)
Meeting: 09/24/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street Commercial
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Board the second story windows and paint.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this two-story brick commercial building that originally featured Italianate details was constructed circa 1885. A significant alteration in the fenestration and surface treatment of the building, including the removal of its Italianate details – an ornate dentilated and bracketed cornice, projecting hoodmolds, etc – occurred circa 1945. The first-floor storefronts have been 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. The building is currently vacant, the storefront is boarded and several panes on the second-story windows are broken. Mr. Lee is currently replacing the rotted storefront boards with new board and batten to match existing. The owners were recently cited for lack of maintenance.
- B. The MHDC’s guide to mothballing buildings state, “Mothballing buildings is important...to secure the building from threat, either manmade or natural, and to ensure the health, safety and welfare of the general public...[T]he quality of materials and the installation of those materials is critical to a successful project.”
- C. Mr. Lee is proposing to board the second-story windows with sheets plywood to fit the openings and paint the wood the color of the building.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff believes that the property owner should replace the broken panes of glass rather than board the windows.

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 repairing the window glass would probably be less expensive than boarding the windows. In addition, boarding windows gives the downtown area an abandoned look.

FINDING OF FACT

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued conditioned on broken and missing glass being replaced in the windows. The motion was seconded by Jim Wagoner and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 09/24/08.

APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS CERTIFIED RECORD

170-07-CA: 159-161 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Ben Cummings
Received: 09/10/07 (+45 Days: 10/25/07)
Meeting: 09/24/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street Commercial
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Rehabilitate façade and add a balcony.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, these two-story brick commercial buildings were constructed circa 1860. They were covered with modern stucco panels circa 1935. At one time the building on the west side (161) had 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. The building is currently vacant, but is being rehabilitated into downtown offices for an insurance company.
- 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.” Rehabilitations must respect the age and style of the building.
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
 - 1. Remove the non-original stucco and C.M.U. wall located below the steel beam and between the side brick walls to reconfigure the storefront per the submitted plans.
 - a. There will be three sets of paired French doors with six-lights and decorative panels and six 2/2 wood sash windows on the east side of the façade.
 - b. There will be two doors with one-light and decorative panels, 3/1 wood sash windows and fixed storefront windows with transoms on the west side of the façade.
 - 2. Cut openings into the wall above the steel beam to investigate the condition of the bricks.
 - a. If the bricks are in good condition, the non-original wall will be removed to expose the original wall and all brickwork will be repaired or replaced with materials to match existing. The openings on the west side of the façade will have three sets of paired French doors with six-lights and decorative panels. The openings on the east side of the façade will be enlarged from windows to doors and have two sets of paired French doors with six-lights, decorative panels and fabric awnings.
 - b. If the bricks are not in good condition, the non-original wall will remain and door/window openings will be cut out. The openings on the west side of the façade will correspond with the original openings extant behind the stucco and have three sets of paired French doors with six-lights and decorative panels. The openings on the east side of the façade will be enlarged from windows to doors and have two sets of paired French doors with six-lights, decorative panels and fabric awnings.
 - 3. Add iron balconies to the façade per the submitted plans.

- a. The east side of the façade will have a two-story balcony with Lawler designed ironwork including columns, rails and collars.
- b. The west side of the façade will have an iron balconet on the second floor.

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, the proposed balconies will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district. They are common and typical updates on commercial buildings.

Staff also feels that as the first floor storefronts have been significantly altered throughout the years, the proposed alterations are acceptable commercial interpretations. However, staff feels that there are some things the Board should consider before making a decision:

- If any of the Carrara glass is still extant underneath the current sheathing, it should be retained and repaired.
- Any original and/or historic floor tiles at the entrances should be maintained.
- The doors appear underscaled and it would also be more appropriate if they were inset.
- The 3/1 sash windows on the west side of the façade are more appropriate on a Craftsman-era residential building.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Architect Ben Cummings was present to discuss the application. He explained that a concrete block wall with stucco finish had been constructed on the outside of the original wall. Upon inspection, the original building wall was unstable and, as a result, the false wall will be retained and openings cut into the wall at the original window/door opening locations. Doors and windows will be pulled forward and recessed a couple of inches to mimic an original opening. He further explained that there is no evidence of Carrara glass remaining on the storefront or of any historic floor tiles at the entrance. Mr. Cummings further stated that the horizontal first floor beam was located at approximately 13 ft. to the floor. As a result, the storefront was made taller with 8 ft. tall doors with 4 ft. high transoms.

Staff recommended a different type of window—2/2 rather than a Craftsman 3/1.

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 questioned whether the building ever had a cornice. Mr. Cummings responded that he did not know since the building had originally been 3 stories in height but is only two stories presently.

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 as amended: Delete C.2.a., no Carrara glass present, no historic floor tiles present and windows to be 2/2 wood sash. The motion was seconded by Carlos Gant 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 Tom Karwinski and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 09/24/08.