

CITY OF MOBILE
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Minutes of the Meeting
October 29, 2007

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Bunky Ralph called the meeting to order at 3:01 p.m.

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

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

<u>In Attendance</u>	<u>Mailing Address/Email Address</u>
Marwa Allen	marwa@ipcaphoto.com
Lamar Elliott	LamarElliott@aol.com
Sailor Cashion	sailor@comcast.net
Ben Cummings	Cummings Architecture
Heather Raley	Cummings Architecture
Robert Lamon	Robert@onesourcebrokerage.com
Barry Cody	Tyco Painting and Construction

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: Casey Ginn
Property Address: 9 North Cedar Street
Date of Approval: October 5, 2007
Remove the termite-damaged wood and treat the house. The applicant will return with formal restoration plans before restoration work begins.
2. Applicant's Name: Myong Sun Yu (Roberson)
Property Address: 1113 Old Shell Road
Date of Approval: October 9, 2007
Reroof with materials to match existing in profile, dimension, color and material. Repair/replace as necessary rotten wood throughout the exterior with materials to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Paint residence in the following BLP color scheme:
 - Body – Ashland Place Green or Ft. Gaines Blue
 - Trim – White
3. Applicant's Name: Curtis Strange
Property Address: 256 Stocking Street
Date of Approval: October 10, 2007
Paint in the existing color scheme.
4. Applicant's Name: Forest Raley and Penny Pickering
Property Address: 1556 Blair Avenue
Date of Approval: October 11, 2007
Paint residence in the following Sherwin-Williams color scheme:
 - Body – Downing Straw, SW2813
 - Body – Brick left unpainted
 - Porch Rail Cap – Rookwood Red, SW2802
 - Porch Rail – White
 - Porch Deck – Rookwood Shutter Green, SW2809
5. Applicant's Name: Stephanie Governor
Property Address: 14 South Reed Avenue
Date of Approval: October 11, 2007
Repair/replace as necessary rotten wood throughout the exterior with new wood to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Repair balustrade to match original spacing. Paint residence in the existing Sherwin-Williams color scheme:

- Body – Fired Brick, SW6335
 - Trim – Ivory Lace, SW7013
 - Accent – Dark Grey
 - Shutters – Black
 - Door – Strip and refinish original wood door and varnish or paint black.
6. Applicant's Name: Cameron Pfeiffer
 Property Address: 204 Michigan Avenue
 Date of Approval: October 12, 2007
 Paint front door to match trim. Install a new Schlage Georgian-style lock on the door.
7. Applicant's Name: Palm Gardens LLC
 Property Address: 1111 Church Street
 Date of Approval: October 12, 2007
 Repair rotten wood as necessary with new wood to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Paint in the following color scheme:
- Body – Brick left unpainted
 - Trim – Sherwin-Williams Westhighland White, SW7566
 - Ironwork and Awnings – BLP Bellingrath Green
8. Applicant's Name: Melvin Koger
 Property Address: 268 South Lawrence Street
 Date of Approval: October 12, 2007
 Repair damaged fence with cinder block to match existing in profile, dimension and materials.
9. Applicant's Name: Nancy Marchlewski
 Property Address: 256 Marine Street
 Date of Approval: October 15, 2007
 Construct a rear carport per MHDC Plan 3. Install a 3' wood picket fence with pointed top around the front yard.
10. Applicant's Name: Vernon Moore
 Property Address: 210 Dexter Avenue
 Date of Approval: October 16, 2007
 This COA replaces the COA dated 09/11/03. Repair rotten wood as necessary with new wood to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Install four white soffit vents. Paint in the existing Sherwin-Williams colors:
- Body – Heritage Renwick Rose Beige
 - Porch Deck, Step Trim and Lattice – Roycroft Copper Red
 - Porch Columns, Balustrade and Step Risers – White
11. Applicant's Name: Manchester Park Apartments/Chateau Oaks
 Property Address: 1575/1621 Springhill Avenue
 Date of Approval: October 18, 2007
 Reroof buildings with black 3-tab shingles. Repair rotten wood, gutters, downspouts and brick to match existing in profile, dimension and materials. Paint building in the existing color scheme. Repair existing brick and iron fence sections with materials to match existing in profile, dimension and material.
12. Applicant's Name: Ralph Vanfosson
 Property Address: 855 Church Street
 Date of Approval: October 19, 2007
 Repaint house to match the existing color scheme.
13. Applicant's Name: Lee and James Fernandez
 Property Address: 64 North Reed Avenue
 Date of Approval: October 19, 2007
 Repair rotten wood as necessary with new materials to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Repaint with the previously approved colors.
14. Applicant's Name: Society of 1868
 Property Address: 254 St. Anthony Street
 Date of Approval: October 19, 2007
 Install new built-up modified bitumen roof behind the parapet.

15. Applicant's Name: James Christiansen
 Property Address: 1707 Government Street
 Date of Approval: October 22, 2007
 Move the existing sign approximately 2'-0" closer to the sidewalk and lower the existing pole by 2'-0".

16. Applicant's Name: William E. Hooker III
 Property Address: 500 Church Street
 Date of Approval: October 22, 2007
 Replace front porch flooring with materials to match existing in profile and dimension, using cypress and painted to match the existing color scheme.

17. Applicant's Name: John Baker
 Property Address: 956 Charleston Street
 Date of Approval: October 22, 2007
 Replace rotten wood as necessary on siding, stairs, soffit and posts with materials to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Repaint in the following color scheme:
 - Body – Theatre Street Gold
 - Trim – Oakleigh White, WTPT25-61

NOTICES OF VIOLATION AND MUNICIPAL OFFENCE TICKETS

1. Notice of Violation: Josh Murray
 Property Address: 1012 Caroline Avenue
 Date of Violation: September 7, 2007
 The residence has been improperly maintained/mothballed and a satellite dish was installed without approval.

2. Notice of Violation: Geoffrey and Avery Fick
 Property Address: 1319 Old Shell Road
 Date of Violation: September 27, 2007
 The driveway was not installed as approved.

3. Notice of Violation: Louis and Donna Vallas
 Property Address: 1254 Elmira Street
 Date of Violation: September 27, 2007
 The fence and rear addition are being constructed without approval.

4. Notice of Violation: Sarah French
 Property Address: 112 North Catherine Street
 Date of Violation: October 9, 2007
 The vinyl siding was installed without approval.

5. Notice of Violation: Sarah Irvine
 Property Address: 913 Augusta Street
 Date of Violation: October 17, 2007
 An inappropriate handrail was installed without approval.

6. Notice of Violation: Myong Sun Yu
 Property Address: 1113 Old Shell Road
 Date of Violation: October 18, 2007
 The color of the residence does not appear to be what was approved.

7. Municipal Offence: Loper Collie, Jr
 Property Address: 1414 Church Street
 Date of Ticket: October 18, 2007
 A satellite dish was installed without approval.

OLD BUSINESS

1. 179-07-CA: 26 South Lafayette Street
 Applicant: Mary Schalin
 Request: Add a rear shed-roof dormer.
TABLED. Certified Record attached.

NEW BUSINESS

2. 189-07-CA: 20-26 South Royal Street
Applicant: Ben Cummings
Request: Rehabilitate building and add a balcony.
APPROVED. Certified Record attached.
3. 190-07-CA: 1054 Selma Street
Applicant: Barry Cody of Tyco Construction
Request: Construct a rear addition.
APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. Certified Record attached.
4. 191-07-CA: 311 North Joachim Street
Applicant: Marwa Allen
Request: Rehabilitate residence and add a dormer.
APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. Certified Record attached.
5. 192-07-CA: 1262 Selma Street
Applicant: Robert Lamon
Request: Replace the wood garage door with a metal garage door.
APPROVED. Certified Record attached.
6. 193-07-CA: 255 Church Street
Applicant: Ray Carney/SOS
Request: Extend the fence and add a gate.
APPROVED. Certified Record attached.
7. 194-07-CA: 64 North Reed Avenue
Applicant: James Fernandez
Request: Replace the front door and extend the rear deck.
APPROVED. Certified Record attached.
8. 195-07-CA: 9 South Lafayette Street
Applicant: Sailor Cashion
Request: Reconfigure the driveway.
APPROVED WITH CONDITINS. Certified Record attached.
9. 196-07-CA: 62 North Reed Avenue
Applicant: David McConnell
Request: Demolish the non-historic rear carport.
APPROVED. Certified Record attached.
10. 197-07-CA: 1313 Chamberlain Avenue
Applicant: Mark Browning
Request: Pour new driveway, install new spindles on the porch handrail and construct a rear shed.
APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. Certified Record attached.

OTHER BUSINESS and ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Staff informed the Board that a change had been made in the rear stair at 709 Dauphin Street. The existing stair and railing will be used rather than the stair included with the application to the Board.
2. Nick Holmes informed Staff that the parking plan submitted with the Spear Barter House at 163 St. Emanuel Street would not be done. Parking is not required in the area.
3. There are a number of appeals before Council: 203 South Warren Street, the storage shed at the Holiday Inn at 301 Government and the new County Probate Court House.

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

APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

179-07-CA: 26 South Lafayette Street
Applicant: Mary Schalin
Received: 10/01/07 (+45 Days: 11/14/07)
Meeting: 10/15/07
Resubmitted: 10/17/07
Meeting: 10/29/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Add a rear shed roof dormer.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this two-story frame Creole Cottage was built circa 1867. The rear of the residence has been considerably altered.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. The owners are renovating the top floor of the residence to create more living space. This application was tabled for more information on 10/15/07.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “[a]ccessory roof elements not original to the structure...shall be located inconspicuously.”
- C. The proposed work will add an 11’-0”w x 6’-0”h x 4’-0”d shed roof dormer with two 1’-0” x 2’-0” fixed-pane windows on the rear elevation (northwest corner) of the residence. All new materials will match existing materials to include the wood lap siding, wood trim, wood corner boards and shingle roof.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the changes will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district. The dormer is a small addition to an attic bathroom that will be minimally seen. All the new materials will match existing materials; the existing roof and the interior have dictated its size, shape, roof pitch and window configuration. Staff recommends approving the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

This application was tabled for additional information at the last meeting; however, the Board continues to have questions concerning the size of the dormer, the manner in which it integrates into the roof system and the

configuration of windows or lights in the dormer. The Board has asked for more comprehensive drawings and has also asked that the applicant attend in order to answer Board questions.

FINDING OF FACT

There was no finding of fact.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Craig Roberts moved to table the application until better drawings could be provided and that the applicant could attend a meeting to answer Board questions. The motion was seconded by Andrew Martin and unanimously approved.

APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

189-07-CA: 20-26 South Royal Street
Applicant: Ben Cummings
Received: 10/02/07 (+45 Days: 11/15/07)
Meeting: 10/29/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

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

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this two-story masonry building was constructed circa 1946. It was most recently the Social Security Building.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. The building is currently vacant, but is being rehabilitated into downtown offices for Hargrove and Associates, Inc.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “[t]he porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture...attention should be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions and decorative details.” The Guidelines also state, “[replacement doors] should respect the age and style of the building” and “[t]he size and placement of new windows...should be compatible with the general character of the building.” Rehabilitations must respect the age and style of the building.
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
 - 1. Replace the existing storefront doors and windows with new ones.
 - a. Four second-floor window openings will be enlarged to install either paired or single Kawneer Series 2000T Terrace doors with aluminum frames, stainless steel hardware, brass fittings and transoms.
 - b. Two sets of first-floor doors will be replaced with paired Kawneer Series 2000T Terrace doors with aluminum frames, stainless steel hardware, brass fittings and transoms.
 - c. One set of first-floor doors will be enclosed with materials to match the existing storefront.
 - 2. Clean the existing granite and limestone on the second floor.
 - 3. Refurbish the existing pink granite and glazing on the first floor, installing new impact glazing within the openings.
 - 4. Add a concrete and steel balcony with painted steel railing and powder-coated steel columns.
 - 5. Install one 29 SF unlit bronze wall sign.
 - 6. Replace the cove lighting with lighting to match existing.

RECOMMENDATION

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

They are common and typical updates on commercial buildings. Staff also feels that as the first floor storefronts have been significantly altered throughout the years, the proposed alterations are acceptable commercial interpretations.

However, staff feels that there are some things the Board should consider before making a decision:

- There are original and/or historic floor tiles at the entrances that should be maintained.
- The detailing of the posts should be specified.
- The owners will need to verify if there are any Right-of-Way issues before installing the balcony.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Architect Ben Cummings was present to discuss the application. He explained that the building will be “cleaned up” and that a balcony will be constructed. He mentioned a 3 dimensional drawing that had not been received by the Board. In this drawing he stated that details of the balcony could be seen. The pipe columns of the balcony have large 12” shafts with no bases or capitals. The balcony will be steel framed with a painted steel railing. The balcony will be attached to the building in such a way that the granite on the exterior will be preserved. The underside of the balcony will be the painted structure of steel. The steel will be painted in a taupe color. There is currently a crank out awning that will be removed. Put in its place will be cove lighting that will illuminate the underside of the balcony.

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

Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to enter into the record. Staff noted a non-illuminated 29 square foot bronze wall sign that will be approved on a mid-month basis.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board questioned Mr. Cummings regarding the depth of the balcony and about the location of columns in the sidewalk. There was discussion about the variety of balcony depths along Dauphin Street and the fact that some balconies bisect the sidewalk. Right of Way will insist that the columns be kept 18 inches off the curb.

FINDING OF FACT

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/29/08.

APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

190-07-CA: 1054 Selma Street
Applicant: Barry Cody for Tyco Construction
Received: 10/22/07 (+45 Days: 12/05/07)
Meeting: 10/29/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Construct a one-story 8'-0" x 20'-0" rear addition.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this one-story frame residence was constructed circa 1940.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. The ARB approved a new rear addition for this residence in January 2003 and a Certificate of Appropriateness was issued. The project, however, was never completed. Staff received a complaint that the owners had recently begun the previously approved work on the rear addition without renewing the COA and a stop work order was issued on 10/16/07. There are some changes to the former application that will be outlined in the staff report.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines call for new materials, finishes and elements to reflect the age and style of the building.
- C. The proposed plan is to construct a new rear addition at the location of a former rear addition:
 - 1. The size has been modified from 16'-0" x 20'-0" to 8'-0" x 20'-0".
 - 2. The pitch of the shed roof has been lowered.
 - 3. The siding has been changed from mineral fiber to match existing to wood 105 boards.
 - 4. The door has been moved from the rear to the side.
 - 5. The windows are being reused from the existing residence.
 - 6. The foundation has been altered from continuous brick to concrete block piers.
 - 7. The roof will be clad in shingles to match the existing roof.
 - 8. The new addition will be painted to match the existing color scheme.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff feels that concrete blocks, as a foundation, are inappropriate for this residence. The blocks should either be sheathed in brick or replaced with the continuous brick foundation as originally proposed. Although the new addition is clad in wood 105 siding that does not match existing, it is a historic material that can be found in residences of a similar age. The applicant has also found it difficult to find asbestos siding.

Staff feels that the remaining changes are relatively minor and should not impair the historic integrity of the district. The size of the addition has been reduced and the pitch of the roof lowered as a result. The windows are being reused from the existing residence and the door has been moved from the rear to the side. The owners will need to submit the design of the door before installation.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Contractor Barry Cody was present to discuss the application. He explained that a friend of the owners began construction on an addition to their house. The addition had previously been approved by the Board but with siding to match the existing asbestos siding on the house and brick piers. As constructed, the exterior sheathing is 105 drop siding and the piers are concrete block. The contractor explained that he intends to call for a City inspection in order that structural code deficiencies can be corrected. Windows located on an addition that has now been removed will be reused on the new addition. The contractor further explained that the foundation would be fully enclosed with concrete blocks. He also stated that the roof pitch of the addition will be too low to use shingles and that the roofing will be torch down.

The Board discussed whether the windows on the new addition should match the 2/2 windows on the main house. They also discussed that a non-asbestos siding is readily available that will match the asbestos siding on the main house.

The Board also discussed that concrete blocks are not acceptable in new construction in the districts. Facing the piers with brick will not be possible since it will protrude beyond the face of the wall. The Board suggested that the piers and chain wall be stuccoed to better blend with the area.

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

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no further Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued conditioned on the following: that the windows on the former addition be reused on the new addition although matching the 2/2 sash of the main house would be preferable, that the siding be the same as the asbestos siding on the main house, that the concrete block be stuccoed and the roof be torch down.. The motion was seconded by Craig Roberts and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/29/08.

APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

191-07-CA: 311 North Joachim Street
Applicant: Marwa G. Allen
Received: 10/10/07 (+45 Days: 11/24/07)
Meeting: 10/29/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: DeTonti Square
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Multiple renovations to include re-roofing, replacing concrete drive and sidewalk with brick, adding gutters, replacing porch elements and replacing siding.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this one-story frame cottage with Classical detailing was constructed circa 1910. It was moved to this location from 315 North Joachim in 1980.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. Ms. Allen recently purchased this home and an inspection revealed some non-structural defects as a result of normal wear and tear.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines call for new materials, finishes and elements to reflect the age and style of the building.
- C. The proposed plan includes the following:
 - 1. Add gutters.
 - 2. Clad the roof with architectural shingles in a grey blend.
 - 3. Replace the wood porch columns with fiberglass columns similar to existing.
 - 4. Repair/replace rotted wood throughout the exterior with materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension to include the porch handrails and siding.
 - 5. Replace the concrete driveway and sidewalk with brick pavers.
 - 6. Install a gabled dormer on the south side of the residence per the submitted drawings.
 - a. It will have a pair of 3'-0" x 4'-6" 6/6 wood sash windows with true divided lights.
 - b. All elements will match existing to include the windows, siding, trim, gable pitch and shingles.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the proposed fiberglass columns are inappropriate and the rotten wood on the existing columns should be repaired/replaced with materials to match.

Staff feels that the remaining application will not impair the historic integrity of the building or district. The new dormer design/materials will match the existing design/materials to include the windows, siding, trim, gable pitch and shingles; the existing roof and proposed interior dictate the dormer's size, shape and pitch. The gutters will blend in with the existing trim and the downspouts will be located to the rear of the residence. The brick pavers are an appropriate paving material in the district and all other proposed work is regular maintenance and rehabilitation. Ms. Allen will need to clear any possible issues with Right-of-Way regarding the pavers before installation.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Ms. Allen and her business partner, Lamar Elliot, were present to discuss the application. Ms. Allen explained that columns at the front are round while columns at the rear are square. Her request is to install fiberglass columns since wood rots easily. The Board asked if the fiberglass columns could be painted. The applicant responded that the columns could be painted.

The Board stated that maintenance of wood is a critical issue in their longevity. Also, the wood chosen for the job is important since conventional pine does not stand the test of time. For example, mahogany or the new blue wood might be good choices.

Ms. Allen also requested that she be allowed to install a fiberglass balustrade rather than wood. Mr. Elliot stated that the balustrade details were not original anyway and that they dated from the 1980s.

The Board commented that, while columns may be available that duplicate existing historic columns, the Board has not seen any balustrade details that duplicate historic precedents.

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

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no additional Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

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 amending fact C.3. to read: "Replace the wood porch columns and handrails with fiberglass similar to existing. The motion was seconded by Tom Karwinski and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued conditioned on the handrail being wood. Applicant may make a new application to the Board if an appropriate fiberglass railing is located. The motion was seconded by Craig Roberts and approved on a vote of 5 to 2 with Harris Oswald and Bunky Ralph voting in opposition.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/29/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

192-07-CA: 1262 Selma Street
Applicant: Robert H. Lamon
Received: 10/17/07 (+45 Days: 12/01/07)
Meeting: 10/29/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Replace the existing wood garage doors with new metal garage doors.
Conflicts: Tilmon Brown, as Chair of the MHDC Properties Committee, recused himself from discussion and voting on the application.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this two-story frame Colonial Revival residence was built circa 1904. The garage was formerly an optometrist shop that was converted to a garage in 1990.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. The current garage doors are standard multi-panel wood doors. As mentioned above, they were installed in 1990 when the optometry shop in the rear was converted to a garage.
- B. The Guidelines state “garage doors should be simple in design and compatible with the main building.”
- C. The proposed work will replace the current wood multi-panel garage doors with white Amarr multi-panel steel doors that operate like the existing ones.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff feels that the proposed work will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district. The new garage door is compatible to the main residence and staff recommends approving the application.
This residence has an easement, so the application will need to go before the Properties Committee.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Lamon was present to discuss the application. He had no additions to the application, although he stated that the wood doors date from 1990.
The Board explained that Mr. Lamon would need to take the application to the Properties Committee since the MHDC holds an easement on the property.
Mr. Lamon asked about the length of an easement and was told that it ran in perpetuity with title to the property.
There were no comments from the public to enter into the record.
Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to enter into the record.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed whether a door that is 4 panels high would be a more appropriate design for the garage. Tom Karwinski stated that he thought the number of panels was proportional to the opening in which the door would be installed and that 4 panels might actually be what will be designated for this opening.

FINDING OF FACT

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/29/08.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF COMMENTS

193-07-CA: 255 Church Street
Applicant: Ray Carney/SOS
Received: 10/18/07 (+45 Days: 12/02/07)
Meeting: 10/29/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Extend the existing fence and add a gate.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this hotel complex was constructed in the 1960s.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. There is currently an iron fence around the property. The extension was built prior to ARB approval and without a building permit. Urban Development issued a Notice of Violation.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines say fences should "complement the building and not detract from it."
- C. Mr. Carney is requesting that the fence extension remain.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff feels that the work will not impair the historic integrity of the district. The new fence matches existing and staff recommends approving the application. Mr. Carney will need to clear any issues with Urban Development regarding the gate.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Neither the applicant nor his representative was present to discuss the application. There were no comments from the public to enter into the record. Staff explained that it had no comments from the public regarding the issue, but that the Urban Development Department may have an issue with the width of the gate. It may not be wide enough for a fire truck to go through. Other than this potential problem, the gate was an extension of the existing iron fence.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/29/08.

APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

194-07-CA: 64 North Reed Avenue
Applicant: James Fernandez
Received: 10/19/07 (+45 Days: 12/02/07)
Meeting: 10/29/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Repair rotted back deck and expand. Replace front door with original door. Remove rotted wood fences.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this one-story frame Bungalow residence was constructed circa 1910.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. The current front door is not original to the house, but an older door was found in the garage that appears to be the original door. There is currently a brick patio area in the back yard and rotted wood fences surrounding the property.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state that doors are “[o]ften one of the most important decorative features of a house, doorways reflect the age and style of a building. Original doors and openings should be retained...[r]eplacements should respect the age and style of the building.” The Guidelines also state that “[decks] shall be measured by the guidelines applicable to new construction. The structure should complement the design and scale of the main building” and “[t]he porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture.”
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
 - 1. Replace the existing front door with the original door in the garage.
 - 2. Repair the rotten wood on the back deck and expand it to sit on the existing brick patio area.
 - 3. Remove the rotted wood fences.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the submitted information, staff feels that the proposed work will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district. The rear deck already partially exists and the expansion will not be seen from the street. The proposed replacement door appears to be either the original door or an appropriate replacement that respects the age and style of the building. The fences will be replaced at a later time. Staff recommends approving the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board questioned the fact that the house has a Chippendale railing. Staff stated that many Bungalows did not originally have railings and that this railing may be added.

Board questioned Staff about painting the door. Staff explained that the applicant had already received permission to paint. The fences that are removed will not be replaced at this time.

FINDING OF FACT

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/29/08.

APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

195-07-CA: 9 South Lafayette Street
Applicant: Sailor Cashion
Received: 10/22/07 (+45 Days: 12/05/07)
Meeting: 10/29/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Reconfigure the driveway.

BUILDING HISTORY

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

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. There is a fire station on this street, therefore no on street parking is allowed. Ms. Cashion owns three vehicles and planned on reconfiguring the driveway in order to have enough parking. Right-of-Way issued her a permit and Ms. Cashion began work on the property, unaware that they had not contacted – or let her know that she needed to contact – Historic Development. Staff received a complaint regarding the proposed work and issued a stop work order on 10/19/07.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state “...the design, location and materials [of the driveway should] be compatible with the property...[and] circular drives and parking pads in the front yard are generally inappropriate in the historic districts.”
- C. Ms. Cashion is proposing to widen the existing drive by 8’-0” and install a sidewalk to the porch per the submitted plans. There will also be additional landscaping.

RECOMMENDATION

After consulting with staff, Ms. Cashion decided to widen the existing drive per the submitted plans rather than install the circular drive. She will also have additional landscaping to minimize the parking area. Staff feels the new plan will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district and recommends approving the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Sailor Cashion and Joey Stacy were present to discuss the application. They explained that they had obtained a permit from the Right-of-Way Department and had already removed the walk from the sidewalk to the house. They further explained that they had three cars and were not allowed to park on Lafayette Street. They have requested to widen the drive to create parking for two cars and create a walkway from the driveway to the front porch by elongated the drive in front of the house. The edge of the drive will have plantings per the submitted plan. The Board suggested that the driveway begin at the same width as the existing curb cut and then widen with landscaping along the edge. The applicants agreed to this change and the curb cut will remain at 8 ft. in width. There were no comments from the public to enter into the record. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to enter into the record.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board asked Staff about the issuing of a permit for a circular drive by Right of Way and questioned that there was supposed to be a flag in the system that prevented this from happening. Staff assured the Board that properties in the historic districts were supposed to be flagged, but this application slipped through.

FINDING OF FACT

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/29/08.

APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

196-07-CA: 62 North Reed Avenue
Applicant: David McConnell
Received: 10/22/07 (+45 Days: 12/05/07)
Meeting: 10/29/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Demolish the non-historic rear carport.

BUILDING HISTORY

This one-story frame Bungalow residence was constructed circa 1915. The carport was a later addition to the property.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 44-79 of the Mobile City Code – Demolition/Relocation of structures within the Historic Districts:

(a) Required findings; demolition/relocation. The board shall not grant certificates of appropriateness for the demolition or relocation of any property within a historic district unless the board finds that the removal or relocation of such building will not be detrimental to the historical or architectural character of the district. In making this determination, the board shall consider:

- (1) The historic or architectural significance of the structure;
- (2) The importance of the structure to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;
- (3) The difficulty or the impossibility of reproducing the structure because of its design, texture, material, detail or unique location;
- (4) Whether the structure is one of the last remaining examples of its kind in the neighborhood, the county, or the region or is a good example of its type, or is part of an ensemble of historic buildings creating a neighborhood;
- (5) Whether there are definite plans for reuse of the property if the proposed demolition is carried out, and what effect such plans will have on the architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological, social, aesthetic, or environmental character of the surrounding area.

(b) Content of applications. All applications to demolish or remove a structure in a historic district shall contain the following minimum information:

- (1) The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
- (2) The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
- (3) Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
- (4) Description of the options currently held for the purchase of such property, including the price received for such option, the conditions placed upon such option and the date of expiration of such option;
- (5) Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
- (6) Financial proof of the ability to complete the replacement project, which may include but not be limited to a performance bond, a letter of credit, a trust for completion of improvements, or a letter of commitment from a financial institution; and
- (7) Such other information as may reasonably be required by the board.

(c) Post demolition or relocation plans required. In no event shall the board entertain any application for the demolition or relocation of any historic property unless the applicant also presents at the same time the post-demolition or post-relocation plans.

STAFF REPORT

- A. The carport is not original to the property. It sits in an area with poor drainage. It has a low ceiling; the posts are metal.
- B. In considering demolitions, the Guidelines refer to Section 44-79 of the Mobile City Code, discussed above.
- C. Mr. McConnell is proposing to demolish the carport and landscape as part of the residence and property renovation.

RECOMMENDATION

This carport is a secondary structure in fair condition and a later addition to the property. Staff feels that the demolition of this structure should not negatively impact the historic integrity of the building or the district and recommends approval.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/29/08.

APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

197-07-CA: 1313 Chamberlain Avenue
Applicant: Mark Browning
Received: 10/22/07 (+45 Days: 12/05/07)
Meeting: 10/29/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Pour concrete driveway. Replace the porch spindles. Construct a shed.

BUILDING HISTORY

This one-story frame Cottage with classical detailing was constructed circa 1910.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. The property currently has an unpaved driveway and a rear utility shed that is in poor shape. The spindles on the front porch are currently square 2x2 posts.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state “...the design, location and materials [of the driveway should] be compatible with the property.” The Guidelines also state that [accessory buildings] shall be measured by the guidelines applicable to new construction. The structure should complement the design and scale of the main building.”
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
 1. Install a driveway.
 - a. It will be 10’-0”w x 97’-0”d.
 - b. It will be a light-colored concrete to match that of the surrounding residences.
 2. Construct a shed per the MHDC stock storage plans.
 - a. It will be modified to 8’-0”x10’-0”.
 - b. It will sit 5’-0” off the back of the lot and 2’-0” off the side.
 - c. It will have lap siding to match the main residence.
 - d. It will have a metal panel roof.
 - e. There will be a vinyl-clad sash window on the back and a 4’-0” wide door on the front.
 3. Replace the square spindles on the front porch with turned spindles.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff feels that the proposed concrete driveway and shed will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district. The materials, proportions and design fall within the standards of the Design Review Guidelines. Staff does, however, feel that the turned spindles are too ornate for this residence, which has more subdued Classical detailing. Mr. Browning will need to clear any setback issues with Urban Development before constructing the shed.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

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

Staff presented a photo of the baluster that the applicant wanted to use on the balustrade. Staff further explained that the driveway was currently dirt and that the concrete drive would extend from behind the sidewalk to the end of the lot. The applicant proposed setting the storage shed directly on top of the concrete drive.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed that the turned baluster was inappropriate to the house and that the applicant should replace the rotten balustrade as it is currently designed. There was also a great deal of discussion concerning placement of the shed directly on the concrete drive. Board members felt that this was a non-historic solution to the shed foundation. They considered that the drive should end and that a separate foundation be poured for the shed. Landscaping could transition to the shed.

The Board also asked about the metal roofing on the shed and specified that it be 5v crimp.

FINDING OF FACT

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report as amended adding 1.c. that the driveway will stop and that there be at least 5 ft. separating the driveway from the shed foundation and amending C.3. to read that the square spindles will be replaced with square spindles to match existing and 2.d. that the roof on the shed would be 5v crimp. The motion was seconded by David Barr and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Andrew Martin 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 following: that the porch have square spindles to match existing, that the driveway end at least 5 ft. in front of the shed, that the shed have a separate foundation and that the roofing be 5 v crimp. The motion was seconded by David Barr and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/29/08.