

**MOBILE HISTORIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION  
CITY OF MOBILE  
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD  
Minutes of the Meeting  
October 20, 2003**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Cindy Klotz called the Architectural Review Board Meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

Anne Crutcher, Assistant MHDC Director, called the roll as follows:

Present: Bunky Ralph, Cindy Klotz, Douglas Kearley, Dennis Carlisle, Karen Carr and Alternates David Barr and Jim Waggoner

Absent: Dan McCleave, Jackie McCracken Nick Holmes III, Bill Christian, Robert Brown

A quorum was declared after the roll was called.

Staff Present: Ed Hooker, Anne Crutcher, Wanda Cochran

| <u>In Attendance</u> | <u>Address</u>              | <u>Item Number</u> |
|----------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|
| Mary Gayle Connor    | 126 Houston Street          | 4                  |
| Bill Connor          | 1259 Lake Circle Drive West | 4                  |
| Wade Wright          | Wrico Signs                 | 3, 12              |
| Kim Wilson           | 1511 Church Street          |                    |
| Loyd Marston         | 61 Warwick Road             |                    |
| Issam El-Farkh       | 118 Macy Place              | 6                  |
| Steve Nicholas       | 166 Government Street       |                    |
| Susan Milling        | 308 North Jackson Street    | 3                  |
| Lana Kershner        | 10884 Luverne Highway       | 1                  |
| James Clark          | 114 North Lafayette         | 13                 |
| Dirk Trusty          | 244 Suzanne Circle          | 3                  |
| James Loris          | 1358 Dauphin Street         | 12                 |

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:** August 11, 2003 Meeting

Douglas Kearley moved to approve the minutes as mailed. David Barr seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

**APPROVAL OF THE MID-MONTH CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS:**

Douglas Kearley moved to approve the mid-month certificates as mailed. Bunky Ralph seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

**B. MID MONTH APPROVALS**

1. Applicant's Name: Mr. Jim's Cannon Brewery  
Property Address: 225 Dauphin Street  
Date of Approval: 8/21/03 weh  
Work Approved: Install 4'x31/2' resin sign to appear like wood; sign to be double faced and non-illuminated.
2. Applicant's Name: Charles Perrotta  
Property Address: 302 Congress Street  
Date of Approval: 8/21/03 weh  
Work Approved: Repair damaged wood on main building and garage apartment to match existing wood in profile and dimension. Paint to match existing color scheme. Re-roof with charcoal gray architectural shingles.

3. Applicant's Name: Bernhardt Roofing Company  
Property Address: 908 Augusta Street  
Date of Approval: 8/22/03 weh  
Work Approved: Re-roof house with black Timberline shingles.
4. Applicant's Name: Jeremy Dorris  
Property Address: 70 Bradford Avenue  
Date of Approval: 8/22/03 weh  
Work Approved: Replace existing deteriorated 3' wood picket fence and continue wood picket fence around remainder of yard as per submitted site plan.
5. Applicant's Name: Bernard Roofing  
Property Address: 59 LeMoyne  
Date of Approval: 8/25/03 weh  
Work Approved: Re-roof house in the following 3-tab shingles, Desert Tan in color to match existing.
6. Applicant's Name: Constance Giles  
Property Address: 158 South Dearborn Street  
Date of Approval: 8/25/03 weh  
Work Approved: Re-roof using Timberline roofing material, Charcoal in color.
7. Applicant's Name: William J. Hyde  
Property Address: 153 Macy Place  
Date of Approval: 8/26/03 weh  
Work Approved: Re-roof with 3-tab fiberglass shingles, weathered wood in color.
8. Applicant's Name: Scott Gonzalez  
Property Address: 4-8 St. Emanuel  
Date of Approval: 8/26/03 jdb  
Work Approved: Repair stucco. Cover openings with plywood to fit the openings and screw to the building. Paint plywood Rookwood Shutter Green. Paint the building in one of the following colors: Renwick Beige, Rookwood Jade, Downing Straw, Downing Stone, Downing Earth, Downing Sand, or Downing Slate.
9. Applicant's Name: Salvation Army  
Property Address: 1009 Dauphin Street  
Date of Approval: 8/26/03 jdb  
Work Approved: Install at grade handicap sidewalk cut. No rails to be installed. To be located on east side of building.
10. Applicant's Name: David Buchanan  
Property Address: 201 Church Street  
Date of Approval: 8/27/03 asc  
Work Approved: Touch up paint on fence, white in color.

11. Applicant's Name: Downtown Parking Diplomats  
Property Address: 300 Dauphin Street  
Date of Approval: 9/2/03 asc  
Work Approved: Install 12 square foot projecting sign under balcony, sign to be painted metal, either black background with white lettering or white background with black lettering. Sign to have painted border.
12. Applicant's Name: Salvation Army  
Property Address: 1009 Dauphin Street  
Date of Approval: 9/3/03 asc  
Work Approved: Repair 3 ft. high picket fence; length of fence to be repaired is 17 running feet.
13. Applicant's Name: Laurie and Baron Benjamin  
Property Address: 118 Providence Street  
Date of Approval: 9/3/03 asc  
Work Approved: Repair rotten wood to match existing in dimension and profile. Paint the exterior using the following Benjamin Moore colors: body-Woodlawn Colonial Gray; trim-Montpellier Madison White; porch deck-gray.
14. Applicant's Name: Virginia Andreades  
Property Address: 506 Monroe Street  
Date of Approval: 9/3/03 asc  
Work Approved: Repair to rotten wood as necessary with new wood to match existing in profile and dimension; replace rear French doors to match existing; paint new materials in the existing color scheme.
15. Applicant's Name: Matt McDonald  
Property Address: 1260 Selma Street  
Date of Approval: 9/2/03 weh  
Work Approved: Remove existing exterior staircase. Repair existing siding with materials matching existing in profile and dimension. Repair existing windows or replace with new windows matching existing in profile and dimension. Remove existing infill on first floor porch to restore porch to its original use. Remove existing exterior cast iron pipes.
16. Applicant's Name: Katherine Morrissette or Dennis Overton  
Property Address: 12 Common Street  
Date of Approval: 9/08/03 weh  
Work Approved: Repair existing eaves, soffit and fascia with materials matching existing in profile and dimension. Reside house using lap siding. Repaint in existing color scheme.
17. Applicant's Name: John Broadus  
Property Address: 960 Augusta Street

- Date of Approval: 9/08/03 asc  
Work Approved: Repaint house in the following Benjamin Moore color scheme:  
Body: Great Barrington Green HC-122  
Trim: Lancaster Whitewash HC-174  
Porch floor: Battleship Grey
18. Applicant's Name: Sam David Knight/Dennis Langan Construction  
Property Address: 101 Ryan Avenue  
Date of Approval: 9/09/03 asc  
Work Approved: Emergency repairs to residence. Repair all wood features to match existing to include porch decking, porch ceiling, front entrance door and windows. House to be repainted in existing color scheme.
19. Applicant's Name: M & A Stamp & Sign  
Property Address: 169 Dauphin Street  
Date of Approval: 9/10/03 weh  
Work Approved: Install 10" x 18" cast bronze sign on face of building as per submitted plans.
20. Applicant's Name: Lipford Construction Company  
Property Address: 203 S. Warren  
Date of Approval: 9/11/03 weh  
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood with new matching existing in profile and dimension as necessary on house and carport. Remove front gable vent, feather wood to match existing. Paint to match existing color scheme. Re-roof house with dimensional shingles, Charcoal in color, install ridge vent along main ridge of roof.
21. Applicant's Name: Dobson Sheet Metal Roofing  
Property Address: 200 S. Broad Street  
Date of Approval: 9/11/03 asc  
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary on fascia with new wood matching existing in profile and dimension. Patch roof as necessary using matching shingles. Paint house in existing color scheme.
22. Applicant's Name: Dobson Sheet Metal Roofing  
Property Address: 252 S. Georgia Street  
Date of Approval: 9/11/03 asc  
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary on fascia with new wood matching existing in profile and dimension. Patch roof as necessary using matching shingles. Paint house in existing color scheme.
23. Applicant's Name: Lee Ross, Inc.  
Property Address: 1110 Selma Street  
Date of Approval: 9/11/03 asc

- Work Approved: Repaint house in the following BLP color scheme:  
 Body: Chinchilla Fur 2948P  
 Trim: Off White RC8  
 Porch Ceiling: Light Blue 2408P  
 Porch Deck: Dark Gray RC6
24. Applicant's Name: Vernon Moore  
 Property Address: 210 Dexter Avenue  
 Date of Approval: 9/11/03 asc  
 Work Approved: Repaint house in the existing color Sherwin Williams color scheme:  
 Body: Heritage Renwick Rose Beige  
 Porch, steps, trim and latticework: Roycroft Copper Red  
 Porch columns, balustrades and step facing boards: white  
 Repair rotten wood as necessary with matching existing in profile and dimension. Install 4 (4"x24") soffit vents, painted white.
25. Applicant's Name: Jim Hood  
 Property Address: 1206 Selma Street  
 Date of Approval: 9/11/03 asc  
 Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary on front porch to match existing in profile and dimension.
26. Applicant's Name: Chris Conlon/Guido's in Oakleigh  
 Property Address: 351 George Street  
 Date of Approval: 9/11/03 weh  
 Work Approved: Paint restaurant the following colors:  
 Body: Precious Jasper, 10GY 40/296  
 Trim: Behr Navajo White, 1822u  
 Replace existing awnings with new awnings matching original in profile and dimension, color Artcraft Burgundy.  
  
 Install wall signage, as per submitted design. Two wall signs, one on either side of plate glass windows. Signage not to exceed 20 sf.
27. Applicant's Name: Mike and Roxanne Windom  
 Property Address: 208 LeVert Avenue  
 Date of Approval: 9/12/03 jss  
 Work Approved: (THIS COA REPLACES COA DATED APRIL 2, 2002)  
  
 Construct an addition measuring 18' -6"x13' -6" as per the submitted Scheme B. The plan uses a shed roof with a parapet wall on the front, and retains the existing gate as a design element, which is incorporated into the new bathroom. A fixed wood French door with opaque glazing is to be placed behind the existing gate. The Board noted that there may have to be a guttering system on the side to retain the water from the neighbor.
28. Applicant's Name: Bernhardt Roofing

- Property Address: 111 S. Catherine St.  
Date of Approval: 9/16/03 asc  
Work Approved: Re-roof using 3 tab shingles, Weathered Gray in color; re-roof flat portion of roof using hot tar to match existing.
29. Applicant's Name: Presley Roofing Co.  
Property Address: 18 N. Ann Street  
Date of Approval: 9/17/03 jdb  
Work Approved: Re-roof with architectural Timberline shingles, dark grey in color.
30. Applicant's Name: Presley Roofing Company  
Property Address: 256 State Street  
Date of Approval: 9/17/03 weh  
Work Approved: Resurface built up flat roof to match existing in profile and dimension.
31. Applicant's Name: Dorothy Rose  
Property Address: 16 Lemoyne  
Date of Approval: 9/17/03 asc  
Work Approved: Repair to rotten wood as necessary to match existing in profile and dimension. Paint white with white trim.
32. Applicant's Name: Mark Burks  
Property Address: 1559 Dauphin Street  
Date of Approval: 9/18/03 jdb  
Work Approved: Repaint house in the following Behr paint scheme:  
Body: Cedar Grove ECC-26-1  
Trim: Nature Trail ECC-26-2  
Porch Floor: Cactus Hill ECC-26-3  
Replace wood on porch floor using 5/4" tongue and groove.
33. Applicant's Name: Jarrod White  
Property Address: 1200 Dauphin Street  
Date of Approval: 9/19/03 jss  
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary to match existing in profile and dimension.  
Repaint house in the following Behr paint scheme:  
Body: Scenic Path, ECC-14-1  
Trim: Great Frontier, ECC-14-2  
Accents: Red Pines ECC-27-1 and Laurel Oak ECC-41-3
34. Applicant's Name: Llana Kershner  
Property Address: 264 Roper Street  
Date of Approval: 9/19/03 km per weh  
Work Approved: Demolish deteriorated lean-to carport w/utility. Replace rotten wood as necessary to match existing in profile and dimension and paint white.
35. Applicant's Name: Tom Townsend  
Property Address: 459 Dauphin Street

- Date of Approval: 9/22/03 weh  
 Work Approved: Emergency repairs to existing masonry historic structure. Reconstruct masonry walls at rear of property. Reconstruct roof structure on rear of property.
36. Applicant's Name: Helen Savage/Savage-Olsen Design Engineering/Centre for the Living Arts, Carlos Parkman.  
 Property Address: 250 Conti/304 Government Street  
 Date of Approval: 9/23/03 weh  
 Work Approved: Install Signage, measuring 66" x 33" as per submitted design.
37. Applicant's Name: Dick and Johnna Rogers  
 Property Address: 250 St. Anthony Street  
 Date of Approval: 9/23/03 weh  
 Work Approved: Repoint existing concrete block structure. Apply stucco finish, leave gray to weather. Install fixed wood blinds over existing window openings.
38. Applicant's Name: Shirley Orr  
 Property Address: 1163 Elmira Street  
 Date of Approval: 9/24/03 asc  
 Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary to match existing in profile and dimension – window casings; 1x4 tongue & groove porch decking and other rotten wood as necessary. Paint to match existing color scheme. Repair roof at the rear to match existing shingles in profile, dimension and color.
39. Applicant's Name: Contractors of Today  
 Property Address: 253 Charles Street  
 Date of Approval: 9/25/03 weh  
 Work Approved: Repaint residence to match existing color scheme.
40. Applicant's Name: Dorinda E. Franklin  
 Property Address: 1701 Dauphin Street  
 Date of Approval: 9/25/03 weh  
 Work Approved: Replace deteriorated wood with new brick-solid recessed brick.
41. Applicant's Name: William J. Meyer  
 Property Address: 301 South Ann Street  
 Date of Approval: 9/29/03 jdb  
 Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary to match existing in profile and dimension. Repaint house in the following BLP color scheme:  
 Body: St. Anthony Street Gray  
 Trim: DeTonti Square Off -White  
 Porch Floor: Colonial Red

Porch Ceiling: Robin's Egg Blue  
Doors: Colonial Red

42. Applicant's Name: Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund  
Property Address: 303 Rapier Street  
Date of Approval: 9/29/03 weh  
Work Approved: Remove deteriorated inappropriate rear porch infill.
43. Applicant's Name: Centre for the Living Arts  
Property Address: 304 Government Street  
Date of Approval: 9/29/03 weh  
Work Approved: Install awning over rear entrance as per submitted design. Replace rear door with new solid glass door with stainless steel kick plate and stainless steel band at top.
44. Applicant's Name: Sin Au  
Property Address: 1702 Government Street  
Date of Approval: 9/29/03 weh  
Work Approved: Repaint sides and rear of building with SW 2822, Downing Sand. Also paint sign band above glass storefronts to match.
45. Applicant's Name: Ron Ross & Paul Nix  
Property Address: 919 Church Street  
Date of Approval: 10/01/03 weh  
Work Approved: Prep, prime and repaint wood window sash, white in color. Power wash exterior aluminum siding and repaint white to match existing color scheme. Repaint porch in existing color scheme. Install new garage door in existing opening, as per submitted brochure.
46. Applicant's Name: Dennis Langan Construction Co.  
Property Address: 1254 Selma Street  
Date of Approval: 10/02/03 jdb  
Work Approved: Repair flat built up roof to match existing materials in profile and dimension.
47. Applicant's Name: Eddie McZeek  
Property Address: 908 Texas Street  
Date of Approval: 10/02/03 weh  
Work Approved: Emergency demolition of unsafe and heavily deteriorated structure.
48. Applicant's Name: Melissa Nissen & Leon Van Dyke  
Property Address: 63 North Monterey Street  
Date of Approval: 10/03/03 weh  
Work Approved: Remove deteriorated concrete driveway strips and install new concrete driveway as per submitted site plan.

49. Applicant's Name: Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund  
Property Address: 303 Rapier Street  
Date of Approval: 10/03/03 asc  
Work Approved: Repair roof as necessary to match existing shingles in profile, dimension and color.  
Repaint house in the existing color scheme. Remove concrete slab under demolished rear porch (COA dated 9-29-03).
50. Applicant's Name: Hunter and Lisa Compton  
Property Address: 21 South Lafayette Street  
Date of Approval: 10/03/03 weh  
Work Approved: Paint house in the following colors:  
Body – Coastal Plain SW 6192  
Trim – Shoji White SW6194  
Door – Burgundy SW7042  
Shutters – Andiron SW6174  
Porch Ceiling – Opaline SW6189
51. Applicant's Name: J.M. Clark  
Property Address: 114 North Lafayette Street  
Date of Approval: 10/03/03 weh  
Work Approved: Reroof residence with new metal roof as per submitted material information.
52. Applicant's Name: Anne Patton  
Property Address: 1053 Dauphin Street  
Date of Approval: 10/06/03 weh  
Work Approved: Repaint in the existing color scheme. (Light grey, white and brick red.)

**OLD BUSINESS:**

1. **091-02/03-CA** 8 St. Joseph Street  
Applicant: Mobile Revolving Fund  
Nature of Request: Install 6' steel fence across front of lot at sidewalk.  
Landscape interior of lot as per submitted landscape plan. Install 8' wood privacy fence at rear of lot as per submitted site plan.
- APPROVED** as submitted. Certified Record attached.
2. **064-02/03 – CA** 651 Dauphin Street  
Applicant: Tony Cooper/Nu Wave Studios  
Nature of Request: Paint exterior of brick veneer building as per submitted rendering; install new wood windows with glass block transoms on front elevation (in original window openings); remodel storefront/entrance; install new metal canopy with decorative brackets; install two rear single entry doors on

rear elevation; install mesh on east elevation with lights behind; also to cover up utility service entrances, all as per submitted plans.

**APPROVED** as submitted. Certified Record attached.

3. **006-02/03 – CA** Northeast corner of Kenneth and Dauphin Streets  
Applicant: Infirmary Health Systems  
Nature of Project: Request to alter previously-approved design to construct masonry monument sign, measuring 5' 2 1/2" by 9'-6", installed on a 1' berm, as per submitted plans.

**APPROVED** as submitted. Certified Record attached.

### **NEW BUSINESS:**

1. **001-03/04-CA** 264 Roper Street  
Applicant: Lana Kershner  
Nature of Request: Alter roof line and facades of existing one story brick residence as per submitted plans.

**APPROVED** as submitted. Certified Record attached.

2. **002-03/04-CA** 303 Rapier Street  
Applicant: Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund  
Nature of Request: Request to enclose rear porch & add deck as per submitted plans.

**APPROVED** as submitted. Certified Record attached

3. **003-03/04-CA** Lot 8, DeTonti Square Historic District  
Applicant: Susan Milling  
Nature of Request: Construct new 1 1/2 story residence as per submitted plans.

**APPROVED** as submitted. Certified Record attached.

4. **004-03/04-CA** 126 Houston Street  
Applicant: Mary Gayle Connor  
Nature of Request: Repair fire damage to structure as per submitted plans.

**APPROVED** as submitted. Certified Record attached.







- A. The 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 District.
  - 1. The vacant lot is adjacent to a concrete masonry parking garage on the north property line and a two story brick commercial structure on the south property line.
  - 2. The proposed front property line fence is 6' steel.
  - 3. The proposed rear property line fence is 8' solid wood privacy fencing.
  
- B. The Guidelines state that "The height of solid fences in historic districts is generally restricted to six feet, however, if a commercial property or multi-family housing adjoins the subject property, an eight foot fence may be considered."
  - 1. The height of the proposed fence is 6' at the sidewalk and 8' at the rear of the lot.
  - 2. All adjacent property is zoned B-4, General Business.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

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

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

Cindy Klotz clarified that the wood privacy fence would be double-sided.

**FINDINGS OF FACT and DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Bunky Ralph moved to accept the Findings of Fact and issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. Douglas Kearley seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/20/04

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD**

064-02/03 – CA      651 Dauphin Street  
**Applicant:**      Tony Cooper  
**Received:**      10/6/03      **Meeting Date (s):**  
**Submission Date + 45 Days:** 11/20/03      1) 7/14/03      2) 10/20/03      3)

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District  
**Classification:** Non-Contributing, New Construction  
**Zoning:** B-4, General Business  
**Additional Permits Required:** (1) Building  
**Nature of Project:** Rehabilitate the exterior of the existing building. Paint building dark sage green as per submitted rendering. Install new wood windows with glass block transoms on front elevation (in original window openings); remodel storefront/entrance; install new metal canopy with decorative metal brackets; install two rear single entry doors on rear elevation; install mesh on east elevation with security lights behind; all as per submitted plans.

**History of the Project:** The ARB approved plans in July 2003 to rehabilitate the existing structure. A copy of the Certified Record is attached for your review. This application is a continuation of the work.

**APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT**  
*Lower Dauphin Street Commercial District Guidelines*

| <b><u>Sections</u></b> | <b><u>Topic</u></b>    | <b><u>Description of Work</u></b> |
|------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Building Condition 1   | Original Design Intact | Rehabilitate existing exterior    |

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, 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 *Lower Dauphin Street Commercial District Guidelines, Building Condition 1* states that “Some portion of the façade may require maintenance and repair...”
  - 1. The proposed changes are to allow the building to be adaptively reused.
  - 2. Proposed new single entry and exit doors at the rear will improve ingress and egress to the facility.
  - 3. Painting of the non-descript brown brick is a reversible treatment.
  
- B. The *Lower Dauphin Street Commercial District Guidelines, Section C-1, Overall Character*, states that “the appearance of the building should reflect its period of significance.”
  - 1. The subject building is a non-contributing modern structure.
  - 2. The proposed changes will not give the building a false sense of history.
  - 3. The installation of the mesh screens will break up the massing of the monolithic brick walls.

- C. The *Lower Dauphin Street Commercial District Guidelines, Section C-1, Overall Character*, states that changes should “Reflect the character established within the block.”
1. Café 615 directly across the street is constructed of stucco-covered masonry with similar entry doors and geometric elements similar to the proposed glass block.
  2. Adjacent historic and non-historic buildings have canopies cantilevered over the sidewalk.

Staff recommends that the Review Board approve the application as submitted.

#### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

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

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Douglas Kearley clarified that this is an existing, non-contributing structure.

#### **FINDINGS OF FACT and DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Douglas Kearley moved to accept the Findings of Fact, and to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. Bunky Ralph seconded the application, which passed unanimously.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/20/04

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD**

006-02/03 – CA Northeast corner of Kenneth and Dauphin Streets

**Applicant:** Infirmary Health Systems

**Received:** 10/06/03

**Meeting Date (s):**

**Submission Date + 45 Days:** 11/20/03 1) 11/13/02 2) 10/20/03 3)

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way Historic District

**Zoning:** R-1, with variance

**Additional Permits Required:** (2) Building, Electrical

**Nature of Project:** Construct masonry monument sign, measuring 5' 2 1/2" by 9'-6", installed on a 1' berm, as per submitted plans.

**Conflicts of Interest:** Jim Wagoner recused himself from review of this application.

**Variations and Previous Approvals:** Variance granted by Board of Zoning Adjustment 10/10/2001  
Certificate of Appropriateness issued by Old Dauphin Way Review Board November, 2002

**Additional Information:** The Mobile Infirmary is re-submitting plans for the design of the sign with minor alterations. The applicant is requesting to substitute brick caps for the approved pre-cast concrete caps as shown in the elevations. All other aspects of the project remain unchanged.

A copy of the Certified Record from the November 2002 meeting is attached for your review.

**APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT**

*Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts*  
*Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts*

| <u>Sections</u> | <u>Topic</u>            | <u>Description of Work</u>      |
|-----------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|
| D               | Materials               | Construct masonry monument sign |
| 3               | Fences, Walls and Gates | Construct boundary wall         |

**STAFF COMMENTS**

- A. The proposed sign materials are brick and cast concrete.
  - 1. Applicant believes the Old Mobile brick relates to the brick pier foundations of the adjacent wood frame structures.
- B. The proposed boundary fence materials are brick and iron pipe.
  - 1. The average height of the wall is 1'-10 1/2" high.
  - 2. The column height is 3' 1 1/2" high.
  - 3. The wall is set back from the sidewalk 2' to allow for a low landscaped planting area.
  - 4. The materials include brick veneer with a brick cap, and a 4" diameter pipe rail, painted black.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

**Support:** Mr. Dirk Trusty, applicant, and Wade Wright of Wrico Signs, appeared before the Review Board to answer questions. There was no one else present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board noted that there were no further changes, other than those requested. The applicants concurred.

## **FINDINGS OF FACT and DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Douglas Kearley moved to accept the Findings of Fact and issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. David Barr seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/20/04

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

001-03/04 – CA 264 Roper Street
Applicant: Lana Kershner
Received: 10/06/03 Meeting Date (s):
Submission Date + 45 Days: 11/20/03 1) 10/20/03 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden Historic District
Classification: Non-Contributing (modern residence)
Zoning: R1-Single Family Residential
Additional Permits Required: (1) Building

Nature of Project: Remove existing front-gable roof structure and construct new side-gable roof structure, utilizing pre-fabricated trusses. Re-roof with metal roofing as per submitted plans. Paint red brick. Construct garage in location of former lean-to carport as per submitted plans. Install new wood windows with true divided lights as per submitted elevations. Install new wood picket fencing as per submitted site plan.

Current Conditions: The non-contributing and non-historic red brick residence is located in the 250 block of Roper Street. The current roof is low-pitched, covered with deteriorated 3-tab asphalt shingles. Existing windows are silver aluminum. Existing porch columns are vertical aluminum supports.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts

Table with 3 columns: Sections, Topic, Description of Work. Rows include Exterior Materials and Finishes, Windows, Roofs, and Fences, Walls and Gates.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, 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...”

Exterior Materials and Finishes

- A. The Guidelines state that “ The exterior material of a building helps define its style, quality and historic period...”
1. The subject residence is a non-historic and non-contributing structure within the district.
2. The subject residence has no architectural style or importance in design.
B. The Guidelines state that “ Painting of unpainted brick is inappropriate in most cases.”
1. The subject residence is faced in a generic red brick veneer.
2. The red brick veneer has no historic or character-defining significance.

## **Windows**

- A. The Guidelines state that “The type, size and dividing lights of windows and their location and configuration (rhythm) on the building help establish the historic character of a building.
1. The existing aluminum windows have no historic or architectural significance.
  2. The proposed new wood windows with true divided lights are more compatible with adjacent historic structures.

## **Roofs**

- A. The Guidelines state that “A roof is one of the most dominant features of a building.”
1. The current low-pitched, front-gabled roof has no architectural or character-defining significance.
  2. The proposed new end-gabled roof will be a strong character-defining feature.

## **Fences, Walls and Gates**

- A. The Guidelines state that fences “...should compliment the building and not detract from it.”
1. The proposed fence is a 4’ wood gothic picket.
  2. The fence is to begin at the front line of the residence and run south to tie into an existing wood privacy fence.

Staff recommends approval as submitted.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Support: Mrs. Lana Kershner, applicant, appeared before the Review Board to answer questions. There was no one else present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application.

Mrs. Kershner noted that the eaves, soffit and fascia would be wood.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

There was no discussion by the Board.

## **FINDINGS OF FACT**

Bunky Ralph moved that based on the facts presented in the application and at the public hearing, the Board finds staff comment A to be acceptable as finding of fact. The motion was seconded by Douglas Kearley, and passed unanimously.

## **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Douglas Kearley moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. Dennis Carlisle seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/20/04



**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

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

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

There was no discussion with regard to this application.

**FINDINGS OF FACT and DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Dennis Carlisle moved to accept the staff comments as Findings of Fact and to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. Bunky Ralph seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/20/04

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD**

003-03/04 – CA Lot 8, DeTonti Square Historic District  
**Applicant:** Susan Milling  
**Received:** 10/06/03 **Meeting Date (s):**  
**Submission Date + 45 Days:** 11/20/03 1) 10/20/03 2) 3)

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** DeTonti Square Historic District  
**Classification:** Non-Contributing (new construction)  
**Zoning:** RB, Residential Business  
**Additional Permits Required:** (5) Building, Electrical, Mechanical, HVAC, Plumbing  
**Nature of Project:** Construction of a 1 ½ story, wood frame residence with stucco exterior as per submitted plans.

The building is sited on the east side of Jackson Street. The lot measures 49’ wide by 150’ deep. The building measures approximately 48’-10” deep x 34’ wide with a 2 car carport/storage area measuring 26’-8” x 20’ connected by a 10’ long breezeway. The front porch of the building located at a distance of 10’ from the sidewalk. The north side of the house is set back 10’ from the lot line. The south side of the house is set back 5’ from the lot line. The main façade will face Jackson Street. The proposed building is a 1 ½ story frame with continuous brick foundation and stucco exterior. The ground plan is rectangular in design. The proposed building has a 3’ finished floor above grade. The distance from grade to the second floor is 15’ in height, meaning a 12’ high first floor height, and an overall ground-to ridge height of 31’-6”. The front porch measures 8’ deep; the rear screened porch measures 12’-6” deep. The proposed roof is an end gable. Proposed roof has a pitch of 7.5/12; roofing material is 26 gauge galvalume, silver in color.

Windows are vinyl-clad wood casements. Porch columns are 12” square chamfered posts. Front door is a pair of wood French doors, ¾ glass with recessed panels below. Wood shutters are vertical tongue & groove with horizontal wood straps.

A 10’ driveway is to be located on the north property line.

A 6’ wood privacy fence is to be located at the rear of the property running between the northeast corner of the house to the northwest corner of the garage.

The following are proposed building materials:

- a. foundation – continuous brick veneer over concrete block
- b. façade – true stucco
- c. doors – wood and glass
- d. windows – vinyl clad wood casement
- e. porch details – wood columns,
- f. roof –26 gauge galvalume, silver in color

**APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT**  
*Guidelines for New Commercial and Residential Construction in Mobile’s Historic Districts*

| <b><u>Sections</u></b> | <b><u>Topic</u></b>                   | <b><u>Description of Work</u></b> |
|------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 3                      | Design Standards for New Construction | Construct new residence           |
| 3,I                    | Placement and Orientation             |                                   |
| 3,II                   | Massing and Scale                     |                                   |
| 3,III                  | Façade Elements                       |                                   |
| 3,IV                   | Materials and Ornamentation           |                                   |

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “ In the case of a proposed new building, that such building will not, in itself, or by reason of its location on the site, materially impair the architectural or historical value of the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity and that such building will not be injurious to the general visual character of the Historic District in which it is to be located.”

**STAFF REPORT**

**3,I**

- I. **Placement and Orientation:** The guidelines state that new construction should be placed on the lot so that setback and spacing approximate those of nearby historic buildings.
- A. Setbacks in DeTonti Square range from buildings constructed at the sidewalk to buildings with a 5’-15’ setback.
  - B. This is a lot in the middle of the block in the heart of the neighborhood.
  - C. The proposed front setback for this building is 10’ from the sidewalk/property line.

**3,II**

II. **Massing and Scale:**

- A. The guidelines state that new construction should reference the massing of forms of nearby historic buildings.
  - 1. 3 bay facades are common in the DeTonti Square Historic District.
  - 2. 1, 1 ½ and 2 story wood frame structures and masonry structures with stucco exteriors are common in the DeTonti Square Historic District.
  - 3. The proposed building is a 1 ½ wood frame structure with a true stucco exterior.
- B. The guidelines state that new buildings should have foundations similar in height to those of nearby historic buildings.
  - 1. Historic buildings in DeTonti Square are constructed on piers, or are elevated above grade by a continuous foundation wall at a height of 2’-3’, and some even taller given the topography of the lot.
  - 2. Property covenants require new construction to be 2’-6” above grade.
  - 3. The proposed foundation is designed using solid brick veneer over concrete block, at a height 3’ above grade.
- C. The guidelines state that new construction should consider roof shapes, pitches and complexity
  - similar to or compatible with those of adjacent historic buildings.
  - 1. A variety of roof shapes exist in the DeTonti Square Historic District, but the most common are simple end gables and hips.
  - 2. Side gabled roofs are common in the DeTonti Square Historic District.
  - 3. The proposed roof is an end gable.

**3, III**

III. **Façade Elements:**

The guidelines state that new construction should reflect the use of façade elements of nearby historic buildings.

- A. The use of casement windows is a design element found in the Historic Districts.
- B. The use of double French doors with  $\frac{3}{4}$  glass and recessed panels below is a design element found throughout the Historic Districts.
- C. The use of wood chamfered columns is found throughout the districts.

### 3, IV

#### IV. **Materials and Ornamentation:**

- A. The guidelines provide a list of appropriate materials for compatible new construction.
  - 1. There are number of wood frame structures remaining in the DeTonti Square Historic District.
- B. The guidelines state that the degree of ornamentation used in new construction should be compatible with the degree of ornamentation found upon nearby historic buildings. Profiles and dimensions should be consistent with examples in the district.
  - 1. Examples of historic ornamentation include wood chamfered posts, batten-type shutters, and casement windows.
  - 2. The use of casement windows and stucco exterior is reminiscent of early French Creole residences once found in Mobile.
  - 3. The Board encourages use of modern materials and design methods in new construction.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

#### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Support: Ms. Susan Milling, applicant, appeared before the Review Board to answer questions. There was no one else present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

There was no discussion regarding this application.

#### **FINDINGS OF FACT and DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Douglas Kearley moved to accept the staff comments as Findings of Fact and to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. Dennis Carlisle seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/20/04

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD**

004-03/04 – CA            126 Houston Street  
**Applicant:**                Mary Gayle Connor  
**Received:**                 10/06/03                            **Meeting Date (s):**  
**Submission Date + 45 Days:** 11/20/03                            1) 10/20/03    2)                            3)

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:**        Old Dauphin Way Historic District  
**Classification:**         Contributing  
**Zoning:**                    R-1, Single Family Residential  
**Additional Permits Required:** (5) Building, Electrical, Mechanical, HVAC, Plumbing  
**Nature of Project:**      Extensive repair to residence from fire damage. Reconstruction of rear wing as per submitted plans.

The building is sited on the northwest corner of Houston and Clearmont Streets. The owners plan to reconstruct the rear wing, incorporating the same interior spaces and functions under one single roof line. New windows, siding, exposed outriggers, soffit, fascia and cornice to match original. The reconstruction of the rear will not exceed the existing building footprint.

**Current Conditions:** The rear and attic of the residence suffered extensive fire damage. The rear was a series of additions, along with a wrap-around deck. A well-constructed 6’ high wooden privacy fence conceals the rear of the property from the street.

**APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT**  
*Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts*

| <b><u>Sections</u></b> | <b><u>Topic</u></b>             | <b><u>Description of Work</u></b>                            |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| 3                      | Exterior Materials and Finishes | Repair/Replace wood siding                                   |
| 3                      | Windows                         | Repair/Replace wood windows                                  |
| 3                      | Roofs                           | Repair/Replace roof structure and with new to match original |

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, 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…”

**Exterior Materials and Finishes**

- A. The Guidelines state that “ The exterior material of a building helps define its style, quality and historic period…”
  - 1. The subject residence is a contributing structure within the district.
  - 2. The subject residence is an excellent and important example of the Neo-Classical Bungalow.
- B. The Guidelines state that “Replacement of exterior finishes, when required, must match the original in profile, dimension and material.”
  - 1. The façade of the subject residence is painted wood lap siding.
  - 2. The replacement material will match the original in profile, dimension and material.

## **Windows**

- C. The Guidelines state that “The type, size and dividing lights of windows and their location and configuration (rhythm) on the building help establish the historic character of a building.
1. The existing wood windows are multi-pane casement and multi-pane top over single pane bottom double sash.
  2. The existing windows will be repaired as necessary.
  3. The new windows will match the existing in profile, materials and dimension.

## **Roofs**

- D. The Guidelines state that “A roof is one of the most dominant features of a building.”
1. The existing end gable roof with deep overhang supported by decorative outriggers is an important and character-defining feature of the subject structure.
  2. The new roof will match the original in pitch, dimension and materials..

Staff recommends approval as submitted.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Support: Ms. Mary Gayle Connor and her son Billy, applicants, appeared before the Review Board to answer questions. There was no one else present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

There was no board discussion with regard to this application.

## **FINDINGS OF FACT and DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

David Barr moved to accept the staff comments as Findings of Fact and to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. Bunky Ralph seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/20/04



### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Support: There was no one present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Mr. Nicholas noted that the north or rear elevation also needed painting as it too was not exposed.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Staff explained to the Board that the drawings for stabilization were received under separate cover, prior to the receipt of the letter from the owner requesting to remove the canopy. Staff further explained that the Board was reviewing this application due to the fact that a hazard warning and ticket had been issued to the owner as part of the Minimum Maintenance Ordinance. Staff noted that the canopy was a character-defining feature and no plans for its replacement were submitted. A letter from the owner stating his desire to replace the canopy with a two story balcony is entered into the record.

Under the current Demolition Requirements, the Board may grant permission to demolish only if an acceptable plan for replacement and a time table is provided.

### **FINDINGS OF FACT**

Bunky Ralph moved to accept the Findings of Fact. David Barr seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

### **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Bunky Ralph moved to deny the request to remove the canopy based on lack of information about the replacement structure. David Barr seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Bunky Ralph moved to approve the request to repair the canopy as submitted. David Barr seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/20/04



- B. Exterior Materials: The Guidelines state that “ Replacement...must match the original in profile and dimension and material.”
  - 1. The existing exterior sheathing is wood lap siding.
  - 2. The proposed exterior sheathing for the addition is wood lap siding.
  
- C. The Guidelines state that “ Original doors and door openings should be retained along with any mouldings, sidelights and transoms.”
  - 1. Proposed plans call for the installation of a pair of new wood 15 light French doors, on the west elevation.
  
- D. The Guidelines state that “The size and placement of new windows for additions or alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.”
  - 1. Windows in the historic residence are predominantly wood 9 -over-1 double hung.
  - 2. Windows in the addition are proposed to match the existing in profile, light configuration, and dimension.
  - 3. Triangular-shaped fixed wood windows are proposed as clerstory-type windows in the new cross gable.
  
- E. The Guidelines state that “...historic roof forms, as well as the original pitch of the roof, should be maintained.”
  - 1. The predominant roof form is end gable.
  - 2. The roof for the proposed addition is a cross gable connecting to the main gable.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

#### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Support: Mr.Issam El-Farkh, applicant, appeared before the Review Board to answer questions. There was no one present in opposition to the application.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Staff advised the Board that a Stop Work Order had been placed on the project by Urban Development because the inspector found that the work being done exceeded the approval issued by the ARB.

#### **FINDINGS OF FACT and DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Dennis Carlisle moved to accept the staff report as Findings of Fact, and to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. Douglas Kearley seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 11/13/02



Staff recommends approval with conditions:

That the fence be constructed at 3' in height to comply with the Zoning Ordinance.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Support: There was no one present to speak in favor of the application.

Mrs. Kim Wilson of 1511 Church Street,, appeared before the Review Board in opposition to the application.

Mrs. Wilson was concerned about the height of the fence obstructing her windows along the west property line.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board noted that a 3' high wood picket fence was in keeping with the Design Review Guidelines. In consultation with UDD staff Frank Palombo, a determination was made that unless the picket was considerably smaller than the spacing, then anything over 3' constituted a line-of-site hazard.

### **FINDINGS OF FACT**

Bunky Ralph moved to accept the staff comments as Findings of Fact. Jim Waggoner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

### **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Bunky Ralph moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct a 3' high wood picket fence, constructed of 3 ¼ wood slats spaced 2" apart. Fence to remain unpainted to weather. Jim Wagoner seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/20/04



Due to the size and use of this structure, this application is being reviewed under the Design Review Guidelines for New Residential and Commercial Construction.

The following are proposed building materials:

- a. foundation – slab on grade
- b. façade – true stucco over concrete block on first floor  
true stucco over frame on second floor
- c. doors – garage doors – metal raised panel  
entry doors – wood six panel
- d. windows – wood casement,
- e. roof – fiberglass to match existing on residence

**APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT**  
*Guidelines for New Commercial and Residential Construction in Mobile’s Historic Districts*

| <u>Sections</u> | <u>Topic</u>   | <u>Description of Work</u>     |     |
|-----------------|--|--------------------------------|-----|
| 3               | Design Standards for New Construction<br>Placement and Orientation | Construct new garage apartment | 3,I |
| 3,II            | Massing and Scale  |                                |     |
| 3,III           | Façade Elements  |                                |     |
| 3,IV            | Materials and Ornamentation  |                                |     |
| 3, IV, A        | Appropriate Materials for New Residential Construction             |                                |     |

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “ In the case of a proposed new building, that such building will not, in itself, or by reason of its location on the site, materially impair the architectural or historical value of the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity and that such building will not be injurious to the general visual character of the Historic District in which it is to be located.”

**STAFF REPORT**

**3,I**

- I. Placement and Orientation:** The guidelines state that new construction should be placed on the lot so that setback and spacing approximate those of nearby historic buildings.
- A. Setbacks in DeTonti Square range from buildings constructed at the sidewalk to buildings with a 5’-15’ setback.
  - B. This is a lot in the middle of the block in the heart of the neighborhood.
  - C. The proposed setbacks for this building are as follows:
    - Rear lot line – 5’
    - East lot line – 5’.
    - West lot line – 5’
    - Distance from main residence to garage – 15’

**3,II**

**I. Massing and Scale:**

- A. The guidelines state that new construction should reference the massing of forms of nearby historic buildings.

1. 3 bay facades are common in the DeTonti Square Historic District.
  2. 1, 1 ½ and 2 story wood frame structures and masonry structures with stucco exteriors are common in the DeTonti Square Historic District.
  3. The proposed building is a 2 story structure constructed with a combination of concrete block with true stucco veneer on the first floor and wood frame with true stucco veneer on the second floor.
- B. The guidelines state that new buildings should have foundations similar in height to those of nearby historic buildings.
1. The proposed foundation is slab on grade to accommodate its use as a garage on the first floor.
- C. The guidelines state that new construction should consider roof shapes, pitches and complexity similar to or compatible with those of adjacent historic buildings.
1. A variety of roof shapes exist in the DeTonti Square Historic District, but the most common are simple end gables and hips.
  2. Side gabled roofs are common in the DeTonti Square Historic District.
  3. The proposed roof is an end gable.

### **3, III**

#### **III. Façade Elements:**

The guidelines state that new construction should reflect the use of façade elements of nearby historic buildings.

- A. The use casement windows is a design element found in the Historic Districts.
- B. The use of arched wood doors is not uncommon in the districts.
- C. The use of paneled metal doors on garages is allowable.

### **3, IV**

#### **IV. Materials and Ornamentation:**

- A. The guidelines provide a list of appropriate materials for compatible new construction.
  1. There are number of wood frame structures remaining in the DeTonti Square Historic District.
- B. The guidelines state that the degree of ornamentation used in new construction should be compatible with the degree of ornamentation found upon nearby historic buildings. Profiles and dimensions should be consistent with examples in the district.
  1. Examples of historic ornamentation include arched garage bays and casement windows..
  2. The use of casement windows and stucco exterior is reminiscent of early French Creole residences once found in Mobile.
  3. The Board encourages use of modern materials and design methods in new construction.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

#### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

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

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board noted that several details were missing from the application, including soffit, fascia and eave details, and end gable design and materials

### **FINDINGS OF FACT and DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Bunky Ralph moved to deny the application as submitted due to lack of information. Karen Carr seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD**

009-03/04 – CA            166 Government Street  
**Applicant:**                Steve Olen  
**Received:**                10/06/03                    **Meeting Date (s):**  
**Submission Date + 45 Days:** 11/20/03                    1) 10/20/03    2)                    3)

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:**        Church Street East Historic District  
**Classification:**         Contributing  
**Zoning:**                    B-4, General Business  
**Additional Permits Required:** (1) Building  
**Nature of Project:**     Paint west side of historic brick structure to match painted brick front.

**Current Conditions:**    Historically, the west wall of this structure has been concealed from public view by the YMCA building. Since this building was demolished, the entire west elevation is now visible. Sections of the brick wall have been patched over time with different types and colors of bricks.

**APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT**  
*Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts*

| <b><u>Sections</u></b> | <b><u>Topic</u></b>             | <b><u>Description of Work</u></b> |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 3                      | Exterior Materials and Finishes | Paint unpainted brick             |

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, 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**

- F. Exterior Materials: The Guidelines state that “ Painting of unpainted brick is inappropriate in most cases.”
  1. The elevation in question has been obscured from public view for over 100 years.
  2. Due to the demolition of the historic YMCA building, the elevation in question is highly visible.
  3. Painting the brick wall to match the front would conceal the areas of patching and repair to the elevation.
  4. Due to the unusual circumstances and the unexpected exposure of this elevation, painting of unpainted brick could be considered appropriate.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

**Support:** Mr. Steve Nicholas, applicant, appeared before the Review Board to answer questions. There was no one else present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Mr. Nicholas noted that the north or rear elevation also needed painting as it too was not exposed.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

There was no board discussion regarding this matter.

## **FINDINGS OF FACT and DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Bunky Ralph moved to accept the Findings of Fact, with the amended request to paint the north/rear elevation in addition to the west elevation, and to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. Douglas Kearley seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/20/04



## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

There was no board discussion regarding this matter.

## **FINDINGS OF FACT and DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Douglas Kearley moved to accept the Findings of Fact, and to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. David Barr seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/20/04



## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussed the contents of the letter with regard to ingress and egress of an adjoining driveway, and the issue of the adjoining property's roof draining onto the drive. The Board noted that these issues were not relevant in terms of the Board's mission.

## **FINDINGS OF FACT and DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Dennis Carlisle moved to accept the Findings of Fact, and to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. Bunky Ralph seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/20/04

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD**

012-03/04 – CA            1358 Dauphin Street  
**Applicant:**            Wrico Signs, contractor/James E. Loris, Jr., owner  
**Received:**            10/06/03                            **Meeting Date (s):**  
**Submission Date + 45 Days:** 11/20/03                            1) 10/20/03    2)                            3)

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:**        Old Dauphin Way Historic District  
**Classification:**        Non-Contributing  
**Zoning:**                R-1, Single Family Residential but grandfathered in as a commercial parcel  
**Additional Permits Required:** (1) Sign  
**Nature of Project:**     Install double-sided pole sign, measuring 5’ wide by 3’-4” tall, mounted between 4”x4” posts, at a point a 2’ above the ground, as per submitted design. Sign to be double faces, 2” thick redwood, sandblasted and painted to match green and white colors on building.

**APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT**  
*Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts*

| <b><u>Sections</u></b> | <b><u>Topic</u></b>  | <b><u>Description of Work</u></b> |
|------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|
| A                      | Mounting & Placement | Install Pole Sign                 |
| B                      | Design               |                                   |
| C                      | Size                 |                                   |
| D                      | Materials            |                                   |

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, 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 COMMENTS**

- A. The Guidelines state that “the height of freestanding signs generally shall not be higher than 8 feet.”
  - 1. The proposed sign is 5’-4” in height
- B. The Guidelines state that “For buildings without a recognizable style, the sign shall adopt the decorative features of the building, utilizing the same materials and colors.”
  - 1. The subject building is a non-descript modern red brick structure.
  - 2. The sign colors are taken from the trim and accent colors of the building.
- C. The Guidelines state that “The total allowable square footage for the display area of...pole signs is 40 square feet.”
  - 1. The proposed signage measures 40 square feet.
- D. The Guidelines state that “The structural materials of the sign should match the historic materials of the building. Wood, metal , stucco, stone or brick is allowed.”
  - 1. The proposed sign material is painted redwood.

Staff Recommends approval of the application as submitted.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

**Support:** Mr. James Loris, applicant, and Wade Wright, sign contractor, appeared before the Review Board to answer questions. There was no one else present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board asked if the sign was to be lighted. The applicant stated that that decision had not been determined. The Board noted that if the sign was to be light, the applicant should confer with ARB staff prior to installing lighting.

### **FINDINGS OF FACT and DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Bunky Ralph moved to accept the Findings of Fact, and to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. Jim Wagoner seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/20/04

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD**

013-03/04 – CA            114 North Lafayette Street  
**Applicant:**                J.M. Clark  
**Received:**                10/06/03                                **Meeting Date (s):**  
**Submission Date + 45 Days:** 11/20/03                                1) 10/20/03    2)                                3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

**Historic District:**        Old Dauphin Way Historic District  
**Classification:**        Non-Contributing (modern construction)  
**Zoning:**                    R-1, Single Family Residential  
**Additional Permits Required:** (1) Fence

**Nature of Project:**     Install cedar fencing and vinyl fencing as per submitted site plan.

This project is divided into six phases addressing specific fencing materials and heights at each phase. Please refer to illustrations for clarification of location and direction.

Phase I – Construct 8’ high solid cedar privacy fence along north property line. At a point 40’ from the northwest corner of the lot construct an 8’ high cedar fence. – beginning at the north wall of the residence, running north to the property line, then turning east and running a distance of 92 feet, to a point where the lot takes a 90 degree turn north.

Phase II – Along the west property line, at a point approximately 132’ from North Lafayette Street, construct an 8’ high solid cedar privacy fence running a distance of approximately 72’, behind two pieces of commercial property facing North Lafayette Street.

Phase III – Along north property line, construct an 8’ high solid cedar privacy fence running approximately 60’.

Phase IV – At a point approximately 191’ from the northeast corner of North Lafayette and Campbell Streets, install a 6’ high solid vinyl fence beginning at a point 25’ from the sidewalk and running approximately 154’ to intersect with the 8’ high solid cedar privacy fence, there the 8’ high solid cedar privacy fence takes a 90 degree turn.

Phase V – At a point 45’ from the northeast corner of North Lafayette and Campbell Streets, install a 4’ high reverse arch vinyl picket fence. Fence to begin at a corner of the house, run approximately 14.7’ south to the sidewalk, then turn east and run approximately 146’ to the southeast property line, then turn north and run 25’ and tie into 6’ high solid vinyl privacy fence.

Phase IV – Install 3’ high vinyl picket fence around perimeter of front yard. Beginning at a point on the north property line 40’ from the sidewalk, then running west to the sidewalk, along North Lafayette Street, then turn south and run approximately 75’ to the northeast corner of North Lafayette and Campbell Streets, then turn east and run 45’ to tie into 4’ high reverse arch vinyl fencing.

The applicant has stated his desire to used vinyl/pvc fencing is due to the water ponding at the location on the lot where the fencing is to be placed. The applicant is concerned about maintenance and upkeep of a wood fence in standing water. In addition, the applicant has provided examples of locations within the Old Dauphin Way Historic District where vinyl/pvc materials have been used for porch details and fencing. It should be noted that in no case was the material or design approved by the Review Board.

**APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT**  
*Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts*

| <b><u>Sections</u></b> | <b><u>Topic</u></b>     | <b><u>Description of Work</u></b>  |
|------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 3                      | Fences, Walls and Gates | Construct 3' and 6' wooden fencing |

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, 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 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 District.
1. The residence is a non-contributing, one story brick veneer ranch-style house.
  2. The proposed fencing types are:
    - a. 8' high cedar solid privacy fence
    - b. 6' high solid vinyl privacy fence
    - c. 4' high reverse arch vinyl picket fence
    - d. 3' high straight top vinyl picket fence.
- B. The Guidelines state that “ The height of solid fences in historic districts is generally restricted to 6'. However, if a commercial property or multi-family housing adjoins the subject property, an 8' high fence may be considered.”
1. The subject property is adjoined by properties with commercial uses/zoning on the north and northwest property lines, where 8' high fencing is requested.
  2. 3' high picket fencing is allowed by zoning code for placement along the sidewalk. 4' high picket fencing is approved at the discretion of the Urban Development staff.
- C. The Guidelines provide a list of appropriate and inappropriate materials for fencing.
1. Wood is an appropriate material for fencing in historic districts
  2. Vinyl, or pvc, is an inappropriate material for fencing in historic districts.

Staff recommends approval of the application with the following conditions:

Should the applicant wish to install a 6' fence to separate the lot, but is concerned with water ponding and rotting of the fence bottom, then a snake board or some other sacrificial design element on a wooden fence should be considered.

A wood picket fence would be an appropriate material according to the guidelines.

Fencing around the property should be consistent. 3' high picket fences are most appropriate in terms of height and scale for sidewalk/perimeter fencing.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Support: Mr. J.M. Clark, applicant, appeared before the Review Board to answer questions. There was no one else present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application.

Mr. Clark explained his six phase plan to fence the subject property. He stated that where he was requesting the 6' high vinyl/pvc fencing, there was a problem with water standing after rains. Mr. Clark's concern was that a wood fence would rot after a short period of time.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board noted that according to the Design Review Guidelines, vinyl/pvc fencing was not appropriate for use in the historic districts.

### **FINDINGS OF FACT and DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Douglas Kearley moved to accept the Findings of Fact, as they related to phases 1-3, and to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for phases 1-4. Bunky Ralph seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Dennis Carlisle moved to deny the request to install vinyl fencing as outlined in phases 4-6. Bunky Ralph seconded the motion. A vote was called. Dennis Carlisle, Bunky Ralph, Karen Carr, David Barr, Jim Wagoner and Cindy Klotz voted to deny the application. Douglas Kearley voted against denying the application.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/20/04

## APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – CERTIFIED RECORD

014-03/04 – CA            258 Marine Street (Gothic House Number 1)  
**Applicant:**            Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund/Douglas Kearley, Architect  
**Received:**            7/30/03                            **Meeting Date (s):**  
**Submission Date + 45 Days:** 9/14/03                            1) 10/20/03    2)                            3)

### INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

**Historic District:**            Oakleigh Garden Historic District  
**Classification:**            Non-Contributing (vacant lot/new construction)  
**Additional Permits Required:** (5) Building, Mechanical, Electrical, Plumbing, HVAC  
**Conflicts of Interest:**    Board Member Douglas Kearley left the meeting prior to the discussion of this agenda item.  
**Nature of Project:**            Construct a 1300 square foot, wood frame, single story residence on raised concrete slab. Site variance will be required.

The building site is located on the west side of the 250 block of Marine Street between Charleston and Augusta Streets. The lot measures 49.43' at the front and 52.22' at the rear; lot depth is 102.88'. The building measures approximately 30' wide by 48' long, with a 6' deep by 14' wide front porch. The front porch is located at a distance of 9' from the sidewalk. The front wall of the main house is located at a distance of 15' from the sidewalk. The main façade faces Marine Street. The proposed construction is of a 1 story wood frame, vertical board & batten, Gothic-Revival style residence. The ground plan is rectangular in design with a small rear ell. Porches include a projecting front porch and a shed-roofed rear porch. The proposed building has a 4' finished floor height above grade, and a first floor finished floor height of 9' – 4 ½". Overall ground to ridge height is 32'. The proposed roof is an end gable with a steeply-pitched cross gable on center of the front porch, a shed roof over the front porch, a cross gable at the rear ell and a shed roof over the rear porch. The proposed pitch of the main roof is 10/12. The proposed pitch of the gable over the front porch is 24/12. The proposed pitch of the shed roofs at the front and rear is 4/12. Proposed roofing material is GAF "Slateline" asphalt/fiberglass shingles, color Slate Gray.

**Additional Information:** The new construction proposed for 258 Marine Street is a modern interpretation of the Gothic Revival style promoted by mid-19th century architect A. J. Downing. There are several examples of this style of architecture remaining in Mobile's Historic Districts, including the Macy House (1867-68) located at 1569 Dauphin Street, and the Kimball House (ca. 1869-70) located at 1161 Old Shell Road.

In order to proceed with construction scheduling, after consultation with Board Attorney Wanda Cochran and Review Board Chair Cindy Klotz, staff issued a Certificate of Appropriateness to allow construction of the foundation and footings. The applicants submitted signed affidavits to both the Board of Zoning Adjustment and the Architectural Review Board agreeing to comply with the

Boards' findings even if altering the previously-constructed foundations and footings was required.

Typically the Board requires new construction to be in line with adjacent historic structures in order to maintain the existing streetscape. Due to Urban Development setback regulations, the required front setback for new construction is mandatory 25'. The applicants' request for a variance from this requirement will be heard at the November 4, 2003 meeting. UDD staff has recommended approval of the request.

**Additional Approvals:** The Board of Zoning Adjustment will consider the request of the owners to construct the new residence in line with existing historic structures on the street at the November 4, 2004 meeting.

The following are proposed building materials:

- a. foundation –  
front porch - brick pier with framed cutwork infill  
main residence – scored stucco-covered concrete block
- b. façade –hardiplank board & batten vertical siding
- c. doors – wood & glass
- d. windows – wood casement, wood fixed
- e. porch details –  
front porch: Built-up wood columns with diamond-shaped decorative elements,  
traditional handrail with ½ wood square pickets  
rear porch: Chamfered wood columns, horizontal wood railing
- f. roof – architectural grade shingles

**APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT**  
*Guidelines for New Commercial and Residential Construction in Mobile's Historic Districts*

| <b><u>Sections</u></b> | <b><u>Topic</u></b>                                    | <b><u>Description of Work</u></b> |
|------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|
| 3                      | Design Standards for New Construction                  | Construct new residence           |
| 3,I                    | Placement and Orientation                              |                                   |
| 3,II                   | Massing and Scale                                      |                                   |
| 3,III                  | Façade Elements  |                                   |
| 3,IV                   | Materials and Ornamentation                            |                                   |
| 3, IV, A               | Appropriate Materials for New Residential Construction |                                   |

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “ In the case of a proposed new building, that such building will not, in itself, or by reason of its location on the site, materially impair the architectural or historical value of the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity and that such building will not be injurious to the general visual character of the Historic District in which it is to be located.”

## STAFF REPORT

### 3,I

- I Placement and Orientation:** The guidelines state that new construction should be placed on the lot so that setback and spacing approximate those of nearby historic buildings.
- A. Setbacks in the Oakleigh Garden District range from buildings constructed at the sidewalk to buildings with a 5'-15' setback.
  - B. The proposed building site is located in the middle of the block, one block west of the eastern boundary of the neighborhood.
  - C. The proposed front setback for this building is 9' from the sidewalk/property line; the proposed side setback for this building is 10' on the south, and 9.43' on the north.

### 3,II

**II. Massing and Scale:**

- A. The guidelines state that new construction should reference the massing of forms of nearby historic buildings.
  1. 3 bay facades are common in the Oakleigh Garden Historic District.
  2. 1, 1 ½ and 2 story wood frame structures are common in the Oakleigh Garden Historic District.
  3. The proposed building is a 1 story wood frame structure.
- B. The guidelines state that new buildings should have foundations similar in height to those of nearby historic buildings.
  1. Historic buildings in the Oakleigh Garden Historic District are constructed on piers, or are elevated above grade by a continuous foundation wall at a height of 2'-5'.
  2. The proposed foundation is designed using brick piers with framed wood lattice infill for the front porch, and scored stucco-covered concrete block for the main residence, at a height 4' above grade.
- C. The guidelines state that new construction should consider roof shapes, pitches and complexity similar to or compatible with those of adjacent historic buildings.
  1. A variety of roof shapes exist in the Oakleigh Garden Historic District, but the most common are simple end gables and hips.
  2. Side gabled roofs are common in the Oakleigh Garden Historic District.

### 3, III

**III. Façade Elements:**

- A. The guidelines state that new construction should reflect the use of façade elements of nearby historic buildings.
  1. The use of wood casement windows is a common design element found throughout the Historic Districts.
  2. The use of a single wood four-panel door with solid wood bottom panels and glass top panels, and triple light transom above, is a common design element found throughout the Historic Districts.
  3. The use of a steeply-pitched front gable, decorative wood drip moulds above the windows, built-up decorative columns, and casement windows defines a Gothic-Revival style structure.

### 3, IV

#### IV. **Materials and Ornamentation:**

- A. The guidelines provide a list of appropriate materials for compatible new construction.
  - 1. There are number of wood frame structures remaining in the Oakleigh Garden Historic District.
- B. The guidelines state that the degree of ornamentation used in new construction should be compatible with the degree of ornamentation found upon nearby historic buildings. Profiles and dimensions should be consistent with examples in the district.
  - 1. Examples of historic ornamentation include use of a steeply-pitched front gable, decorative wood drip moulds above the windows, built-up decorative columns, and casement windows.
  - 2. The proposed design utilizes a simple transom over the single entry door and triple-hung windows. The classically-detailed dormers on the roof break up the massing of the end gabled roof.
  - 3. The use of vertical board & batten hardiplank siding is a modern interpretation of a traditional building material.
  - 4. The Board encourages use of modern materials and design methods in new construction.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

#### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

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

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

There was no board discussion regarding this matter.

#### **FINDINGS OF FACT and DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

David Barr moved to accept the Findings of Fact, and to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. Dennis Carlisle seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/20/04



Typically the Board requires new construction to be in line with adjacent historic structures in order to maintain the existing streetscape. Due to Urban Development setback regulations, the required front setback for new construction is mandatory 25'. The applicants' request for a variance from this requirement will be heard at the November 4, 2003 meeting. UDD staff has recommended approval of the request.

**Additional Approvals:**

The Board of Zoning Adjustment will consider the request of the owners to construct the new residence in line with existing historic structures on the street at the November 4, 2004 meeting.

The following are proposed building materials:

- a. foundation – split-faced concrete block covered with elastomeric coating, with beveled concrete block water table
- b. façade –hardiplank board & batten vertical siding
- c. doors – wood & glass
- d. windows – wood double hung, wood fixed
- e. porch details –
  - front porch: chamfered 8x8 posts, open work brackets cut from 2x12s, traditional handrail with ½ wood square pickets,
  - rear porch: chamfered wood columns, traditional handrail with ½ wood square pickets
- f. roof – architectural grade shingles

**APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT**  
*Guidelines for New Commercial and Residential Construction in Mobile's Historic Districts*

| <b><u>Sections</u></b> | <b><u>Topic</u></b>                                    | <b><u>Description of Work</u></b> |
|------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|
| 3                      | Design Standards for New Construction                  | Construct new residence           |
| 3,I                    | Placement and Orientation                              |                                   |
| 3,II                   | Massing and Scale                                      |                                   |
| 3,III                  | Façade Elements  |                                   |
| 3,IV                   | Materials and Ornamentation                            |                                   |
| 3, IV, A               | Appropriate Materials for New Residential Construction |                                   |

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “ In the case of a proposed new building, that such building will not, in itself, or by reason of its location on the site, materially impair the architectural or historical value of the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity and that such building will not be injurious to the general visual character of the Historic District in which it is to be located.”

**STAFF REPORT**

**3,I**

- I. **Placement and Orientation:** The guidelines state that new construction should be placed on the lot so that setback and spacing approximate those of nearby historic buildings.
  - A. Setbacks in the Oakleigh Garden District range from buildings constructed at the sidewalk to buildings with a 5'-15' setback.

- B. The proposed building site is located in the middle of the block, one block west of the eastern boundary of the neighborhood.
- C. The proposed front setback for this building is 17' from the sidewalk/property line; the proposed side setback for this building is 10' on the south, and 19.4' on the north.

### **3,II**

## **II. Massing and Scale:**

- A. The guidelines state that new construction should reference the massing of forms of nearby historic buildings.
  - 1. 1, 1 ½ and 2 story wood frame structures are common in the Oakleigh Garden Historic District.
  - 2. The proposed building is a 1 ½ story wood frame structure.
- B. The guidelines state that new buildings should have foundations similar in height to those of nearby historic buildings.
  - 1. Historic buildings in the Oakleigh Garden Historic District are constructed on piers, or are elevated above grade by a continuous foundation wall at a height of 2'-5'.
  - 2. The proposed foundation is designed using brick piers with framed wood lattice infill for the front porch, and scored stucco-covered concrete block for the main residence, at a height 4' above grade.
- C. The guidelines state that new construction should consider roof shapes, pitches and complexity similar to or compatible with those of adjacent historic buildings.
  - 1. A variety of roof shapes exist in the Oakleigh Garden Historic District, but the most common are simple end gables and hips.
  - 2. Side gabled roofs are common in the Oakleigh Garden Historic District.

### **3, III**

## **III. Façade Elements:**

- A. The guidelines state that new construction should reflect the use of façade elements of nearby historic buildings.
  - 1. The use of wood double-hung windows is a common design element found throughout the Historic Districts.
  - 2. The use of a single wood four-panel door with solid wood bottom panels and glass top panels, and triple light transom above, is a common design element found throughout the Historic Districts.
  - 3. The use of a steeply-pitched gable, decorative wood drip moulds above the windows, built-up decorative columns, and casement windows defines a Gothic-Revival style structure.

### **3, IV**

## **IV. Materials and Ornamentation:**

- A. The guidelines provide a list of appropriate materials for compatible new construction.
  - 1. There are number of wood frame structures remaining in the Oakleigh Garden Historic District.

- B. The guidelines state that the degree of ornamentation used in new construction should be compatible with the degree of ornamentation found on nearby historic buildings. Profiles and dimensions should be consistent with examples in the district.
1. Examples of historic ornamentation include use of a steeply-pitched front gable, decorative wood drip moulds above the windows, built-up decorative columns, and casement windows.
  2. The proposed design utilizes a simple transom over the single entry door and triple-hung windows. The classically-detailed dormers on the roof break up the massing of the end gabled roof.
  3. The use of vertical board & batten hardiplank siding is a modern interpretation of a traditional building material.
  4. The Board encourages use of modern materials and design methods in new construction.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

#### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

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

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

There was no board discussion regarding this matter.

#### **FINDINGS OF FACT and DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

David Barr moved to accept the Findings of Fact, and to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. Dennis Carlisle seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/20/04