

CITY OF MOBILE
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Minutes of the Meeting
October 30, 2006

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m. by Chair, Bunky Ralph.

Aileen de la Torre called the roll as follows:

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

Members Absent: Douglas Kearley (excused), David Tharp.

Staff Members Present: Aileen de la Torre, Anne Crutcher, Devereaux Bemis, John Lawler

<u>In Attendance</u>	<u>Mailing Address</u>	<u>Item Number</u>
Evelyn Hope Neely	1117 Montauk Ave.	115-06-CA

Tilmon Brown moved to approve the minutes of the last meeting as emailed with a correction noted by Jim Wagoner on 1150 Old Shell Road. The motion was seconded by Robert Brown and unanimously approved.

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

A. MID-MONTH APPROVALS

- Applicant's Name:** Affordable Roofing
Property Address: 901 Government Street
Date of Approval: September 27, 2006
Install torch applied modified flat roof to match existing.
- Applicant's Name:** Alex J. Kraft
Property Address: 1219 Texas Street
Date of Approval: September 29, 2006
Repair eaves as necessary with new wood to match existing in profile and dimension. Install new roof using Tamko shingles in Old English Pewter.
- Applicant's Name:** Tracy O'Brien
Property Address: 157 Charles Street
Date of Approval: October 2, 2006
Repair asbestos shingle roof over porch to match existing. Replace non-conforming front porch to match original, including box columns with capital & base detail, square picket balustrade, 1x4 tongue & groove deck and brick stairs. Repaint to match existing.
- Applicant's Name:** John Carpenter
Property Address: 153 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: October 2, 2006
Install double-faced 30x30 projecting painted wood sign hung by chains from existing standard. Illuminate sign with existing goose neck light.
- Applicant's Name:** Anne and Hastings Read
Property Address: 1225 Selma Street
Date of Approval: October 3, 2006
Replace rotten wood as necessary with new materials to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Paint teahouse to match existing main house color scheme.

5. **Applicant's Name:** Philip Foster
Property Address: 68 North Reed Street
Date of Approval: October 4, 2006
Replace rotten wood as necessary to match existing in profile, dimension and materials. Replace broken window glass to match existing. Paint with the following Sherwin Williams colors:
- Body – Sage, SW2860
 - Trim – Dover White, SW6385
 - Accent and Porch – Polished Mahogany, SW2838
6. **Applicant's Name:** Norman Figures/Global Roofing Company
Property Address: 654 St. Michael
Date of Approval: October 5, 2006
Install new Certinteed 3-tab shingle roof in Dove Gray to match existing in profile, dimension and color.
7. **Applicant's Name:** Pallottian Construction
Property Address: 456 Broad Street
Date of Approval: October 5, 2006
Install helper piers as necessary.
8. **Applicant's Name:** Jaime Betbeze
Property Address: 1210 Selma Street
Date of Approval: October 6, 2006
Replace rotten wood on front porch as necessary with materials to match existing in profile and dimension. Paint to match existing color scheme.
9. **Applicant's Name:** Fred South Construction Company
Property Address: 203 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: October 10, 2006
Repair windows, window casings and rotten wood as necessary on façade. Paint to match existing colors.
10. **Applicant's Name:** Carla Sharrow
Property Address: 1611 Government Street
Date of Approval: October 10, 2006
Repair rotten wood as necessary with new wood to match existing in dimension and profile. Paint exterior in the following color scheme:
- Body – Faint Coral or Quaint Peche
 - Trim – White
11. **Applicant's Name:** Michael Mastro
Property Address: 33 McPhillips
Date of Approval: October 10, 2006
Reroof house in Medium Gray, GAF shingles. Repair rotten wood as necessary to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Paint in existing color scheme.
12. **Applicant's Name:** Arthur Madden
Property Address: 465 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: October 11, 2006
Repaint building in the existing color scheme.
13. **Applicant's Name:** Lenna Romero
Property Address: 116 Espejo Street
Date of Approval: October 11, 2006
Replace rotten wood as necessary to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Paint to match.
14. **Applicant's Name:** Richard E. and Cynthia Longmire
Property Address: 955 Palmetto Street

Date of Approval: October 11, 2006

Replace rotten wood as necessary to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Replace missing lattice in foundation to match existing. Paint in existing color scheme.

15. **Applicant's Name:** Applied Marine Design, LLC

Property Address: 308 Congress Street

Date of Approval: October 12, 2006

Install Sunbrella fabric Dubonnet Tweed canvas awning over rear door.

16. **Applicant's Name:** Gordon Armstrong III

Property Address: 213 Lanier Avenue

Date of Approval: October 13, 2006

Replace rotten wood as necessary with materials to match existing in profile, dimension and materials. Repaint house in the following Devoe color scheme:

- Body – Cambric Tea, 953
- Trim – Brilliant White
- Step Hand Rail – Black

NOTICES OF VIOLATION and MUNICIPAL OFFENSE TICKETS

No NoVs or MoTs were written during this time period.

NEW BUSINESS

1. **113-06-CA:** 909 Elmira Street
Applicant: Joia Juzang
Request: Remove shed roof addition to construct rear deck. Add French doors and wood steps to deck. Replace rotten wood on front porch and add guardrail. Replace existing concrete steps at front porch with wood ones. Replace existing aluminum windows with wood ones. Replace existing front door with new one. Remove chain link fence. Enlarge east side addition and reclad. Add vent to front gable. Add lattice between piers. Repaint.

APPROVED with the exception of door, gable vent and front window.
Certified Record attached.

2. **114-06-CA** 310 Marine Street
Applicant: Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund/Douglas Kearley, architect
Request: Repair or replace building materials and architectural features to match existing. Remove chain link fence. Install 3'6" picket fence on front of property and 6' wood privacy fence on rear of property. Install Bahamian Limestone driveway. Remove storm damaged trees that fell on the north side of house. Install roof.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

3. **115-06-CA** 1115 Montauk Avenue
Applicant: Joseph Sejud
Request: Extend 6' wood privacy fence at western boundary of property.

APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.. Certified Record attached.

4. **116-06-CA** 1156 Palmetto Street
Applicant: Ginger & Sidney Harrell
Request: Construct rear porch on existing deck, reusing existing railings. Enlarge breakfast room to the east \pm 2'4" and continue porch roof to cover new addition. Replace existing shed roof on east-side extension with the new porch/addition roof. Paint to match existing colors.

APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. Certified Record attached.

5. **117-06-CA** 64 Bradford Avenue
Applicant: Paul Morris
Request: Reclad entire house with 5" pine lap siding. Remove awnings at windows.

**APPROVED AWNING REMOVAL. DENIED SIDING REPLACEMENT.
Certified Record attached.**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:25 p.m.

APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS CERTIFIED RECORD

113-06-CA: 909 Elmira Street
Applicant: Joia Juzang
Received: 10/04/06 (+45 Days: 11/18/06)
Meeting: 10/30/06

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Remove shed roof addition to construct rear deck. Add French doors and wood steps to deck. Replace rotten wood on front porch and add guardrail. Replace existing concrete steps at front porch with wood ones. Replace existing aluminum windows with wood ones. Replace existing front door with new one. Remove chain link fence. Enlarge east side addition and reclad. Add vent to front gable. Add lattice between piers. Repaint.

BUILDING HISTORY

This one-story frame residence was built 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. Remove Addition and Construct Rear Deck
 1. Currently, the proposed rear deck on this residence has already been completed.
 2. The Design Review Guidelines state that “new additions...shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be...compatible with the massing, size, scale and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.”
 3. Remove non-historic shed roof addition located on the rear of the building.
 4. Construct 10’x24’ wood deck on existing brick piers.
 5. Fill-in façade opening with pine lap siding to match existing.
 6. Add French doors centered on façade that lead to deck.
 7. Add wood steps from deck to ground.
- B. Front Porch Alterations
 1. Currently, the proposed front porch improvements are being completed.
 2. The Design Review Guidelines state that porches “should...reflect their period [and] maintain their historic appearance. Materials should blend with the style of the building.”
 3. Replace rotted wood posts and deck with materials to match existing.
 4. Replace concrete staircase with new wood staircase.
 5. Add wood guardrail with simple square balusters.
- C. Replace Windows and Door
 1. Currently, the proposed window and door replacements are being completed. However, the windows being replaced are non-historic aluminum alterations of the original wood windows. The door being replaced is also a later alteration of the original.
 2. For windows, the Design Review Guidelines state that “original window openings should be retained as well as original window sashes and glazing. Where windows cannot be repaired, new windows...should be compatible with the general character of the building.”

3. Replace aluminum sash windows on all elevations with wood sash windows, retaining the original window openings.
 4. Replace rotted wood sash kitchen windows with wood side-by-side windows, decreasing the size of the original window openings in order to fit the interior layout of the kitchen.
 5. Remove non-historic aluminum paired sash windows at front porch with one single-pane non-opening wood window with artificial muntins, enlarging the window opening. It is necessary to note that the non-historic aluminum paired sash windows were shorter than the original wood sash windows, therefore, the integrity of the historic window opening has already been impaired.
 6. For doors, the Design Review Guidelines state that "original doors and openings should be retained...replacements should respect the age and style of the building."
 7. Replace non-historic front door with a Mahogany door with a large tempered-glass single light and two decorative panels on the bottom.
- D. Remove Chain Link Fence
1. Currently, this residence has a chain link fence. The property is approximately 54'x155'. The front façade faces north. There are no plans to install a new fence at this time.
 2. The Design Review Guidelines state that fences "...should compliment the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic Districts."
 3. Remove the damaged non-historic chain link fence surrounding the property.
- E. Enlarge East Side Addition
1. Currently, this proposed enlargement has already been completed.
 2. The Design Review Guidelines state that "new additions...shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be...compatible with the massing, size, scale and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment."
 3. Extend the later east side addition approximately 1' to the rear.
 4. Reclad addition in pine lap siding to match existing.
- F. Other
1. Install a small attic vent in the front gable.
 2. Add lattice infill between piers.
 3. Replace rotted wood siding with pine lap siding to match existing.
 4. Paint all to match existing.

RECOMMENDATION

It is important to note that most of these proposed improvements have either already been or are being completed. Staff feels that items A, B, C1-3 and D-F are typical and common updates of historic properties. Additionally, some of the historic characteristics of the building that were lost may be restored with the current improvements. Staff feels that although item C4 decreases the size of the current window openings, approval is acceptable. They are located at the rear of the building and are sized to allow space for the updated kitchen. Staff feels that although item C5 increases the size of the current window opening, approval is acceptable. The window opening had already been resized with the previous alteration, therefore, its integrity has already been impaired. The proportions of the larger window are also more compatible to the building. However, staff feels that sash windows would be more appropriate. Staff feels that we need more specific information for item C7.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Neither the applicant nor his representative was present to discuss the application. There was no one else to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record. The Board questioned Staff regarding the fact that a CoA was displayed at the house and most of the work being considered in this application by the Board has been completed or is in progress. Staff explained that the applicant had obtained a CoA to repair rotten wood and paint, but that the work had gone beyond the CoA. There was no stop work put on the project.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the inappropriateness of the multi lighted fixed window on the façade. 6/6 sash windows identical to the other windows on the structure would be appropriate.

The Board questioned the lack of information regarding front door. The round gable vent proposed for the front gable would also be inappropriate. A rectangular wood vent would be compatible with the building.

FINDING OF FACT

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Cameron Pfeiffer moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the portion of the application including the door, attic vent and multi-lighted window impairs the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines. A Certificate of Appropriateness can be issued for the removal of the chain link fence, the enlargement of the side addition, the addition of lattice between the foundation piers, and painting which do not impair the historic integrity of the structure. The door can be decided on a mid-month basis by staff. The motion was seconded by Robert Brown and unanimously approved.

In addition, the Board directed Staff to inform the property owner that any work done without a CoA or building permit could result in a stop work order and a fine.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/30/07.

APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS CERTIFIED RECORD

114-06-CA: 310 Marine Street
Applicant: Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund/Douglas Kearley, architect
Received: 10/04/06 (+45 Days: 11/18/06)
Meeting: 10/30/06

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Repair or replace building materials and architectural features to match existing. Remove chain link fence. Install 3'6" picket fence on front of property and 6' wood privacy fence on rear of property. Install Bahamian Limestone driveway. Remove storm damaged trees that fell on the north side of house. Install new roof.

BUILDING HISTORY

This one-story frame residence was built in 1897.

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. Repair or Replace Building Materials and Architectural Features
 1. Currently, this residence is not in good condition. There are broken windows, cracked masonry, rotting wood and missing architectural elements. The brick piers need to be leveled and repointed. Water damage is evident throughout.
 2. The Design Review Guidelines state that "original [elements] should be retained and repaired. Replacement...when required, must match the original in profile, dimension and material."
 3. Repair existing front porch columns, gingerbread detailing and masonry.
 4. Replace existing front porch guardrail with new rail consisting of flat sawn ¾" balusters.
 5. Repair or replace as necessary all doors and windows to match existing in placement, size and materials.
 6. Repair or replace as necessary all siding to match existing in size and materials.
 7. Level and repoint the existing brick piers.
 8. Repair or replace as necessary side porch columns and guardrail.
 9. Replace existing side porch stairs with wood steps and guardrail.
 10. Repaint with colors to be submitted at a later date.
- B. Remove Chain Link Fence and Install New Fences
 1. Currently, this residence has a non-historic chain link fence. The property is approximately 50'x67'. The front façade faces east.
 2. The Design Review Guidelines state that fences "...should compliment the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic Districts."
 3. Remove the damaged non-historic chain link fence surrounding the property.
 4. Install a 6' wood privacy fence along the rear (west) boundary and extending 25' towards the front (east) along the north and south boundaries.
 5. Install a 3'6" picket fence along the front (east) boundary and extending 25' towards the back (west) along the north and south boundaries, leaving an opening for the driveway.

6. Install an additional small section of picket fence placed flush with the north façade of the house to separate the front yard from the driveway.
 7. Add a pair of 3'x3'6" gates centered with the front steps.
 8. Fences of this type are common throughout historic districts.
- C. Install Bahamian Limestone Driveway
1. Currently, this residence has an overgrown grass driveway on the right hand side of the property.
 2. The Design Review Guidelines state that "modern paving materials are acceptable in the historic district."
 3. Repave driveway with 4" thick Bahamian Limestone on compacted base, maintaining the proportions of existing.
- D. Remove Storm Damaged Trees and Install New Roof
1. Currently, there are two fallen trees on the property that damaged the north side of the roof during one of the previous storms.
 2. The Design Review Guidelines state that "historic roof forms [and] pitch...should be maintained. Materials should be appropriate to the form and pitch and color."
 3. Remove storm damaged trees from the property.
 4. Repair the damaged section of roof.
 5. Install new fiberglass/asphalt Timberline shingles on 15# felt with 6 nails per shingle.

RECOMMENDATION

The proposed improvements are typical and common updates of historic properties. Staff feels that these improvements will not negatively impact the integrity of the building or the district and recommends approval of items A-C and D4&5. Staff recommends approval for item D3, however, the applicant must get a permit from Urban Forestry before proceeding.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Neither the applicant nor his representative was present to discuss the application. There was no one else to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record. The Board questioned Staff on the character of Bahamian limestone which is a gray pebble like parking surface. The Board also questioned Staff regarding the 3'8" picket fence. Fences higher than 3 ft. require a variance.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Harris Oswalt moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued subject to a variance being obtained for a fence higher than 3 ft. in the front yard. The motion was seconded by Joe Sackett and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/30/07.

APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS CERTIFIED RECORD

115-06-CA: 1115 Montauk Avenue
Applicant: Joseph Sejud
Received: 10/11/06 (+45 Days: 11/25/06)
Meeting: 10/30/06

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Extend 6' wood privacy fence at western boundary of property.

BUILDING HISTORY

This two-story frame residence was built circa 1900.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. Extend Wood Privacy Fence Along Western Boundary of Property
 1. Currently, this residence has a 6' wood privacy fence that surrounds most of the rear half of the property.
 2. The Design Review Guidelines state that fences "...should compliment the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic Districts."
 3. Extend the 6' wood privacy fence along the western boundary of the property, maintaining a setback of approximately 45' from the curb.
 4. Match new boards to existing 6" wide unpainted dog-eared boards.
 5. Fences of this type are common throughout historic districts.

RECOMMENDATION

The proposed improvements are typical and common updates of historic properties. Staff feels that these improvements will not negatively impact the integrity of the building or the district. It is necessary to note, however, that there is a property line dispute between Mr. Sejud and his neighbor at 1117 Montauk Avenue. Therefore, while staff recommends approval of the application, MHDC cannot issue a permit until this dispute is resolved.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Neither the applicant nor his representative was present to discuss the application. Mrs. Neely who lives at 1117 Montauk Avenue was present to discuss the property boundary issue that exists between herself and Mr. Sejud. She stated that Mr. Sejud intends to tie onto an existing fence that is on her property. The fence is old and leaning and she wants to preserve her property line. She has no objection to Mr. Sejud building a privacy fence on his property.

The Board's attorney had already advised Staff that no CoA can be issued to Mr. Sejud without a survey indicating that he will be building a privacy fence on his own property. Mrs. Neely reported that the property line had been surveyed. Staff had no comments from city departments to read into the record.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no Board discussion

FINDING OF FACT

The Board modified the facts in the Staff Report as follows:

3. Erect a 6' wood privacy fence along the western boundary of the property, maintaining a setback of approximately 45 ft. from the curb; and
4. Six inch wide unpainted dog-eared board will be used.

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/30/07.

APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS CERTIFIED RECORD

116-06-CA: 1156 Palmetto Street
Applicant: Ginger & Sidney Harrell
Received: 10/16/06 (+45 Days: 11/30/06)
Meeting: 10/30/06

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Construct rear porch on existing deck, reusing existing railings. Enlarge breakfast room to the east ± 2'4" and continue porch roof to cover new addition. Replace existing shed roof on east-side extension with the new porch/addition roof. Paint to match existing colors.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to a previous historic resource survey conducted in 1986, this two-story frame residence was built in 1899 in what was known as a "modern renaissance" style. Originally owned by Charles T. Hearin, this is "one of nine two-story frame buildings in this block [owned by Mr. Hearin] which were constructed on the same plan...by Rudolph Benz. [It] is a rather unique example of speculative building in the city."

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. Construct Rear Porch on Existing Deck
 1. Currently, there is an approximately 8'x20' wood deck at the rear of the residence. It has a guardrail with turned post balusters and stairs leading to the ground located at the center. This is a non-historic addition to the residence.
 2. The Design Review Guidelines state that "historic porches should...reflect their period." Although the deck is non-historic, its "form and shape...[and] materials should blend in with the style of the building."
 3. Install a partial height hipped roof with fiberglass shingles on 15# felt (6 nails per shingle) to match existing, centering the ridge with the main staircase.
 4. Add eight chamfered wood posts with decorative capitals at regular intervals along the sides and paired at the corners.
 5. Reuse existing guardrail, sawing down the balusters to shorten it to 3' tall.
 6. Build a new staircase with wood steps leading to ground.
 7. Build a secondary wood staircase at the southeast corner of the porch.
 8. Replace existing multi-pane windows on the left side of the rear façade with paired 3'x7'x1³/₄" exterior Spanish cedar doors with clear tempered true divided lights and a transom to match existing window height.
 9. Install an Isokern "Patio Series" fireplace with a DM44 Isokern brick veneer chimney at the west side of the porch.
 10. Paint to match existing.
- B. Enlarge Breakfast Room
 1. Currently, there is a small one-story breakfast room extension on the east side of the building with a pair of small two-over-two sash windows.

2. The Design Review Guidelines state that “new additions...shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be...compatible with the massing, size, scale and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.”
 3. Square the northeast corner of the building flush with existing façades.
 4. Match the brick piers with lattice infill and wood siding to existing.
 5. Clad in siding to match existing.
 6. Reuse existing multi-light windows from the east façade.
 7. Replace, if possible, existing two-over-two windows with the multi-light windows removed from the rear façade for the new door to the porch.
 8. Paint to match existing.
- C. Replace Existing Shed Roof with New Porch/Addition Roof
1. Currently, there is a shed roof on the small breakfast room extension on the east side of the building.
 2. The Design Review Guidelines state that “historic roof forms, as well as the original pitch...should be maintained. Materials should be appropriate to the form and pitch and color.”
 3. Replace existing shed roof with a new shed roof extending from the porch.
 4. Install fiberglass shingles on 15# felt (6 nails per shingle) to match existing

RECOMMENDATION

Staff feels that the proposed improvements in item A will not negatively impact the integrity of the building or the district. They affect an existing non-historic deck at the rear of the property, which will remain open to the outdoors and replicate the elements of the front porch, as well as reuse existing materials. The proposed door leading to the porch will maintain the look and proportions of the existing window. Staff feels that items B and C will not negatively impact the integrity of the building or the district. The proposed addition maintains the lines and materials of the house. Staff recommends approval of the application and strongly suggests that the owners accept the option outlined in item B7.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Neither the applicant nor his representative was present to discuss the application. There was no one else to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record. Staff explained that the application entailed squaring off the breakfast room and installing French doors in place of double windows on the rear elevation. An option indicated by the applicant was to move the windows to the east elevation of the breakfast room.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the importance of these windows and considered that they should be relocated as indicated in the application.

FINDING OF FACT

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Harris Oswalt 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 rear windows being moved to the east elevation of the breakfast room. The motion was seconded by Jim Wagoner and approved with Robert Brown voting in opposition.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/30/07.

APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS CERTIFIED RECORD

117-06-CA: 64 Bradford Avenue
Applicant: Paul Morris
Received: 10/20/06 (+45 Days: 12/04/06)
Meeting: 10/30/06

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Reclad entire house with 5" pine lap siding. Remove awnings at windows.

BUILDING HISTORY

This one-story frame residence was built circa 1946.

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. Reclad House and Remove Awnings
 - 1. Currently, this residence is clad with 105 siding, much of it rotted. There is vertical wood siding embellishment above and beneath the windows.
 - 2. The Design Review Guidelines state that "original siding should be retained and repaired. Replacement of exterior finishes, when required, must match the original in profile, dimension and materials."
 - 3. Replace Pattern 105 siding and vertical siding embellishments with 5" pine lap siding.
 - 4. Remove the non-historic awnings from the windows.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff feels that the "exterior material of a building helps define its style, quality and historic period." Although wood lap siding is appropriate to the area and will not negatively impact the integrity of the district, it will certainly alter the building significantly. Therefore, staff recommends that the rotted wood be replaced with siding to match the existing siding. Should the ARB approve the lap siding, staff recommends that the vertical embellishments at the windows, which are original to the house and give it character, be retained. Staff recommends approval to remove the awnings.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Neither the applicant nor his representative was present to discuss the application. There was no one else to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record. Staff explained that the applicant explained that the 105 siding on his house was rotted and that he preferred lap siding. In addition 105 siding was more expensive and difficult to obtain. He also wanted to remove the awnings on the building. Staff reported that the siding was in relatively good condition with only some areas rotted. There are several areas in which vertical siding is used decoratively and appears original.

Tilmon Brown reported that 105 siding is readily available and costs a maximum of 10% more than lap siding.

Board members also asked about the awnings which appear to be wood. Board members felt that the awnings could be original.

Staff reported that awnings were often an added feature on houses of the period.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed that 105 siding is an original feature of the building and should be retained.

FINDING OF FACT

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Harris Oswalt moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application to replace the 105 siding does impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines and should be denied. The removal of awnings would not impair the historic integrity of the structure and a Certificate of Appropriateness should be issued to remove them. Staff may give a mid-month approval on the repair of the existing 105 siding. The motion was seconded by Robert Brown and approved with Joe Sackett opposing.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/30/07.