

CITY OF MOBILE
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

Minutes of the Meeting
November 14, 2005

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m. by Chair Cindy Klotz.

Ed Hooker, MHDC Architectural Engineer, called the roll as follows:

Members Present: Douglas Kearley, David Tharp, Bunky Ralph, Harris Oswalt, Cindy Klotz, Robert Brown, Joe Sackett, Tilmon Brown, Cameron Pfeiffer.

Members Absent: Michael Mayberry.

Staff Members Present: Ed Hooker, Anne Crutcher, Devereaux Bemis, John Lawler

<u>In Attendance</u>	<u>Mailing Address</u>	<u>Item Number</u>
Dandi Dolbear	157 S. Jefferson St.	009-05/06-CA
Celia Lewis	158 S. Jefferson St.	009-05/06-CA
Tom Karwinski	17 S. Lafayette St.	013-05/06-CA
Danielle Juzan	254 S. Georgia Ave.	010-05/06-CA
John Peebles	P.O. Box 1187 36602	009-05-06/CA
Stephen Harvey	412 Pine Court 36608	014-05/06-CA
Allen Perkins	254 S. Georgia Ave.	010-05/06-CA
Ellie Fox	Real Estate Dept.	083-04/05-CA

Douglas Kearley moved to approve the minutes as emailed. The motion was seconded By Harris Oswalt and unanimously approved.

Bunky Ralph moved to approve the mid-month Certificates of Appropriateness. The motion was seconded by David Tharp and unanimously approved.

MID-MONTH APPROVALS

1. Applicant's Name: Jean Buckner
Property Address: 1221 Elmira Street
Date of Approval: 10/3/05 asc
Work Approved: Re-roof building with 3-tab fiberglass shingles, black in color.
2. Applicant's Name: Dennis Langan Construction
Property Address: 56 Fearnway
Date of Approval: 10/3/05 weh
Work Approved: Re-roof building with dimensional shingles, black in color.
3. Applicant's Name: Ben Cummings
Property Address: 1 Houston Street
Date of Approval: 10/3/05 weh
Work Approved: Remove deteriorated handrail from front of building.
Touch up painting as necessary matching existing paint color.

4. Applicant's Name: Joan Walker
Property Address: 1405 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 10/3/05 asc
Work Approved: Repairing storm damage; rebuild 25' x 30' carport with materials to match existing in profile, dimension, materials and color.

5. Applicant's Name: Mike Roach/ Cooper Roofing Co.
Property Address: 219 South Dearborn Street
Date of Approval: 10/4/05 weh
Work Approved: Re-roof building with 3 tab shingles, slate gray in color.

6. Applicant's Name: Latham Company, Inc.
Property Address: 401 Auditorium Drive
Date of Approval: 10/4/05 asc
Work Approved: Install new flat roof using modified bitumen roof to match existing.

7. Applicant's Name: 3MB, LLC/ Ben Cummings
Property Address: 1 Houston Street
Date of Approval: 10/5/05 weh
Work Approved: Replace existing signage with new signage as per submitted design.

8. Applicant's Name: Ollinger/Mostellar Construction
Property Address: 1119 Government Street
Date of Approval: 10/7/05 weh
Work Approved: Repair storm damage to roof and parapet. Repair stucco as necessary. Repaint repaired areas to match existing.

9. Applicant's Name: A & B Contracting
Property Address: 209 Marine Street
Date of Approval: 10/7/05 asc
Work Approved: Install new Timberline shingles, charcoal in color.

10. Applicant's Name: Ken Baggette
Property Address: 66 South Ann Street
Date of Approval: 10/7/05 weh
Work Approved: Repaint house in the following color scheme:
Body – Lowes Pecan EB26-4
Trim – Pumpkin 601

11. Applicant's Name: Catherine Bacher Estate
Property Address: 9 McPhillips
Date of Approval: 10/11/05 asc
Work Approved: Re-roof house with materials to match existing architectural black shingles.

12. Applicant's Name: Charlie and Kathy McLeod
Property Address: 18 Common Street

- Date of Approval: 10/11/05
Work Approved: Re-roof with architectural shingles, weathered gray in color.
13. Applicant's Name: Kevin Chambers
Property Address: 1054 Palmetto Street
Date of Approval: 10/11/05
Work Approved: Investigative Demolition – remove porch in-fill at second floor over main porch. Install railing after MHDC staff has determined appropriate porch railing and design.
14. Applicant's Name: A-1 Services
Property Address: 455 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 10/11/05 asc
Work Approved: Repair storm-damaged roof with materials to match existing in color, profile and dimension.
15. Applicant's Name: Detailed Roofing Inc.
Property Address: 150 Government Street
Date of Approval: 10/11/05 weh
Work Approved: Re-roof with 30 year dimensional shingles, cedar in color.
16. Applicant's Name: Dennis Langan Construction
Property Address: 1001 Church Street
Date of Approval: 10/11/05 weh
Work Approved: Re-roof building with 3 tab fiberglass shingles, black in color.
17. Applicant's Name: Dennis Langan Construction
Property Address: 31 South Lafayette Street
Date of Approval: 10/11/05 weh
Work Approved: Re-roof building with 3 tab fiberglass shingles, black in color.
18. Applicant's Name: Dennis Langan Construction
Property Address: 56 Fearnway
Date of Approval: 10/11/05 weh
Work Approved: Re-roof building with dimensional shingles, black in color.
19. Applicant's Name: Building and Maintenance Co./Jeremy Milling
Property Address: 19 North Reed Street
Date of Approval: 10/12/05 asc
Work Approved: Repaint exterior matching the existing color scheme:
Body – cream
Trim – white
Porch deck – black green
20. Applicant's Name: Gulf Coast Roofing
Property Address: 918 Government Street

- Date of Approval: 10/12/05 asc
 Work Approved: Install new modified bitumen roof to match existing flat roof.
21. Applicant's Name: Willie J. Wilson
 Property Address: 1159 Old Shell Road
 Date of Approval: 10/12/05 asc
 Work Approved: Repair to rotten wood with new wood to match existing in dimension and profile; Paint exterior: body and trim – white; porch deck – dark green; install black shingle roof.
22. Applicant's Name: Margaret Thigpen
 Property Address: 1558 Monroe Street
 Date of Approval: 10/12/05 asc
 Work Approved: Install 3' high pointed picket fence in front yard as per submitted site plan with matching gates at the walkway and drive. Fence to be left natural to weather.
23. Applicant's Name: Coxwell Roofing and Construction
 Property Address: 255 Church Street
 Date of Approval: 10/12/05 asc
 Work Approved: Partial re-roof using modified bitumen where roof has failed.
24. Applicant's Name: Lyons Pipes and Cook
 Property Address: 7 North Royal Street
 Date of Approval: 10/12/05 asc
 Work Approved: Perform structural stabilization to façade and side of building as illustrated on submission.
25. Applicant's Name: Debra Butler
 Property Address: 1753 Hunter Avenue
 Date of Approval: 10/13/05 weh
 Work Approved: Repair hurricane damaged rear portion of residence. Materials to match existing in profile and dimension. Repaint to match existing color scheme.
26. Applicant's Name: Patricia Haynie
 Property Address: 11 Macy Place
 Date of Approval: 10/13/05 weh
 Work Approved: Repaint building in the following color scheme:
 Body – SW6157, Sherwin Williams Favorite Tan
 Trim – Devoe Antique White
 Steps – SW 6159 – High Tea
27. Applicant's Name: David Adkinson
 Property Address: 1119 Old Shell Road
 Date of Approval: 10/14/05 weh
 Work Approved: Replace storm damaged wood as necessary with new materials matching existing in profile and dimension. Repaint in existing color scheme.

28. Applicant's Name: Theobald Roofing
Property Address: 106 Hannon Avenue
Date of Approval: 10/13/05 weh
Work Approved: Re-roof building with 3 tab fiberglass shingles, driftwood or weathered wood in color.
29. Applicant's Name: Fred South
Property Address: 124 Ryan Avenue
Date of Approval: 10/13/05 weh
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood siding with new materials to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Paint new materials to match existing color scheme.
30. Applicant's Name: Enlaw Construction
Property Address: 753 St. Francis Street
Date of Approval: 10/17/05 weh
Work Approved: Install handicap ramp at entry door to match existing in profile, material, dimension and color. Install gates at existing fence on roof at a/c units.
31. Applicant's Name: D and D Construction
Property Address: 111 North Julia Street
Date of Approval: 10/17/05 asc
Work Approved: Replace 30' section of storm-damaged fence to match existing. Re-roof building with 3 tab fiberglass shingles, desert tan in color.
32. Applicant's Name: Michael Peavy
Property Address: 1766 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 10/17/05 asc
Work Approved: Repair storm damaged garage apartment: roof and siding, with materials to match existing in profile, material and dimension. Replace rotten wood as necessary on main house with new materials matching existing in profile, material and dimension. Paint all new materials to match existing color scheme.
33. Applicant's Name: Building and Maintenance Company/ Alec and Kelley Bailey
Property Address: 56 North Reed Avenue
Date of Approval: 10/18/05 asc
Work Approved: Paint exterior in existing color scheme.
34. Applicant's Name: DMDMC
Property Address: 261 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 10/18/05 asc
Work Approved: Repair to rotten wood as necessary with new materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Paint in existing color scheme.
35. Applicant's Name: Robert L. Brown
Property Address: 1804 New Hamilton Street

- Date of Approval: 10/20/05 weh
Work Approved: Install metal standing seam roof, light gray in color.
36. Applicant's Name: Jay Higginbotham/ Jeanne Mercier
Property Address: 60 North Monterey Street
Date of Approval: 10/20/05 jdb
Work Approved: Re-roof building to match existing roof in profile, dimension and color.
37. Applicant's Name: Andre Baskin
Property Address: 1502 Brown Street
Date of Approval: 10/20/05 weh
Work Approved: Install new metal roof, either standing seam or 5 v-crimp, galvanized in color.
38. Applicant's Name: Tripp Construction
Property Address: 255 Church Street
Date of Approval: 10/20/05 weh
Work Approved: Remove unsafe brick from south wall of hotel, damaged by Hurricane Katrina.
39. Applicant's Name: Joe and Rachael Kulakowski
Property Address: 254 North Conception Street
Date of Approval: 10/20/05 weh
Work Approved: Emergency repair and stabilization of damaged frame addition caused by Hurricane Katrina.
40. Applicant's Name: Bennet Wayne and Doris Dean
Property Address: 1064 Palmetto Street
Date of Approval: 10/20/05 asc
Work Approved: Re-paint house in existing color scheme.
41. Applicant's Name: Weaver Roofing Company
Property Address: 955 Old Shell Road
Date of Approval: 10/20/05 asc
Work Approved: Re-roof with Timberline roofing shingles, black in color.
42. Applicant's Name: Bobby Handley
Property Address: 1119 Montauk Avenue
Date of Approval: 10/20/05 asc
Work Approved: Re-roof with Tamko architectural shingles, weathered wood or mountain slate in color.
43. Applicant's Name: Nick Holmes, III
Property Address: 257 North Conception Street
Date of Approval: 10/20/05 asc
Work Approved: Replace deteriorated wood fence with new wood fence to match existing height; fence to have 6' boards with square top
44. Applicant's Name: Chip Nolan
Property Address: 206 South Cedar Street

- Date of Approval: 10/21/05 jdb
 Work Approved: Re-roof building with 3 tab fiberglass shingles, weathered wood in color.
45. Applicant's Name: Bill DeMouy
 Property Address: 105 LeVert Avenue
 Date of Approval: 10/24/05 asc
 Work Approved: Install new weathered wood shingle roof.
46. Applicant's Name: Ron Everts
 Property Address: 908 Palmetto Street
 Date of Approval: 10/24/05 jss
 Work Approved: Replace rotten wood to match and repaint per existing color scheme.
47. Applicant's Name: Centimark Company/ Salvation Army
 Property Address: 1009 Dauphin Street
 Date of Approval: 10/25/05 weh
 Work Approved: Re-roof flat roof with new materials to match existing in profile and dimension.
48. Applicant's Name: Lucky Roofing/ Willy Lucky
 Property Address: 203 Everett Street
 Date of Approval: 10/25/05 asc
 Work Approved: Install new black onyx 20 year shingle roof.
49. Applicant's Name: Steve Pond
 Property Address: 300 South Georgia Avenue
 Date of Approval: 10/26/05 weh
 Work Approved: Repair asbestos roof with materials matching existing in profile and dimension. Repair storm-damaged wood fence with materials matching existing in materials, profile and dimension.
50. Applicant's Name: Dandi Dolbear
 Property Address: 157 South Jefferson Street
 Date of Approval: 10/26/05 weh
 Work Approved: Re-roof with materials matching existing in materials, profile and dimension.
51. Applicant's Name: Big Zion AME Zion Church
 Property Address: 112 South Bayou Street
 Date of Approval: 10/26/05 weh
 Work Approved: Repaint in existing color scheme. Repair storm damaged exterior and rotten wood with materials matching existing in materials, profile and dimension. Repair stained glass windows as necessary. Re-stucco as necessary, painting to match existing.
52. Applicant's Name: Mary Bell Kirksey
 Property Address: 960 Selma Street
 Date of Approval: 10/26/05 asc

OLD BUSINESS:

- 1. 011-04/05-CA 1108-1110 Old Shell Road
Applicant: MHDC/Mobile Revolving Fund
Nature of Request: Change in plans before construction from a solid wall of glass to wood bulkhead with glass panels as per submitted plans.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

- 2. 083-04/05-CA 316 North Jackson Street/Lot 10, DeTonti Square
Applicant - Mr. and Mrs. Leon Raue
Nature of Request: Construct new one story residence as per submitted plans.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

- 3. 009-05/06-CA 805 Church Street
Applicant: John Peebles
Nature of Request: Renovate existing warehouse/office into warehouse/2 apartments. Construct new balcony on Church Street elevation; replace windows, construct wall, construct new garage, re-skin warehouse with new pre-finished metal panels. Install metal fence matching that used at the Mobile Cruise Ship Terminal.

APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. Certified Record attached.

NEW BUSINESS:

- 1. 010-05/06-CA 256 South Georgia Avenue
Applicant: Allen Perkins and Danielle Juzan
Nature of Request: Demolish non-contributing residential structure.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

- 2. 011-05/06-CA 255 Church Street
Applicant: Ramada Inn/ Vincent LaCoste, Contractor
Nature of Request: Continue removal of brick veneer and install EIFS system on south wall to match that on east wall. Paint to match existing.

DENIED. Certified Record attached.

- 3. 012-05/06-CA 110 Ryan Avenue
Applicant: Norman Wood
Nature of Request: Extend eaves 10"; extend roof to cover flat built-up roof; add dormers on south elevation; add bay window at east elevation and re-roof entire structure.

APPLICATION WITHDRAWN

4. 013-05/06-CA 21 South Lafayette Street
Applicant: Hunter and Lisa Compton/ Tom Karwinski, Arch.
Nature of Request: Remove existing rear deck and metal storage building; construct new addition and concrete patio around pool. Addition to measure 10' x 18'. Replace damaged privacy fence with 6' high wood privacy fence with 2' tall lattice panels at top.

APPROVED Certified Record attached.

5. 014-05/06-CA 120 Ryan Avenue
Applicant: Steven and Ellen Harvey
Nature of Request: Remove aluminum siding; re-roof; construct addition at rear. Raise existing garage 2' and make rear elevation changes, relocating as per site plan. Remove later screen porch addition from garage.
Construct 6' wood fence at north and east property lines.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

OTHER BUSINESS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Policy on metal roofs in the Districts.

Ed Hooker requested that staff be allowed to approved metal shingle roofs on a mid-month basis. The Board, however, reserved the right to review these applications. Chair Cindy Klotz stated that she requested a disclaimer to be included on the CoA for 204 S. Ann Street stating that the Board will look at this application and use it as a basis for further decisions on shingled metal roofs.

There being no further business, the Board adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

011-04/05-CA 1108-1110 Old Shell Road
Applicant: Mobile Historic Development Commission/Mobile Revolving Fund
Received: 11/18/04 Meeting Dates:
Submission Date + 45 Days: 1/22/05 1) 12/13/04 2) 10/13/05 3) 11/14/05

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Conflicts of Interest: David Tharp and Cameron Pfeiffer recused themselves from discussion and voting on the application and left the room when the agenda item was called. Devereaux Bemis had left the meeting before the agenda item was called.
Nature of Project: Change in plans before construction from a flat roof over the connector to a pitched roof as per submitted plans.

Additional Information:

The Mobile Revolving Fund acquired these two abandoned and derelict historic properties for the purpose of rehabilitating the structures and selling them to preserve the streetscape along Old Shell Road. Currently 1108 OSR is situated at the rear of the lot. Plans call for the structure to be moved forward 30’ and for the two structures to be connected and restored as one single family residence. Their proposal was approved by the Board. This request is to change the glass connector to one with the look of a more traditional porch enclosure.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES AND DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
3	General	Rehabilitate two historic structures

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

Based on the information contained in the application, in Staff’s judgment, the proposed restoration will not impair the historic integrity of the structures or the district.

- A. The following is a list of proposed changes to the structures:
1. move 1108 OSR forward 30’
 2. construct a connector between 1108 and 1110 OSR
 - a. connector to resemble glassed-in porch
 3. rehabilitate the structures as follows:
 - a. stabilize foundations and repair any structural damage

- b. repair/replace rotten siding as necessary
- c. repair/replace deteriorated windows
- d. repair/replace deteriorated exterior doors
- e. repair/replace deteriorated soffit, cornice and fascia
- f. repair/replace deteriorated or missing porch details
- g. re-roof entire structure
- h. install new concrete ribbon drive and gravel parking as per site plan
- i. landscape property to meet City of Mobile's Landscape Ordinance

Staff recommends approval as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

There was no one present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. There were no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record. The Board asked staff to clarify that only the connector was before the Board at this time and to clarify that the windows are to be made of wood with pilasters between. Staff answered in the affirmative. The other facts in the staff report were part of the original application and were already approved.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no additional Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board adopt the facts in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Douglas Kearley and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 11/14/06.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

083-04/05 – CA 316 North Jackson Street
Applicant: Mr. and Mrs. Leon Raue
Received: 8/8/05 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 9/23/05 1) 8/22/05 2) 10/17/05 3) 11/14/05

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: DeTonti Square Historic District
Classification: Non-Contributing (vacant lot/new construction)
Zoning: R-B, Residential Business
Nature of Project: Construct a wood frame with brick veneer, one story residence on a raised concrete slab.

History of the Project: At the September 22nd meeting of the ARB, this project was referred to the Design Review Committee. Architect Michael Mayberry developed four elevations. These were sent to the applicant for review. Of the four, the applicant picked the one that was then developed into the other 3 elevations. The revised elevations were distributed to the Design Review Committee, who determined that the proposed revised design would not impair the historic integrity of the neighborhood.

At the October 17th meeting of the ARB, the project was denied.

Project Synopsis:

The building site is located one lot south from the southeast corner of Adams and Jackson Streets. This parcel was recently purchased from the City of Mobile's Real Estate Department. The lot measures approximately 47'-7" wide by 120' deep. The building measures approximately 33' wide with a 9' wide recessed front porch, by approximately 67' long. The north setback is approximately 11' and the south setback is approximately 4'. The house faces west towards Jackson Street. The front wall of the main house is located at a distance of 20' from the sidewalk. The proposed construction is a one story brick veneer residence raised on a floating slab. The ground plan is rectangular in design. The proposed building has a 3' finished floor height above grade, and a first floor finished floor height of 10'. Overall ground to parapet height is 19'-9". The proposed roof is hipped. The proposed pitch of the main roof is 6/12. Proposed roofing material is asphalt/fiberglass shingles.

The following are proposed building materials:

- a. foundation –
 front porch - brick veneer
 main residence –brick veneer over wood frame with a soldier course water table
- b. façade – brick veneer with hardiboard trim;
- c. doors – wood & glass
- d. windows – wood casement, wood fixed, wood double hung
- e. porch details –
 front porch: Built-up wood columns
- 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

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
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

In Staff’s judgment, the proposed new construction is in compliance with the Design Review Guidelines for New Residential and Commercial Construction and will not impair the historic integrity of the Historic District.

3,I

I. Placement and Orientation:

- A. The Guidelines state that new construction should be placed on the lot so that setback and spacing approximate those of nearby historic buildings.
 1. Setbacks in the DeTonti Square Historic District range from buildings constructed at the sidewalk to buildings with a 5’-25’ setback.
 2. The proposed front setback for this building is approximately 20’ from the sidewalk/property line.
 3. The proposed front setback for this building is in line with the houses to on lots to the immediate south of the subject property.

3,II

II. Massing and Scale:

- A. The Guidelines state that new construction should reference the massing of forms of nearby historic buildings.
 1. This area of DeTonti Square has a high concentration of new construction and one moved structure on an adjacent lot.
 2. 1 – 3 story masonry structures are found in the DeTonti Square Historic District.
 3. The proposed building is a 1story brick veneer 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 DeTonti Square 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 a floating slab, 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. Parapet walls are common within the DeTonti Square Historic District.
 - 3. The proposed design features a front parapet wall.

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 windows is a common design element found throughout the Historic Districts.
 - 2. The use of wood French doors with transoms, is a common design element found throughout the Historic Districts.
 - 3. Wood windows and wood French doors are proposed for use in this 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 brick veneer and solid masonry 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 in the design of nearby historic buildings. Profiles and dimensions should be consistent with examples in the district.
 - 1. Examples of historic ornamentation include the use of a parapet wall.
 - 2. The use of hardiplank trim is a modern interpretation of a traditional building material and is allowed on new construction.
 - 3. The Board encourages use of modern materials and design methods in new construction.

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. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record. Staff introduced the application and explained the changes that had been made to the design as a response to Board comments from the previous meeting: the roof pitch had been reduced to 6/12; the parapet was brought forward in order that the porch was flush with the parapet, the foundation had been raised to 3 ft. and vents added to simulate true pier construction; the rear elevation has a full width porch; windows were modified and a diamond window reduced in size. The Board noted that handrails had been omitted from the steps and questioned the chimney material. Staff responded that the handrail had not been drawn in and that the chimney will be constructed of brick. The same brick will be used as previously submitted.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

David Tharp moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board adopts the facts in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Tilmon Brown and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the facts adopted 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 David Tharp and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 11/14/05.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

009-05/06 – CA 805 Church Street
Applicant: John Peebles
Received: 10/3/05 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 11/16/05 1) 10/17/05 2) 11/14/05 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East Historic District
Classification: Non-Contributing (concrete block warehouse)
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Conflicts of Interest: Douglas Kearley recused himself from discussion and voting on the application.
Nature of Project: Renovate existing warehouse/office into warehouse/2
apartments. Construct new balcony on Church Street elevation; replace
windows, construct wall, construct new garage, re-skin warehouse with new pre-
finished metal panels. Install metal fence matching that used at the Mobile
Cruise Ship Terminal.

Project Synopsis:

The existing building, the former Appliance Parts & Supply, is located on the south side of Church Street between South Bayou and South Jefferson Streets. To the east is Church Street Cemetery; across the street is the Big Zion AME Zion Church; to the south is the Crystal Ice warehouse complex; to the west is a vacant parcel. The building is constructed of plain and decorative painted concrete block. Plans call for the replacement of existing aluminum windows and plate glass windows with wood or aluminum clad casements. Existing doors are to be replaced with flush metal doors with glass block sidelights. The existing metal warehouse is to be divided into six separate storage units with roll-up doors and pedestrian doors. Plans call for re-sheathing the building with pre-finished metal panels.

The proposed garage has slab on grade foundation matching that of the existing structure. Proposed roofing material is metal panel.

The following are proposed building materials:

- a. foundation – slab on grade
- b. façade –
garage building – painted concrete block
existing warehouse – pre-finished metal panels
- c. doors – metal
- d. windows – wood or clad casement
- e. porch details –
6” cast iron pipe columns
horizontal balustrade between columns
- f. roof – metal panel and flat built-up roof

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	Construct new garage
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

In Staff's judgment, the proposed new construction is in compliance with the Design Review Guidelines for New Residential and Commercial Construction and will not impair the historic integrity of the Historic District.

3,I

I. Placement and Orientation:

- A. The Guidelines state that new construction should be placed on the lot so that setback and spacing approximate those of nearby historic buildings.
 - 1. The garage addition will occur at the right of the existing building in the same plane as the front of the existing building.

3,II

II. Massing and Scale:

- A. The Guidelines state that new construction and additions should reference the massing of forms of nearby historic buildings.
 - 1. The massing of the proposed addition is in keeping with the massing of the existing structure.
- B. The Guidelines state that new buildings and additions should have foundations similar in height to those of nearby historic buildings.
 - 1. Historic and non-historic commercial buildings and institutional buildings in the Church Street East Historic District utilize various types of foundation designs, from slab on grade to floating slab.
 - 2. The proposed garage foundation is designed using typical slab-on-grade construction.
- C. The Guidelines state that new construction and additions 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 Church Street East Historic District, but the most common are simple end gables and hips.
 - 2. The proposed garage design features a shed roof running from front to rear concealed behind a parapet.

3. The proposed replacement roof for the warehouse section is a pre-finished metal panel roof.

3, III

III. Façade Elements:

- A. The Guidelines state that new construction and additions should reflect the use of façade elements of nearby historic buildings.
 1. The use of casement windows is a common design element found in commercial and institutional structures throughout the Historic Districts.
 2. The use of metal and glass doors is a common design element found in commercial and institutional structures throughout the Historic Districts.
 3. Glass block is commonly associated with the age and style of the existing building.
 3. Casement windows, metal doors and glass block sidelights are proposed.

3, IV

IV. Materials and Ornamentation:

- A. The Guidelines provide a list of appropriate materials for compatible new construction and additions.
 1. There are a number of brick veneer and solid masonry structures remaining in the Church Street East Historic District.
 2. The existing building is constructed of decorative and plain painted concrete block.
 3. While the Guidelines state that concrete block is generally an unapproved material, in this case the existing building being renovated is constructed of concrete block.
 4. The proposed garage is to be attached to the existing structure and constructed of painted concrete block matching the existing building.
 5. The existing warehouse is currently sheathed in rusted, corrugated tin panels.
 5. The existing warehouse is to be re-sheathed in pre-finished metal panels.
- B. The Guidelines state that the degree of ornamentation used in new construction should be compatible with the degree of ornamentation found in the design of nearby historic buildings.
 1. Profiles and dimensions should be consistent with examples in the district.
 2. Proposed building details match those on the existing building.
 3. The Board encourages use of modern materials and design methods in new construction.

V. Fences, Walks and Gates:

- A. 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 District.”
 1. The proposed fence is a powder-coated woven wire fence identical to the one constructed around the Mobile Cruise Ship Facility.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

John Peebles was present to answer Board questions regarding his application. He stated he was in agreement with staff comments on his project.

In presenting the application, Staff explained that the zoning had been changed from R-1 to R-2 and B2 to accommodate the current program of apartments and adjacent storage facilities.

Additional documentation required by the Board including elevations and material samples had been submitted.

Several neighborhood residents were present to comment on the project.

Dandi Dolbear commented that the proposed wire fencing was little more than chicken wire and inappropriate adjacent to a residential neighborhood and a historic church. Pre-finished industrial sheathing was also inappropriate for a historic district. She also commented on the water run-off issue that is already a problem at 153 and 157 S. Jefferson. She stated that there had been gutters on the building at one time, but that they were in disrepair.

Celia Lewis commented that the development was not the luxury duplex apartment she had anticipated. The existing facility had been a blight on the neighborhood and the rezoning had fallen through the cracks. She does not anticipate filing an appeal. She also commented that traffic coming and going from the facility had never been a problem in the neighborhood.

Cindy Klotz explained to the audience that this is an existing building and, as such, would be looked at differently—that different standards exist for different types of buildings. She also stated that the Review Board does not deal with drainage issues and that Urban Development should be contacted regarding this matter.

Mr. Peebles explained that he will comply with any requirements placed on the property with regard to run-off. He further stated that a use variance and not a zoning change had been granted for the property. He also stated that he had looked for attractive industrial fencing and had decided on this type since it was used at the Mobile Landing facility. He had seen another attractive fencing used extensively in England at industrial sites, but that there is no distributor in the United States and the cost of shipping the material from England is prohibitive. He intends to have controlled access to the facility with an automatic gate. He will look for other fencing solutions.

Board members suggested a brick and iron fence similar to those at the Burger King or McDonald's sites. Mr. Peebles stated that they would be too expensive for the project since this type of project would not generate the cash flow of a McDonald's franchise.

The Board also questioned the retention of the concrete apron at the front of the facility and suggested that it be removed and the area landscaped. The lack of landscaping at the facility was also a concern of Board members

Mr. Peebles explained that street trees will be required and that they will be located on Jefferson Street.

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board commented that the items that seem to be in contention regarding the project are the fencing, the large expanse of concrete at Church Street and the lack of landscaping.

FINDING OF FACT

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board adopts the facts in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswalt and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

David Tharp moved that, based upon the facts adopted by the Board that the application does impair the historic integrity of the district. The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph and approved with Harris Oswalt voting in opposition.

Tilmon Brown moved that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued conditioned on the concrete being removed, the neutral ground being landscaped, and staff working with the owner on an appropriate fencing solution other than that in the application. Landscaping plan to be submitted to the Board. The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph and approved on a vote of 5 to 3.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 11/14/06.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

010-05/06 – CA 256 South Georgia Avenue
Applicant: Allen Perkins and Danielle Juzan
Received: 10/6/05 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 12/20/05 1) 11/14/05 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden Historic District
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Nature of the Project: Demolish existing deteriorated residential structure.

STAFF REPORT

Section 10 of the Preservation Ordinance prohibits the demolition or relocation of “any property within a historic district unless the Board finds that the removal or relocation of such buildings will not be detrimental to the historical and architectural character of the district...” In making this determination, the Board must examine a number of factors set out in the ordinance, each of which is discussed below:

- A. Historic or Architectural Significance
 - 1. The Oakleigh Garden Historic District was created in 1972.
 - 2. 256 South Georgia Avenue is a one story frame structure sheathed in asbestos shingles.
 - 3. 256 South Georgia Avenue is not a contributing structure within the Oakleigh Garden Historic District.
 - 4. The structure has no historic or architectural significance.

- B. Importance to the Integrity of the District
 - 1. Mobile’s Oakleigh Garden District neighborhood is a large, late 19th-century/early 20th-century suburban neighborhood...The majority of the development in this district...dates from the 1870s and 1880s through World War I. Within this large grouping are examples of various Victorian styles as well as large numbers of bungalows...Between 1830 and World War II, the district developed as a solidly middle-class residential neighborhood. The residential character is evident in the size and massing of building form that represents adaptations to local climate considerations. In response to these influences, a group of buildings evolved that maintain a compactness of size, massing and consistent program while responding to a variety of stylistic influences...

- C. Ability to Reproduce Historic Structures
 - 1. The type and quality of the materials used in the construction of 256 South Georgia Avenue are readily available.
 - 2. The structure dates from the second half of the 20th century.

- D. Ensemble of Historic Buildings Creating a Neighborhood
 - 1. The subject property is not typical of the residences along South Georgia Avenue or the District.
 - 2. Removal of this residence would not erode the Oakleigh Garden Historic District.
- E. Proposed Redevelopment Plans for the Site
 - 1. The application states that the site will be cleared of building debris and grassed.
- F. Effect of Proposed Project on the Oakleigh Garden Historic District.
 - 1. The removal of 256 South Georgia Avenue would not degrade the streetscape along this section of South Georgia Avenue.
 - 2. The removal of 256 South Georgia Avenue would not impair the architectural, cultural, historical, social, aesthetic and environmental character of the Oakleigh Garden Historic District.
- G. Content of Application
 - 1. Property information:
 - a. 256 South Georgia Avenue was acquired by the applicant on June 30, 2005 for \$75,000.
 - b. The applicant states that the property is in deplorable condition.
 - c. The property is currently unoccupied.
 - d. The lot measures 52' x 125'.
 - e. The Historic District Overlay Ordinance would allow new construction with setbacks matching that of surrounding properties.
 - f. Probate records note that the property, “ a wood frame with asbestos siding single family residence” was constructed ca. 1950.
 - 2. Alternatives Considered
 - a. The applicant states that no alternatives have been considered to retain the residence.
 - 3. Sale of Property by Current Owner
 - a. Information presented in the application notes that 256 South Georgia Avenue has not been listed for sale.
 - 4. Financial Proof
 - a. No financial proof was included with the application.

Based on the above facts, Staff recommends approval of the request to demolish.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Danielle Juzan and Dr. Perkins were present to discuss the application. They commented that the lot would be landscaped and, should they decide to build on the lot, they would return to the Board with plans.

Staff explained that the owners could build another house on the site since the lot meets single family residential size requirements.

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

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

Harris Oswalt moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and at the meeting, that the Board adopts the facts in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Douglas Kearley and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 11/14/06.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

011-05/06-CA 255 Church Street
Applicant: Ramada Inn/ Vincent Lacoste, Contractor
Received: 9/21/05 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 11/6/05 1) 11/14/05 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East Historic District
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-4, General Business
Nature of Project: Continue removal of brick veneer and install EIFS
system on south wall to match that on east wall. Paint to match existing.

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

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
3	Exterior Materials and Finishes	Remove remaining brick veneer and install EIFS system

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

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff's judgment, the proposed work complies with the Design Review Guidelines and will not impair the historic integrity of the structure and the district.

- A. The Guidelines state that “While often an inappropriate material, EIFS may be appropriate in some circumstances and its use will be reviewed on a case by case basis .”
1. The Ramada Inn currently has a brick veneer and EIFS system exterior.
 2. The Ramada Inn is a non-contributing and non-historic structure.
 3. The area in question is concrete block construction with recycled brick veneer.
 4. The existing complex utilizes stucco or EIFS as the main design material, with brick being used in areas to accent.
 5. The particular damaged area was at the location of an exterior stair well.
 6. Winds from Hurricane Katrina knocked off a good portion of brick veneer on the south elevation.
 7. The east elevation is sheathed in EIFS.
 8. The owner/contractor is requesting to go back with EIFS instead of replacing the brick.

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. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record. Tilmon Brown felt that the brick softened the look of the building and was appropriate with the ironwork on the hotel. Staff explained that brick is present where there is a stairwell.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph moved that based upon the facts adopted by the Board that the application does impair the historic integrity of the district according to the Guidelines and the application be denied. The motion was seconded by Tilmon Brown and approved with Kearley and Tharp voting in opposition to the motion. Applicant can obtain a permit to repair the wall to pre-hurricane condition on a mid-month approval from staff.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

013-05/06-CA 21 South Lafayette
Applicant: Hunter and Lisa Compton/Tom Karwinski, Architect
Received: 10/31/05 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 1/14/06 1) 11/14/05 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Nature of Project: Remove existing rear deck and metal storage building; construct new addition and concrete patio around pool. Addition to measure 10’ x 18’. Replace damaged privacy fence with 6’ high wood privacy fence with 2’ tall lattice panels at top.

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

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
3	Additions	Construct Rear Addition

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

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff’s judgment, the proposed work complies with the Design Review Guidelines and will not impair the historic integrity of the structure and the district.

Project Synopsis: The applicants are requesting to remove an existing wood deck and deteriorated metal storage building. This will make way for the construction of a 10’ x 18’ rear addition as per submitted plans.

A. Rear Addition:

The proposed construction is in compliance with Section 3 of the Design Review Guidelines.

1. The main structure is a one story wood frame Bungalow residence.
2. The proposed addition occurs at the rear of the residence at the location of an existing wood deck.
3. The proposed addition stays within the confines of the current left and right building lines.

4. The proposed addition copies the pitch of the existing roof, and does not exceed the existing ridge height.
5. Windows from the original house are to be reused in the addition.
6. There will be skylights over each entry.
7. Facts 2-6 are in compliance with numbers 2, 9 and 10 of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, as follows:
 - a. Number 2 –
The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alterations of the features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.
 - b. Number 9 -
New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.
 - c. Number 10 –
New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.
8. The proposed concrete patio will be placed in the location of an existing metal storage shed.
9. The proposed concrete patio will not be visible from the street.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Tom Karwinski was present to answer Board questions concerning the application. He explained that wood siding would be used. The fence will replace a hurricane damaged 6 ft. privacy fence and will have two feet of lattice on top.

The Board asked staff to read the guideline concerning fencing which stated that solid board fences should not exceed 6 ft. except adjacent to commercial sites.

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

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

On the basis of discussion with Mr. Karwinski, Bunky Ralph asked to add fact 10. The fence is a 6 ft. high solid board fence with 2 ft. of lattice on top, for a total of 8 ft.

FINDING OF FACT

Harris Oswald moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board adopts the facts in the staff report adding fact 10. above. The motion was seconded by Douglas Kearley and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

David Tharp moved that, based upon the facts adopted by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines and that a

Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswalt and approved with Ralph and Pfeiffer voting in opposition.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 11/14/06.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

014-05/06-CA 120 Ryan Avenue
Applicant: Steven and Ellen Harvey
Received: 10/31/05 **Meeting Date (s):**
 Submission Date + 45 Days: 1/14/06 1) 11/14/05 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Ashland Place Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Conflicts of Interest: Douglas Kearley recused himself from discussion and voting on the application.
Nature of Project: Remove aluminum siding; re-roof; construct addition at rear. Raise existing garage 2’ and relocate as per site plan. Remove later screen porch addition from garage. Construct 6’ wood fence at north and east property lines.

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

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
3	Accessory Structures	Relocate and Raise Existing Garage
3	Additions	Construct Rear Addition

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

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff’s judgment, the proposed work complies with the Design Review Guidelines and will not impair the historic integrity of the structure and the district.

Project Synopsis: The applicants are requesting to relocate the existing historic garage and add approximately 4’-6” to the front and 2’ to the height to accommodate larger vehicles. Also, the applicants are requesting to add a rear addition measuring approximately 26’ x 38’.

B. Rear Addition:

The proposed construction is in compliance with Section 3 of the Design Review Guidelines.

1. The main structure is a one and one-half story wood frame Colonial Revival residence.

2. The proposed addition occurs at the rear of the residence.
3. The proposed addition stays within the confines of the current left and right building lines.
4. The proposed addition copies the pitch of the existing roof, and does not exceed the existing ridge height.
5. Windows from the original house are to be reused in the addition.
6. Wood French doors from the original house are to be reused in the addition.
7. Facts 2-6 are in compliance with numbers 2, 9 and 10 of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, as follows:
 - a. Number 2 –
The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alterations of the features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.
 - b. Number 9 -
New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.
 - c. Number 10 –
New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

B. Garage Alterations:

The proposed construction is not in compliance with Section 3 of the Design Review Guidelines.

1. The existing garage is a contributing historic structure constructed at or around the same time as the 1938 residence.
2. The Ashland Place neighborhood was developed as an early streetcar suburb along the Springhill Avenue trolley line.
3. Automobiles were an important element in the layout of the neighborhood, and many of the houses were constructed with free-standing garages and carriage houses.
4. The National Register Nomination lists 24 contributing outbuildings in the Ashland Place Historic District.
5. The existing garage retains its original design, with the exception of a screened porch addition to the south, which is to be removed.
6. The proposed design calls for extending the garage opening 4'-6" forward to allow for larger vehicles.
7. The proposed design calls for the addition of two feet to the base to raise the height of the garage.
8. There is no delineation between the main structure and the new 2' base.

C. Fencing:

The proposed construction is in compliance with Section 3 of the Design Review Guidelines.

1. The main structure is a one and a half story Colonial Revival wood frame residence.
2. The proposed wood fence is 6' in height.

3. The proposed fence is to be located across the rear property line and along the north property line, as per submitted site plan.
Staff recommends approval of the addition as submitted.

Staff recommends that the addition to the garage be constructed at the rear of the structure so the front elevation remains unchanged from the ca. 1938 structure. Staff further recommends that there be a delineation between the extra 2' of height and the original garage.

Staff recommends approval of the fence as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Harvey was present. He had no additional comments on the application to the Board. Staff reported that comments in the staff report regarding the inappropriateness of alterations to the garage had been addressed by Mr. Harvey's architect in revised drawings. A bump out to accommodate the size of modern automobiles will occur on the rear and Dutch lap siding will be used on the additional 2 ft of height leaving the original garage in tact. Dutch lap siding is an element contemporary with this period.

There was no one else to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

Bunky Ralph felt that several of the facts should be altered to reflect the modified garage drawings.

The Chair suggested:

"6. The proposed design calls for extending the garage opening 4'6" toward the rear to allow for larger vehicles.

8. There is delineation between the main structure and the new 2' base through the use of Dutch lap siding as per attached revised plans.

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and at the public hearing, that the Board adopts the facts in the staff report with revisions to numbers 6 and 8 as above. The motion was seconded by Tilmon Brown and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

David Tharp moved that, based upon the facts adopted 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: 11/14/06.