

**CITY OF MOBILE**  
**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD**

Minutes of the Meeting  
October 16, 2006

**CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m. by Chair, Bunky Ralph.

Devereaux Bemis, MHDC Director, called the roll as follows:

**Members Present:** Robert Brown, Tilmon Brown, Harris Oswalt, Cameron Pfeiffer, Bunky Ralph, Joe Sackett, Jim Wagoner.

**Members Absent:** Douglas Kearley, David Tharp.

Staff Members Present: Anne Crutcher, Devereaux Bemis, John Lawler.

<u>In Attendance</u>	<u>Mailing Address</u>	<u>Item Number</u>
Charles K. Breland		107-06-CA
Don Davis		112-06-CA
Warren Carmichael		109-06-CA

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

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

**MID-MONTH APPROVALS:**

- 1. Applicant's Name:** Read Roofing and Contracting  
**Property Address:** 1320 Dauphin Street  
**Date of Approval:** September 11, 2006

Install new three tab shingled roof. Weathered Wood in color.

- 2. Applicant's Name:** F.S. Land Company, LLC  
**Property Address:** 1255 Springhill Avenue  
**Date of Approval:** September 12, 2006

Build 8 x 10 pad for dumpster and relocate dumpster from 1257 Springhill Avenue to end of driveway. Construct a section of 6 ft. wood privacy fencing on the east property line and install two wood gates of the same design across east and west driveways.

- 3. Applicant's Name:** Vivian Ash  
**Property Address:** 1108 Selma Street  
**Date of Approval:** September 13, 2006

Repaint house in the following Sherwin Williams color scheme:

Body: Gallery Green  
Trim: Billiard Green  
Door: White

4. **Applicant's Name:** Vivian Ash  
**Property Address:** 1106 Selma Street  
**Date of Approval:** September 13, 2006

Repaint house in the following Sherwin Williams color scheme:

Body: Pewter Tankard

Trim: White

Shutters: Billiard Green

5. **Applicant's Name:** Mrs. Farley  
**Property Address:** 255 Dexter Avenue  
**Date of Approval:** September 13, 2006

Replace rotten wood as necessary on rear of building with new materials matching existing in profile, dimension and material. Paint new materials to match existing color scheme.

6. **Applicant's Name:** Amanda Bray  
**Property Address:** 962 Dauphin Street  
**Date of Approval:** September 13, 2006

Replace rotten wood as necessary with new materials to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Prime to paint. Paint house: colors to be submitted at a later date.

7. **Applicant's Name:** Barbara Giddens  
**Property Address:** 200 S. Dearborn Street  
**Date of Approval:** September 13, 2006

This CoA replaces approval for fence repairs granted on 01-13-06. Fence will be located as constructed approximately 12 inches behind sidewalk. Approval is in compliance with side setback approval granted 09-11-06 by BOA.

8. **Applicant's Name:** Dharam S. Pannu  
**Property Address:** 907 Elmira Street  
**Date of Approval:** September 15, 2006

Install 12 x 12 shed in rear yard. Siding to be Hardiplank. Roof to be gabled with asphalt shingles. Design supplied by MHDC.

9. **Applicant's Name:** Ralph Reynolds Roofing  
**Property Address:** 60 St. Francis Street  
**Date of Approval:** September 15, 2006

Install new built up bitumen flat roof to match existing in profile and dimension.

10. **Applicant's Name:** J.O. Hermann  
**Property Address:** 59 S. Catherine Street  
**Date of Approval:** September 15, 2006

Repair rear porch with new materials to match existing in profile and dimension;  
paint new materials to match existing color scheme.

11. **Applicant's Name:** O.C. Wiggins Construction  
**Property Address:** 208 Lanier Avenue  
**Date of Approval:** September 15, 2006

Remove deteriorated gutter. Install new fascia board leaving extended rafters exposed.

12. **Applicant's Name:** Stewart Contracting Company  
**Property Address:** 182 St. Francis Street  
**Date of Approval:** September 15, 2006

Clean and prep building. Paint rusted areas black to match existing color scheme. (Unpainted brick to remain unpainted.)

13. **Applicant's Name:** Gary and Patricia Collie  
**Property Address:** 10 Oakland Terrace  
**Date of Approval:** September 15, 2006

Replace rotten wood as necessary to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Paint house in the following color scheme:  
Body: Valspar Jekyll Sans Souci Green  
Trim: Valspar Woodlawn Lace  
Porch: Valspar Deep River Green  
Shutters: Valspar Crabapple Wine

14. **Applicant's Name:** Richard Brown/Hastings Reid  
**Property Address:** 1225 Selma Street  
**Date of Approval:** September 19, 2006

Repair existing 6 inch dog eared privacy fence to match existing.

15. **Applicant's Name:** P.M. Gardner Construction Co.  
**Property Address:** 103 S. Ann Street  
**Date of Approval:** September 19, 2006

Replace rotten wood as necessary with new materials to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Paint new materials to match existing color scheme. Repair roof with shingles and materials to match existing in color, profile and dimension.

16. **Applicant's Name:** Timothy Ellzey  
**Property Address:** 5 N. Jackson Street  
**Date of Approval:** September 20, 2006

Accent paint around entrance door as per submitted colors.

17. **Applicant's Name:** Steven Byrd Construction  
**Property Address:** 805 Church Street

**Date of Approval:** September 20, 2006

Demolish metal warehouse at rear of lot; remove deteriorated sections of concrete and block foundation.

18. **Applicant's Name:** Thomas Roofing  
**Property Address:** Fort Conde, 150 S. Royal Street  
**Date of Approval:** September 20, 2006

Replace broken roof tiles where needed matching existing in shape and color.

19. **Applicant's Name:** Papa John's Pizza/Victor Sign Company  
**Property Address:** 1500 Government Street  
**Date of Approval:** September 21, 2006

Install aluminum halo-illuminated channel letters with red painted faces. Sign to be 22.13 sq. ft. and placed in sign band per the submitted drawings.

20. **Applicant's Name:** Kelly Beeker/Diversified Roofing  
**Property Address:** 1207 Government Street  
**Date of Approval:** September 21, 2006

Install new roof using 30 year dimensional shingles. Weathered Wood in color.

21. **Applicant's Name:** Off Dauphin  
**Property Address:** 5 N. Jackson Street/300 Dauphin Street  
**Date of Approval:** September 22, 2006

Install 12 sq. ft. of logo signage on inner surface of glass. Install three light fixtures on window surface as per submitted plans.

22. **Applicant's Name:** Kenneth Palmertree  
**Property Address:** 1111 Old Shell Road  
**Date of Approval:** September 22, 2006

Add front porch detailing to include: column, railing, wood stairs and stair rail per MHDC drawings.

23. **Applicant's Name:** Three Georges  
**Property Address:** 226 Dauphin Street  
**Date of Approval:** September 25, 2006

Repair west wall. Cover with stucco and paint to match existing colors.

24. **Applicant's Name:** Kevin Chambers  
**Property Address:** 1054 Palmetto Street  
**Date of Approval:** September 25, 2006

Replace rotten wood as necessary with new wood to match existing in dimension and profile; repaint house white with Bellingrath Green trim.

**C. NOTICES OF VIOLATION and MUNICIPAL OFFENSE TICKETS**

No NoVs or MoTs were written during this time period.

**D. NEW BUSINESS**

- 1. 105-06-CA** 219 Dauphin Street  
Applicant: Archdiocese of Mobile/Dan Merker  
Nature of Request: Build privacy fence to enclose rear parking lot.

**DENIED** Certified Record attached.
- 2. 106-06-CA** 311 Marine Street  
Applicant: Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund/Douglas Kearley, architect  
Nature of Request: Remove rear addition and construct new addition. Remove chain link fence. Install Bahamian limestone driveway. Repaint house in same gray and white colors.

**APPROVED.** Certified Record attached.
- 3. 107-06-CA** 753 St. Francis Street  
Applicant: St. Francis Place, LLC/Charles K. Breland  
Nature of Request: Build suspended deck on existing third floor roof area and add handrails.

**APPROVED.** Certified Record attached.
- 4. 108-06-CA** 1150 Old Shell Road  
Applicant: Ryan J. Stuckas  
Nature of Request: Build 24' x 20' gabled addition on rear of house with details to match existing house.

**APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.** Certified Record attached.
- 5. 109-06-CA** 256 S. Cedar Street  
Applicant: Warren V. Carmichael  
Nature of Request: Enclose rear patio sunroom.

**APPROVED.** Certified Record attached.
- 6. 110-06-CA** 1200 Dauphin Street  
Applicant: Jarrod White  
Nature of Request: Install garage doors on garage apartment at rear of property.

**TABLED for lack of information.** Certified Record attached.

7. **111-06-CA** 301 Conti Street  
Applicant: Centre for the Living Arts, Mobile/Mathes Brierre,  
architects  
Nature of Request: Add new entrance to front of building. Add rooftop terrace  
with guard rail. Re-clad third floor brick and concrete  
exterior wall with glass and metal panels. Replace service  
doors. Replace second floor windows. Repair or replace  
elements of building as needed. New signage.
- APPROVED.** Certified Record attached.

8. **112-06-CA** 601 Government Street  
Applicant: MDI Media Group Inc./AAA Iron Works  
Nature of Request: 252 linear feet of 4' aluminum fence with black powder  
coat finish.
- APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.** Certified Record  
attached.

#### **OTHER BUSINESS and ANNOUNCEMENTS**

1. Announcement of Thursday evening lecture series at the Museum of Mobile on  
ironwork in conjunction with the publication of John Sledge's book on historic  
ironwork.

**There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.**

## **APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS CERTIFIED RECORD**

**105-06-CA:** 219 Dauphin Street  
**Applicant:** Archdiocese of Mobile/Dan Merker  
**Received:** 09/25/06 (+45 Days: 11/09/06)  
**Meeting:** 10/16/06

### **INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Lower Dauphin Street  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** B-4  
**Project:** Install privacy fence to enclose rear parking lot.

### **BUILDING HISTORY**

This two-story brick commercial building with a full-width glass storefront on the first floor is owned by the Archdiocese of Mobile. It was built circa 1940 and has been home to a number of businesses, including a Woolworth's and several nightclubs. It is currently the Soul Kitchen Music Hall.

### **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**

1. New Privacy Fence to Enclose Parking Lot
  - A. Currently, the building has a rear parking lot open to Conti Street.
  - B. The Design Review Guidelines state that fences "...should compliment the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic Districts."
  - C. Retain the 6' wood privacy fence partially enclosing the rear parking lot, leaving openings for traffic to enter and exit.
  - D. Generally, wood privacy fences are considered residential in character and open metal fences are more typical of commercial areas.
  - E. Conti Street is becoming an important pedestrian street in the downtown area, particularly with the Arts Alive event, the location of the Saenger Box Office and the popularity of Café 219 with its proposed expansion.
  - F. The fence is out of character with the district and the masonry building.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

It is necessary to note that the privacy fence has already been built; however, MHDC has received numerous complaints about it. In its current form, the fence does not follow the typical open work metal type of design and materials of the Lower Dauphin Street Historic District. Staff believes the fence as built impairs the historic integrity of the district and recommends denial of this application.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Neither the applicant nor his representative was present to discuss the application. There was no one else to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application.

Staff noted that several comments from the public were received that opposed the retention of this fence at the sidewalk that was erected without Board review or a building permit. There were no comments from other city departments to read into the record.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board asked Staff if a stop work had been issued. Staff explained that the fence was quickly erected and there was no opportunity to issue a stop work.

The Board questioned Staff regarding the appropriateness of a dog eared privacy fence at this location. Staff explained that low walls with plantings or a 4 ft. open work metal fence are more commonly found in the area. Low fencing increases the sense of security in the area.

Board members noted that the existing fence does not work like a fence since there are two wide openings for cars to enter and leave the parking lot.

### **FINDING OF FACT**

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

### **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Jim Wagoner moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does impair the historic integrity of the structure and the district according to the Guidelines and that the application be denied. The motion was seconded by Cameron Pfeiffer and approved 6 to 1 with Tilmon Brown abstaining.



## APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS CERTIFIED RECORD

**106-06-CA:** 311 Marine Street  
**Applicant:** Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund/Douglas Kearley, architect  
**Received:** 09/25/06 (+45 Days: 11/09/06)  
**Meeting:** 10/16/06

### INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

**Historic District:** Oakleigh Garden  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Remove rear addition and construct new addition. Remove chain link fence and install 6' wood fence. Install Bahamian limestone driveway. House to be repainted same gray and white color scheme.

### BUILDING HISTORY

This one-story frame shotgun 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

1. Remove Rear Addition and Construct New Addition
  - A. Currently, this residence has a small one-room addition on the back that was built some time after the original building.
  - B. The Design Review Guidelines state that "new additions...shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be...compatible with the massing, size, scale and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment."
  - C. The existing frame room with shed roof will be removed.
  - D. A gabled frame addition on brick piers with wood lattice infill will be placed at the rear of the house that mimics the design of the existing house.
  - E. Siding will match existing.
  - F. Door and Window sizes, placement and materials will match existing.
  - G. There will be a rear porch with wood steps leading to the ground and a chamfered center wood column to match existing columns on the front porch.
2. Remove Chain Link Fence and Install 6' Wood Privacy Fence
  - A. Currently, this residence has a non-historic chain link fence surrounding the rear of the property from the front porch. There is a small section of 6' wood privacy fence on the right side of the property. The lot is approximately 40' x 130' and the rear property line abuts a parking lot.
  - B. The Design Review Guidelines state that fences "...should compliment the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic Districts."
  - C. The proposed wood fence will be 6' tall and complete the wood privacy fence already in place on the right hand side of the property.

- D. Wood will be pressure treated.
  - E. There will be a 5' gate extending from the left side of the house to the property line. It will be set back 25' from the curb. Unlike the current chain link gate, which sits flush with the front porch, the new gates will be set back from the front porch.
  - F. Fences of this type are common throughout historic districts.
3. Install Bahamian Limestone Driveway
    - A. Currently, this residence has a driveway on the left hand side of the property.
    - B. The Design Review Guidelines state that "modern paving materials are acceptable in the historic district."
    - C. Driveway will be 4" thick Bahamian Limestone and maintain the proportions of existing.
  4. Repaint House
    - A. Rear addition will be painted existing gray and white color scheme.
    - B. Existing section of house will be repainted as necessary.

**RECOMMENDATION**

The proposed improvements are typical and common updates of historic properties. Staff feels that these improvements will not negatively impact the integrity of the building or the district and recommends approval of the application as submitted.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Neither the applicant nor his representative was present to discuss the application. There was no one else to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

There was no Board discussion.

**FINDING OF FACT**

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

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

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

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/16/07.**

## APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS CERTIFIED RECORD

**107-06-CA:** 753 St. Francis Street  
**Applicant:** St. Francis Place LLC/Charles K. Breland  
**Received:** 09/25/06 (+45 Days: 11/09/06)  
**Meeting:** 10/16/06

### INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

**Historic District:** Lower Dauphin Street

**Classification:** Contributing

**Zoning:** R-3

**Conflicts of Interest:** Tilmon Brown is chair of the MHDC Properties Committee that will hear this application and, as such, will abstain from voting on the application.

**Project:** Build a suspended deck on the existing roof area on the third floor and add handrails.

### BUILDING HISTORY

This multiple-story masonry building with Baroque-style architectural elements was built in 1908 as the Convent of Mercy. The building served as such until 1973, when it was sold to the Empress Chandelier Company as a showroom. It stood vacant from 1978 until 2000, when it was renovated into condominiums. The former convent now operates as St. Francis Place.

### 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

1. Build Suspended Deck and Add Handrails
  - A. Currently, the area of the building where the proposed deck will be located is a roof. The deck alteration is part of the ongoing renovation of the convent.
  - B. The Design Review Guidelines state that “new additions...shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be...compatible with the massing, size, scale and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.”
  - C. Build a floating deck on top of the existing third-floor roof made of galvanized steel channels.
  - D. Build up existing parapets with 2’ of stucco on CMU anchored to coping and topped with a pre-cast copper cap.
  - E. Add powder-coated metal handrails around balcony with hardware to match existing metal rails throughout building.

### RECOMMENDATION

MHDC has an easement on the property. Staff feels that while the addition of handrails and 2’ of height on each parapet will alter the front façade significantly, the alteration will finish, rather than detract from, the building. Additionally, the impact of the proposed improvements on the façade will be dependant upon the angle at which they are viewed. They will “not destroy historic materials that characterize the property,” but are of a style and material that can be found throughout the property. Furthermore, the

deck portion of the proposed improvements will not be seen from the street. Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Charles Breland was present to discuss the application. He explained that all the units were designed with balconies. This balcony was not constructed early in the project since sales were slow. The visual impact on the street will be a build up of the corners and the railing sitting on a parapet wall. The deck will not be cantilevered into the building, rather a structural member will be bolted into the brick along the wall to support the deck. Thompson Engineering will oversee the construction of the deck to avoid any structural issues from arising. The property owners have met and approved the deck and covenants are in place that restrict the use of the balconies. He further explained that the capacity of the balcony will be posted and water run off will be handled by an existing drain.

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

Staff received comments by email from three owners in the complex opposing the project. These are attached to the record.

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

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

There was no additional Board discussion.

### **FINDING OF FACT**

Cameron Pfeiffer moved to modify facts D & E. as follows:

D. Build up existing parapets with 2' of stucco on CMU anchored to coping and topped with a pre-cast architectural cap.

E. Add powder-coated black metal handrails around balcony with hardware to match existing metal rails throughout building.

The motion was seconded by Jim Wagoner and approved.

Cameron Pfeiffer moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report as amended. The motion was seconded by Jim Wagoner 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 Joe Sackett and approved on a 4 to 2 vote with Bunky Ralph in opposition and Tilmon Brown abstaining.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/16/07.**

## **APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS CERTIFIED RECORD**

**108-06-CA:** 1150 Old Shell Road  
**Applicant:** Ryan J. Stuckas  
**Received:** 09/25/06 (+45 Days: 11/09/06)  
**Meeting:** 10/16/06

### **INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Demolish previous lean-to addition at rear of house and build a new 24' x 20' rear addition. It will have a gabled roof and asphalt shingles to match existing roof. Windows and exterior details will be matched to existing house. Some elements will be salvaged from demolition to incorporate into new addition. Paint exterior to match existing.

### **BUILDING HISTORY**

This is a one-story frame bungalow residence built in 1925.

### **STANDARD OF REVIEW**

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

### **STAFF REPORT**

1. Remove Rear Addition and Construct New Addition
  - A. Currently, this residence has a full-width shed roof addition with a deck on the back that was built some time after the original building.
  - B. The Design Review Guidelines state that "new additions...shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be...compatible with the massing, size, scale and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment."
  - C. Remove existing rear addition.
  - D. Construct a gabled frame 24' x 20' addition on block piers at the rear of the house that mimics the design of the existing house.
  - E. Match new roof shingles to existing asphalt 3tab weathered wood.
  - F. Match new siding to existing with either smooth Hardi lap siding if approved or 6" pine lap siding.
  - G. Use salvaged wood windows. Match door and window sizes, placement and materials to existing.
  - H. Place a single-light door on the right side of the rear elevation with wood steps leading to the ground.
  - I. Add a 4' shed wood awning with exposed rafters to addition.
  - J. Paint exterior to match existing.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

The proposed improvements are typical and common updates of historic properties. Staff feels that these improvements will not negatively impact the integrity of the building or the district and recommends approval of the application as submitted.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Neither the applicant nor his representative was present to discuss the application. There was no one else to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board questioned the use of hardiplank siding on a historic house and considered that the existing siding should be matched.

## **FINDING OF FACT**

Harris Oswald moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report with the following amendment to item F: Match new siding to existing. The motion was seconded by Tilmon Brown and unanimously approved.

## **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Harris Oswald 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 door being submitted to Staff and a railing design being provided by Staff. The motion was seconded by Cameron Pfeiffer and unanimously approved.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/16/07.**

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
CERTIFIED RECORD**

**109-06-CA:** 256 S. Cedar Street  
**Applicant:** Warren V. Carmichael  
**Received:** 10/02/06 (+45 Days: 11/16/06)  
**Meeting:** 10/16/06

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Church Street East  
**Classification:** Non-Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Enclose rear patio sunroom.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This is a two-story brick residence built in 1999.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

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

**STAFF REPORT**

1. Enclose Sunroom
  - A. This owner received previous approval for footings and slab on 06-27-05.
  - B. This is a non-contributing building in the historic district.
  - C. Brick in rear circular patio sunroom with brick and stone, leaving large openings for windows.
  - D. Enclose openings with Pella multi-light windows.

**RECOMMENDATION**

It is necessary to note that the sunroom has already been partially enclosed. Based on the information contained in the application, as well as the building being non-contributing to the historic district, the proposed work does not impair the historic integrity of the district. Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Mr. Carmichael was present to discuss the application. He explained that the sunroom was already under construction and he had received a stop work order. He will use multi lighted windows in the sunroom openings.

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

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

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

There was no additional Board discussion.

**FINDING OF FACT**

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

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

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

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/16/07.**



## **APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS CERTIFIED RECORD**

**110-06-CA:** 1200 Dauphin Street  
**Applicant:** Jarrod White  
**Received:** 10/03/06 (+45 Days: 11/17/06)  
**Meeting:** 10/16/06

### **INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Conflicts of Interest:** Cameron Pfeiffer and Devereaux Bemis stated that they serve on the Mobile Revolving Fund for Historic Properties with Jarrod.  
**Project:** Install four metal Series 281 garage doors on openings of garage apartment.

### **BUILDING HISTORY**

This two-story frame garage apartment sits at the rear of the 1200 Dauphin Street property. The residence at 1200 Dauphin Street was built in 1894; however, the garage apartment appears to have been built later.

### **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**

1. Install New Garage Doors
  - A. Currently, this garage apartment belongs to 1200 Dauphin Street. There are four large chamfered garage door bays on the first floor spaced at even intervals on either side of the center door. Items stored within these bays are visible from the street. Garage doors are the norm for buildings of any age, and having open bays creates visual clutter.
  - B. The Design Review Guidelines state that “wood or metal garage doors should be simple in design and compatible with the main building.”
  - C. Enclose garage bays with metal Series 281 doors. They will be 8’ wide on the west side and 7’ wide on the east side to fit in openings and will have a simple panel design. The chamfered bays will need to be squared to fit the doors.
  - D. Paint doors same color as building – Behr Canyon View.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

The garage apartment building, though large and visible from the street, sits at the rear of the property. Also, the design and materials are compatible with the Design Review Guidelines. Staff feels that these improvements will not negatively impact the integrity of the building or the district and recommends approval of the application as submitted.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Neither the applicant nor his representative was present to discuss the application. There was no one else to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board questioned Staff whether garage doors are addressed in the Guidelines. Staff responded that garage doors are not addressed.

The Board also questioned to final look of the garage façade and requested a drawing.

Tilmon Brown suggested that doors similar to the ones used on Wolfe and Wolfe at 12 Dauphin Street could be used and suggested that applicant look at them as a model.

### **FINDING OF FACT**

There was no finding of fact.

### **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Jim Wagoner moved that the application be tabled for lack of information and that a rendering of the garage façade be submitted. The motion was seconded by Robert Brown and approved.

## APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS CERTIFIED RECORD

**111-06-CA:** 301 Conti Street  
Applicant: Centre for the Living Arts/Mathes Brierre Architects  
Received: 10/03/06 (+45 Days: 11/17/06)  
Meeting: 10/16/06

### INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East

Classification: Non-Contributing

Zoning: B-4

Conflicts of Interest: Cameron Pfeiffer, Devereaux Bemis and Bunky Ralph stated that they were members of the Centre for the Living Arts

Project: New glass front entrance. Storefront windows and metal panels replacing existing concrete panels and windows on third floor. New rooftop terrace. Aluminum side-by-side single pane windows replacing existing awning windows on second floor. Clean and repair brick and cast stone façades as necessary. Replace old signs with new signs at entrances.

### BUILDING HISTORY

This two-story brick building with a partial brick third story and clerestory faces Cathedral Square. It was originally the rear warehouse facility for the Mobile Press Register located on Government Street. It is currently being used as an art gallery, Space 301.

### 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

1. New Glass Front Entrance on North Elevation
  - A. Currently, the building’s entrance is located on the west side of the north elevation. It is cast stone with a tall canvas awning above it. There are no windows on the first floor. The second floor windows are aluminum awning type in a regular fenestration pattern set in cast stone, which extends along the east elevation.
  - B. Remove canvas awning from existing entrance, clean and repair metal canopy as needed.
  - C. Replace metal sign at existing entrance with new corner cast stone tile to match existing cast stone façade.
  - D. Create new entrance just east of center of north elevation, removing part of wall to form a new 10’11” x 14’2½” x 13’10” glass entryway with glass doors.
  - E. Install decorative slate in new entryway extending to curb.
  - F. Add 2½ story (31’1”) glass inverted awning curtain wall above entrance, removing wall section to the interior.
  - G. Replace existing aluminum awning windows on second floor (north and east elevations) with side-by-side single light aluminum windows in existing openings.
2. Third Floor Alterations
  - A. Currently, the third floor façade consists of concrete panels with aluminum sash one-over-one windows in a regular fenestration pattern along the north and east elevations.

The north and west elevations of the third story are flush with the first two levels. The east elevation of the building is stepped.

- B. Replace existing concrete panels and aluminum sash windows with 7'1 $\frac{3}{4}$ " composite metal panels, 9'9 $\frac{1}{2}$ " glass curtain wall and glass fin glazing system.
  - C. Add new outdoor terrace on east side of building consisting of roof pavers above waterproofing/paver system on new concrete slab.
  - D. Add new stainless steel cable guard rail around terrace.
3. Signage
- A. Add lettering at new north elevation entrance made of individual stainless steel letters to be surface mounted on the existing walls. Bottom of sign will be 5'4" from ground level and 2' from entrance. Top of sign will be 8' from ground level. The total area is 10.56 square feet.
  - B. Add lettering at west elevation entrance made of individual stainless steel letters to be surface mounted on the existing walls. Bottom of sign will be 4'4 $\frac{7}{8}$ " from ground level and sit within the entryway. Top of sign will be 7'7 $\frac{7}{8}$ " from ground level. The total area is 13.45 square feet.
4. Other
- A. Clean and repair or replace brick and cast stone as needed.
  - B. Clean and repair or replace exterior light fixtures and downspouts as needed.
  - C. Drawings show new metal louver vents at north and east elevations. Not in application.
  - D. Drawings show new insulated service doors to replace existing overhead coiling doors at north and east elevations. Not in application.
  - E. Drawings show new terracotta tile wall system at entrance on west elevation. Not in application.
  - F. Drawings show sidewalk improvements and light pole relocations that will need to be addressed by Right-of-Way.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Based on the information contained in the application, as well as the building being non-contributing to the historic district, the proposed work does not impair the historic integrity of the district. Furthermore, the addition of the rooftop terrace and the new entrance on the north elevation will create visual interest which does not currently exist along this part of the street. Staff recommends approval for all items in parts 1-3 and 4A&B. Upon clarification of finishes, staff would recommend approval of items 4C&D. Staff recommends more information be provided for item 4E. Staff recommends approval of item 4F; however, Right-of-Way has final approval.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Neither the applicant nor his representative was present to discuss the application. There was no one else to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

While this is a non-contributing building in the district, this is an attempt to give the building a presence on the block

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

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/16/07.**

## APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS CERTIFIED RECORD

**112-06-CA:** 601 Government Street  
Applicant: MDI Media Group Inc./AAA Iron Works  
Received: 10/06/06 (+45 Days: 11/20/06)  
Meeting: 10/16/06

### INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East  
Classification: Non-Contributing  
Zoning: B-4  
Project: Install 252 linear feet of 4' tall aluminum fence with black powder coat finish around property.

### BUILDING HISTORY

This one-story brick on masonry commercial building with large multi-light bay windows was built in 1976. It has been home to a number of businesses, including an antique shop and a printing/copy center. It is owned by MDI Media Group Inc., but is currently vacant.

### 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

1. New Aluminum Fence to Enclose Property
  - A. Currently, the building has a parking lot facing Warren Street to the east.
  - B. The Design Review Guidelines state that fences “...should compliment the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic Districts.”
  - C. Retain the 4' aluminum fence that surrounds the property, leaving openings for traffic on the Warren Street side.
  - D. Generally, open metal fences are typical of commercial areas.
  - E. The powder coat finish will allow the fence to appear like iron, following the Guidelines statement that aluminum fences are appropriate, but should “appear to be iron.”
  - F. The fence is not out of character with the district and the masonry building.

### RECOMMENDATION

It is necessary to note that the fence has already been partially built. In its current form, the fence follows the typical open work metal type of design and materials appropriate for the downtown commercial areas. Based on the information contained in the application, as well as the building being non-contributing to the historic district, the proposed work does not impair the historic integrity of the district. Staff recommends approval of this application as submitted.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Don Davis of MDI Media Group was present to discuss the application. He explained that the fence contractor did not know that he required a fence permit and ARB approval. Board members questioned the applicant about the inclusion of gates in the application. He stated that the gates will not be installed at this point in time due to their expense but that gates are proposed along S. Warren and Government Streets as indicated on the plan. Following the suggestion of the Board, Mr. Davis amended the application to include the gates. The Board also questioned the applicant regarding proposed landscaping on the site. Mr. Davis stated that there is a green space toward the south side of the property and bushes on S. Warren Street. The issue of a sign for the business was discussed. The applicant will submit a sign application once a sign design has been chosen. There was no one else to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

There was no Board discussion.

### **FINDING OF FACT**

Cameron Pfeiffer moved to amend the facts in the staff report to include:  
G. There will be gates on S. Warren and Government Streets as shown on the submitted plan. The motion was seconded by Jim Wagoner and unanimously approved. Cameron Pfeiffer moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report as amended. The motion was seconded by Jim Wagoner 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 Joe Sackett and unanimously approved. Applicant to submit landscaping plan and signage.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/16/07.**