

**CITY OF MOBILE
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD**

Minutes of the Meeting
November 27, 2006

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:04 p.m. by Chair, Bunky Ralph.
MHDC Staff member, Aileen de la Torre, called the roll as follows:

Members Present: Tilmon Brown, Douglas Kearley, Harris Oswalt, Bunky Ralph, David Tharp, Jim Wagoner.

Members Absent: Robert Brown, Cameron Pfeiffer, Joe Sackett.

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>
Carlos Gant	2970 Cottage Hill Rd.	125-130-06-CA
Patti and Joe Schilling	1112 Palmetto Street	122-06-CA
David L. Thomas, Sr.	263 S. Cedar Street	119 & 120-06-CA
Vanessa Jackson	151 S. Claiborne Street	125-130-06-CA
Stevens Gregory	151 S. Claiborne Street	125-130-06-CA
Jim Mitchell	Sign A Rama	123-06-CA

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

Jim Wagoner 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:** Wanda Cochran
Property Address: 255 North Conception Street
Date of Approval: October 31, 2006
Replace 18" retaining wall to match existing.
- 2. Applicant's Name:** Wendell Quimby
Property Address: 609 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: November 2, 2006
Paint building in existing color (Mission Sand). Repair/replace existing flat built-up roof to match existing.
- 3. Applicant's Name:** TCM Remodelers
Property Address: 260 St. Anthony Street
Date of Approval: November 2, 2006
Remove non-historic wooden lineage at top of building to return to original historic stucco surface. Repair stucco as needed and paint building in existing color scheme.
- 4. Applicant's Name:** George Runyan
Property Address: 1322 Old Shell Road
Date of Approval: November 2, 2006
Rebuild front porch to match existing in materials, profile and dimension. Repaint to match existing color scheme. (This COA replaces COA dated 3-28-06.)

5. **Applicant's Name:** George Runyan
Property Address: 1320 Old Shell Road
Date of Approval: November 2, 2006
 Rebuild front porch to match existing in materials, profile and dimension. Repaint to match existing color scheme. (This COA replaces COA dated 3-28-06.)

6. **Applicant's Name:** Cummings Architecture
Property Address: 106 Providence Street
Date of Approval: November 3, 2006
 Install 3' picket fence with pointed top around the A/C equipment at the rear of the Sisters of Mercy building. Wood will be unpainted and pressure treated.

7. **Applicant's Name:** Bryan Pape/Watson Contracting Company
Property Address: 210 South Cedar Street
Date of Approval: November 3, 2006
 Repair rotten wood as necessary with new wood to match existing in profile and dimension. Repair railing spindles as necessary with matching spindles. Paint exterior in the existing color scheme.

8. **Applicant's Name:** Kevin Latimer
Property Address: 1250 Old Shell Road
Date of Approval: November 6, 2006
 Install new 3-tab shingle roof, gray in color.

9. **Applicant's Name:** Andre Baskin
Property Address: 5 North Pine Street
Date of Approval: November 8, 2006
 Construct 10'x5' storage enclosure at rear of property. Materials and paint will match house.

10. **Applicant's Name:** Affordable Roofing/Suzette Morris
Property Address: 25 Houston Street
Date of Approval: November 9, 2006
 Redeck and reroof using charcoal fiberglass shingle roof to match existing.

11. **Applicant's Name:** Kiker Roofing Company
Property Address: 1717 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: November 13, 2006
 Install built-up bitumen flat roof to match existing.

NOTICES OF VIOLATION and MUNICIPAL OFFENSE TICKETS

No NoVs or MoTs were written during this time period.

OLD BUSINESS:

1. **110-06-CA:** 1200 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Jarrod White
Request: Install metal roll up garage doors squaring the openings and removing angled brackets.

APROVED. Certified Record attached.

NEW BUSINESS

1. 119-06-CA: 505 St. Francis Street
Applicant: Della Adams
Request: Demolish residence and sell vacant lot.

DENIED. Certified Record attached.

2. 120-06-CA: 507 St. Francis Street
Applicant: Della Adams
Request: Demolish residence and sell vacant lot.

DENIED. Certified Record attached.

3. 121-06-CA: 14 Macy Place
Applicant: Christopher Hollingsworth
Request: Reclad roof with metal, 3/4” standing rib vertical panels in Autumn Red.

DENIED. Certified Record attached.

4. 122-06-CA: 1112 Palmetto Street
Applicant: Patti and Joe Schilling
Request: Enlarge existing rear addition. Replace existing deck with new deck.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

5. 123-06-CA: 1616 Government Street
Applicant: Dollar Express/Sign-A-Rama
Request: Attach a sign to the building consisting of acrylic, burgundy-colored individual letters. The sign will be unlit.

DENIED. Certified Record attached.

6. 124-06-CA: 1306 Chamberlain Avenue
Applicant: Lewis Burlison
Request: Replace old and damaged asbestos shingles on roof with 5V crimp metal panels in Evergreen to match trim.

APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. Certified record attached.

The Board adjourned and reconvened as the Design Committee. Recommendations were made to the applicant that would make the proposed buildings more compatible with historic precedents. The recommendations of the Design Committee apply to all submissions. Recommendations attached.

1. 125-06-CA: Façade One – Lot 322 on Jefferson Street
Applicant: Mobile Housing Board/Watermark Design
Request: New single resident house.

2. 126-06-CA: Façade Two – Lot 321 on Jefferson Street
Applicant: Mobile Housing Board/Watermark Design
Request: New single resident house.

- 3. 127-06-CA:** Façade Three – Lot 320 on Jefferson Street, Lot 6 on Scott Street
Applicant: Mobile Housing Board/Watermark Design
Request: New single resident house.
- 4. 128-06-CA:** Façade Four – Lot 7 on Monroe Street, Lot 5 on Scott Street
Applicant: Mobile Housing Board/Watermark Design
Request: New single resident house.
- 5. 129-06-CA:** Façade Five – Lots 248, 250 and 254 on Monroe Street
Applicant: Mobile Housing Board/Watermark Design
Request: New single resident house.
- 6. 130-06-CA:** Façade Six – Lot 4 and 8 on Monroe Street, Lot 9 on Scott Street
Applicant: Mobile Housing Board/Watermark Design
Request: New single resident house.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

110-06-CA: 1200 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Jarrod White
Received: 10/03/06 (+45 Days: 11/17/06)
Meeting: 10/16/06; 11/27/06

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

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

BUILDING HISTORY

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

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

1. Install New Garage Doors
 - A. Currently, this garage apartment belongs to 1200 Dauphin Street. There are four large chamfered garage door bays on the first floor spaced at even intervals on either side of the center door. Items stored within these bays are visible from the street. Garage doors are the norm for buildings of any age, and having open bays creates visual clutter.
 - B. The Design Review Guidelines state that “wood or metal garage doors should be simple in design and compatible with the main building.”
 - C. Enclose garage bays with metal Series 281 doors. They will be 8’ wide on the west side and 7’ wide on the east side to fit in openings and will have a simple 2 panel design. The chamfered bays will need to be squared to fit the doors.
 - D. Paint doors same color as building trim.

RECOMMENDATION

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

The applicant was present to discuss the application. He explained that he would install metal garage doors in a simpler pattern with only 2 panels and square off the openings. He stated that there will be a transom with glass and handles would be attached to the outside. The garage probably dates from WWII and is later than the house. Board members asked the applicant about the brackets. He stated they would be removed.

The Board also questioned the use of glass in the transom. During the discussion, a consensus arose among the Board members that the arches were inappropriate to the building and the house. The owner indicated that he would follow the wishes of the Board and there was agreement that rectangular windows would be used.

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

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no additional Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

Tilmon Brown moved, that based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report adding that the windows in the doors would be rectangular. The motion was seconded by David Tharp and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 11/27/07.

APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS CERTIFIED RECORD

119-06-CA: 505 St. Francis Street
Applicant: Della Adams
Received: 11/02/06 (+45 Days: 12/17/06)
Meeting: 11/27/06

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Demolish residence and sell vacant lot.

BUILDING HISTORY

This one-story frame dwelling was built circa 1900 in what was once a vibrant residential district. It sits across from the 1878 Hunter House, which is a National Register property, and next to the 1834 Dade House.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

- (a) *Required findings; demolition/relocation.* The board shall not grant certificates of appropriateness for the demolition or relocation of any property within a historic district unless the board finds that the removal or relocation of such building will not be detrimental to the historical or architectural character of the district. In making this determination, the board shall consider:
- (1) The historic or architectural significance of the structure;
 - (2) The importance of the structure to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;
 - (3) The difficulty or the impossibility of reproducing the structure because of its design, texture, material, detail or unique location;
 - (4) Whether the structure is one of the last remaining examples of its kind in the neighborhood, the county, or the region or is a good example of its type, or is part of an ensemble of historic buildings creating a neighborhood;
 - (5) Whether there are definite plans for reuse of the property if the proposed demolition is carried out, and what effect such plans will have on the architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological, social, aesthetic, or environmental character of the surrounding area.
- (b) *Content of applications.* All applications to demolish or remove a structure in a historic district shall contain the following minimum information:
- (1) The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
 - (2) The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
 - (3) Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
 - (4) Description of the options currently held for the purchase of such property, including the price received for such option, the conditions placed upon such option and the date of expiration of such option;
 - (5) Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
 - (6) Financial proof of the ability to complete the replacement project, which may include but not be limited to a performance bond, a letter of credit, a trust for completion of improvements, or a letter of commitment from a financial institution; and

- (7) Such other information as may reasonably be required by the board.
- (c) *Post demolition or relocation plans required.* In no event shall the board entertain any application for the demolition or relocation of any historic property unless the applicant also presents at the same time the post-demolition or post-relocation plans for the site.

STAFF REPORT

A. Demolish Residence

1. Currently, 505 St. Francis Street is in a decrepit state. The City recently declared the property a public nuisance, and it has directed that the owner repair or demolish the building.
2. In considering demolitions, the Design Review Guidelines refer to **Section 44-79 of the Mobile City Code**, discussed above. There are a number of points which have not been satisfied:
 - a. The owner has not considered any adaptive uses for the building.
 - b. The owner has not attempted to sell the building.
 - c. The owner has not considered other alternatives to demolition.
 - d. The owner has not made any replacement construction plans.

B. Sell Vacant Lot

RECOMMENDATION

The current absentee owner has left this building abandoned for a number of years, having made no attempt to improve upon or reuse the property or sell the residence. In addition, there are no definite post-demolition plans.

Although the building is in an extreme state of neglect, it is one of the few residences left in this once thriving neighborhood. Allowing it to remain and be restored gives context to both the Hunter House across the street and the Dade House next door. It also avoids yet another empty lot, which the MHDC is working hard to prevent. Additionally, new businesses and residents in downtown Mobile are helping to revive the area.

As a contributing building to the Lower Dauphin Street Historic District, the demolition or removal of this building would result not only in an impairment of the historic structure, but also the historic district. Staff recommends denial of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

The applicant's representative, David Thomas Sr., was present to discuss the application. He explained that if the Board ruled against the applicant's request to demolish the building, that the property would be appraised immediately and listed for sale with a real estate company. He asked if this action would slow down legal action against the owner.

Staff responded that the process would be slowed, but not indefinitely. There should be no further citations after the property is marketed.

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

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

David Tharp moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does impair the historic integrity of the structure and the district according to the Guidelines and that the application be denied. The motion was seconded by Douglas Kearley and unanimously approved.

APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS CERTIFIED RECORD

120-06-CA: 507 St. Francis Street
Applicant: Della Adams
Received: 11/06/06 (+45 Days: 12/21/06)
Meeting: 11/27/06

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Demolish residence.

BUILDING HISTORY

This one-story frame dwelling was built circa 1900 as a small, two-story duplex in what was once a vibrant residential district. According to neighbors, the second story was lost in Hurricane Frederick. It sits across from the 1878 Hunter House, which is a National Register property.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

- (a) *Required findings; demolition/relocation.* The board shall not grant certificates of appropriateness for the demolition or relocation of any property within a historic district unless the board finds that the removal or relocation of such building will not be detrimental to the historical or architectural character of the district. In making this determination, the board shall consider:
- (1) The historic or architectural significance of the structure;
 - (2) The importance of the structure to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;
 - (3) The difficulty or the impossibility of reproducing the structure because of its design, texture, material, detail or unique location;
 - (4) Whether the structure is one of the last remaining examples of its kind in the neighborhood, the county, or the region or is a good example of its type, or is part of an ensemble of historic buildings creating a neighborhood;
 - (5) Whether there are definite plans for reuse of the property if the proposed demolition is carried out, and what effect such plans will have on the architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological, social, aesthetic, or environmental character of the surrounding area.
- (b) *Content of applications.* All applications to demolish or remove a structure in a historic district shall contain the following minimum information:
- (1) The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
 - (2) The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
 - (3) Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
 - (4) Description of the options currently held for the purchase of such property, including the price received for such option, the conditions placed upon such option and the date of expiration of such option;
 - (5) Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;

- (6) Financial proof of the ability to complete the replacement project, which may include but not be limited to a performance bond, a letter of credit, a trust for completion of improvements, or a letter of commitment from a financial institution; and
 - (7) Such other information as may reasonably be required by the board.
- (d) *Post demolition or relocation plans required.* In no event shall the board entertain any application for the demolition or relocation of any historic property unless the applicant also presents at the same time the post-demolition or post-relocation plans for the site.

STAFF REPORT

A. Demolish Residence

1. Currently, 507 St. Francis Street is in a decrepit state. The City recently declared the property a public nuisance, and it has directed that the owner repair or demolish the building.
2. In considering demolitions, the Design Review Guidelines refer to **Section 44-79 of the Mobile City Code**, discussed above. There are a number of points which have not been satisfied:
 - a. The owner has not considered any adaptive uses for the building.
 - b. The owner has not attempted to sell the building.
 - c. The owner has not considered other alternatives to demolition.
 - d. The owner has not made any replacement construction plans.

B. Sell Vacant Lot

RECOMMENDATION

The current absentee owner has left this building abandoned for a number of years, having made no attempt to improve upon or reuse the property or sell the residence. Previous correspondence with the property owner resulted in no action. In addition, there are no definite post-demolition plans.

Although the building is in an extreme state of neglect, it is one of the few residences left in this once thriving neighborhood. Allowing it to remain and be restored gives context to the Hunter House across the street. It also avoids yet another empty lot, which the MHDC is working hard to prevent. Additionally, new businesses and residents in downtown Mobile are helping to revive the area.

As a contributing building to the Lower Dauphin Street Historic District, the demolition or removal of this building would result not only in an impairment of the historic structure, but also the historic district. Staff recommends denial of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

The applicant's representative, David Thomas Sr., was present to discuss the application. He explained that if the Board ruled against the applicant's request to demolish the building, that the property would be appraised immediately and listed for sale with a real estate company. He asked if this action would slow down legal action against the owner.

Staff responded that the process would be slowed, but not indefinitely. There should be no further citations after the property is marketed.

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

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

David Tharp moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does impair the historic integrity of the structure and the district according to the Guidelines and that the application be denied. The motion was seconded by Douglas Kearley and unanimously approved.

APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS CERTIFIED RECORD

121-06-CA: 14 Macy Place
Applicant: Christopher Hollingsworth
Received: 11/06/06 (+45 Days: 12/21/06)
Meeting: 11/27/06

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Reclad roof with metal, ¾” standing rib vertical panels in Autumn Red.

BUILDING HISTORY

This 1925 frame Bungalow was built on speculation by Mr. Jacob Van Der Sys.

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. Currently, 14 Macy Place has a black, Owens Corning, 20-year fiberglass roof.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state that a roof “is one of the most dominant features of a building [and] materials should be appropriate.”
- C. The property owner is proposing to replace the current shingles with metal, ¾” standing rib vertical panels in Autumn Red.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff has received several calls in opposition to the roof from other residents on Macy Place.

It is common for roofs of historic homes to be reclad in the styles and materials popular at each time. Wood shingles, for example, gave way to asbestos shingles and so forth. The current trend in Mobile is to clad roofs with metal in an assortment of colors. According to the Design Review Guidelines, metal is an appropriate roof material in historic districts, although roof colors are not addressed.

While some architectural styles lend themselves to variety, others do not. Bungalow residences typically had dimensional shingles to give them texture, which would not be recreated with metal panels. Although it was not unusual for Bungalows to have colored roofs, staff is not aware of any remaining examples. Colored roofs are currently rare in the historic districts.

Staff recommends denial of the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Neither the applicant nor his representative was present to discuss the application.

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

Staff reported several calls from the public in opposition to the application based upon both the color and material of the proposed roof.

There were no comments from City departments to read into the record.

Board members confirmed with Staff that it had not approved metal roofing in this pattern, but had routinely approved 5 v crimp and standing seam.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

By mutual agreement, the Board added the following fact to the staff report.

“D. Several calls opposing the material and color of the proposed metal roofing were received by Staff.”

Douglas Kearley 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 David Tharp and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

David Tharp moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does impair the historic integrity of the structure and the district according to the Guidelines and that it be denied. The motion was seconded by Jim Wagoner and approved unanimously.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

122-06-CA: 1112 Palmetto Street
Applicant: Patti and Joe Schilling
Received: 11/06/06 (+45 Days: 12/21/06)
Meeting: 11/27/06

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Enlarge existing rear addition. Replace existing deck with new deck.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to a report written in 1981, this three-story frame residence, built circa 1906, is “an interesting example of the early 20th c. domestic architecture that used an eclectic approach to its design rather than following a formal style...the outstanding aspect of the design of this house is its use of a variety of window types.”

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. Enlarge Existing Rear Addition

1. Currently, there is a shed roof extension at the rear of the residence that houses a small kitchen. It has a door leading to the rear deck and windows of various sizes. The extension sits slightly left of center on the rear elevation.
2. The Design Review Guidelines state, “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.” The plan includes the following:
 - a. Extend rear addition 9’x24’, centering it with the rear elevation.
 - b. Install two Spanish cedar French doors with clear tempered glass at the center and right side of the rear elevation. Each door will have a 5’x1’ wood fixed transom window.
 - c. Install trim and 5’x1’ fixed transom window at the left side of the rear elevation that mimics the French doors.
 - d. Remove the existing wood window on the right side of the main rear elevation and fill in with siding to match existing.
 - e. Relocate the wood windows on the new addition. The removed window will be reused on the addition.
 - f. Reuse existing siding and corner boards and install new siding to match.

- g. Paint to match existing.
- B. Replace Existing Deck With New Deck
 - 1. Currently, there is a non-historic multi-level deck attached to the rear addition.
 - 2. The Design Review Guidelines state, “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.” The plan includes the following:
 - a. Remove the existing multi-level deck.
 - b. Attach a 14’x24’ wood deck on 6’x6’ wood posts with wood lattice infill to the new rear addition.
 - c. Build three wood staircases, one at each elevation, per MHDC specifications.
 - d. Install a wood handrail per MHDC specifications.
- C. Reconfigure Roof On Addition
 - 1. Currently, there is a shed roof on the rear addition on the east side of the building.
 - 2. The Design Review Guidelines state, “historic roof forms, as well as the original pitch...should be maintained. Materials should be appropriate to the form and pitch and color.” The plan includes the following:
 - a. Replace existing shed roof with a new gable roof. It will have gable returns to match existing gables.
 - b. Install dimensional fiberglass/asphalt shingles on 15# felt (6 nails per shingle) on 5/8” Cox plywood 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. Rear additions are common and typical alterations to historic homes. However, staff recommends not mimicking the French doors on the left side of the elevation (Item A.2.c), but rather installing only the transom. Staff feels that the proposed improvements in Item B 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. Also, the plan of the new deck should blend in better with the style of the building. Staff feels the proposed improvements in Item C will negatively impact the building by creating a different pitch that would look out of place with the pitch of the original house roof. Staff recommends maintaining a shed roof on the proposed addition.

Staff recommends approval of the application providing the applicant maintain the current roof form.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

The applicants were present to discuss the application. Mrs. Schilling explained that the roof as drawn will allow for the retention of three large windows that will provide light into her husband’s art studio. In addition, the height of the roof will allow them to maintain the 11 ft. height of the kitchen through the addition.

The Board questioned the applicants about the use of door trim where there is no door and suggested the elimination of this feature. The applicants agreed to this modification.

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. After hearing comments by the applicants, Staff had no issue with the roof as proposed. Staff also had no issue with the deck.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

The Board added the following fact to the staff report A 2 h. “Trim around a non-existent door will be eliminated.”

David Tharp 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 Tilmon Brown and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

David Tharp 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 Tilmon Brown and approved with Bunky Ralph voting in opposition.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 11/27/07.

APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS CERTIFIED RECORD

123-06-CA: 1616 Government Street
Applicant: Dollar Express/Sign-A-Rama
Received: 11/08/06 (+45 Days: 12/23/06)
Meeting: 11/27/06

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way Perimeter
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-3
Project: Attach a sign to the building consisting of acrylic, burgundy-colored individual letters. The sign will be unlit.

BUILDING HISTORY

This one-story, L-shaped, masonry commercial building was built in 1984. It has housed a number of retail businesses, including a pawnshop.

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. Currently, this non-contributing building houses a Dollar Express and a Dominoes Pizza. It is a simple box with large storefront windows and there are no defining architectural features.
- B. The Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile state that signs shall “not obscure the architectural features or openings of a building...shall relate to the design of the principal building on the property...shall be in proportion to the building and the neighboring structures and signs...should match the historic materials of the building...[and] shall use focused, low intensity illumination.”
- C. It is necessary to note that this sign has already been placed. The applicants received a Notice of Violation from Urban Development for lack of permits. The sign consists of acrylic, burgundy-colored individual letters and is unlit.

RECOMMENDATION

The Sign Design Guidelines do not allow plastic signs in historic districts and the ARB has maintained this rule in its decisions. However, staff feels that should the Board allow plastic, this is the appropriate place. A brief window survey of signs along Government from Broad Street to the Loop found the Dollar Express sign to be among the least intrusive. There is also another plastic sign on the building. Additionally, this is a modern structure that likely would have always had a sign made of non-historic material such as plastic.

Staff recommends approval of the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

A representative from Sign a Rama was present to discuss the application. He explained that all window signage had been removed and that the business owner wanted to retain his existing wall signage. The existing sign is an unlit acrylic sign 58.4 sq. ft in size. It was his opinion that the sign is the least intrusive sign in the area. The material will not fade in sunlight.

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 building was a modern building dating from 1984.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed whether it had ever approved a plastic sign and considered that the sign did not meet the Sign Guidelines. Metal letters, wood letters of a painted wall sign would meet the material Guidelines.

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 Jim Wagoner and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Harris Oswalt moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does impair the historic integrity of the district according to the Guidelines and that the application be denied. The motion was seconded by Jim Wagoner and approved on a 3 to 2 vote.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

124-06-CA: 1306 Chamberlain Avenue
Applicant: Lewis Burleson
Received: 11/13/06 (+45 Days: 12/28/06)
Meeting: 11/27/06

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Replace asbestos shingles on roof with 5V crimp metal panels in Evergreen to match trim.

BUILDING HISTORY

This two-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. Currently, 1306 Chamberlain Avenue has a diamond-shaped asbestos shingle roof.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state that a roof “is one of the most dominant features of a building [and] materials should be appropriate.”
- C. The property owner is proposing to replace the current shingles with metal, 5V crimp vertical panels in Evergreen to match the trim.

RECOMMENDATION

It is common for roofs of historic homes to be re clad in the styles and materials popular at each time. Wood shingles, for example, gave way to asbestos shingles and so forth. The current trend in Mobile is to clad roofs with metal in an assortment of colors. While some architectural styles lend themselves to variety, others do not. This residence is a two-story, side hall type with no elements to identify it with a particular style. It also has a medium-pitch hipped roof that should minimize any impact.

According to the Design Review Guidelines, metal is an appropriate roof material in historic districts, although roof colors are not addressed. Colored roofs are currently rare in historic districts.

Staff recommends approval of the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

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

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board considered that the 5 v crimp would not be very visible since the pitch of the roof was shallow. The Board noted that it had not approved colored 5v crimp roofs and that a galvanized finish would provide the owner with greater flexibility should he decide to change paint colors.

FINDING OF FACT

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswalt and failed on a 3 to 2 vote. Jim Wagoner 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 5 v crimp being silver in color. The motion was seconded by David Tharp and approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 11/27/07.

The Board adjourned its regular meeting and reconvened as the Design Committee. It offered recommendations to the Mobile Housing Board on ways the designs of its Hope VI houses could be slightly modified to be more in keeping with the surrounding historic district. David Tharp recused himself from discussion on the applications. The recommendations that follow are applicable to applications 125-06-CA through 130-06-CA.

1. Setback

The Committee stated that neighbors had expressed concern about building setbacks.

2. Fences:

6 ft. privacy fences are acceptable. 106 review will ask MHB to stabilize and repoint cemetery wall alleviating the need for privacy fences at the rear.

3. Sheathing

Buildings will be constructed of hardiplank which is an approved material in new construction.

4. Details should be varied.

Columns can be fiberglass. Railings will be MHDC approved designs since pvc railings are unacceptable

5. Fenestration

Window size and placement—windows or false windows.

Windows can be vinyl clad wood. Committee members recommended muntins with no more than a 1 7/8" dimension.

6. Gable Vents

Vents should be larger or rectangular.

7. Lattice

PVC is unacceptable. Look into the use of MARC lattice.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF COMMENTS

125-06-CA: Hope VI Houses, Façade 1 – Lot 322 on Jefferson Street
Applicant: Mobile Housing Board/Watermark Design Group
Received: 11/13/06 (+45 Days: 12/28/06)
Meeting: 11/27/06

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Construct two-story residence.

BUILDING HISTORY

This is currently an empty lot.

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. Build Two-Story Single Resident House Per Submitted Plans
1. Currently, Lot 322 on South Jefferson Street is an empty lot across from the Sav-A-Lot in a commercial area of the Church Street East Historic District.
 2. The Guidelines for New Residential and Commercial Construction state “the goal of new construction should be to blend into the historic district but to avoid creating a false sense of history...by using historic examples as a point of departure it is possible for new construction to...fit into the historic district.”
 3. The property owner is proposing to build a residence on the lot. The front façade will face west. The plan includes the following:
 - a. Build a two-story, frame residence on masonry piers with wood lattice insert. Siding will be Hardi Plank and have 4” trim boards.
 - b. Maintain a building setback typical of the setbacks of the residences in the district.
 - c. Install six-over-six clad windows with true divided lights. Some windows will be paired.
 - d. Install a door with transom on the front elevation and a side door leading to the driveway.
 - e. Install exterior masonry chimney.
 - f. Install architectural asphalt shingles.
 - g. Install a PVC guardrail with fiberglass columns at the front porch.
 - h. Install staircase at front porch per MHDC stock design.
 - i. Install a graded driveway.
 - j. Paint.
- B. Other Elements
1. There are a number of additional items that include:
 - a. Install a concrete sidewalk.

- b. Reconfigure curb cuts.
 - c. Remove any trees that are within the footprint of the new construction.
2. These items will need to be addressed by Right-of-Way and/or Urban Forestry once the Architectural Review Board has reviewed them.

RECOMMENDATION

There are a number of elements that need to be addressed in the application, which include

- Door design and materials,
- Window placement (per changes suggested by architect),
- Colors for paint, masonry and roof,
- Column and guardrail design,
- Chimney design,
- Driveway materials,
- Defined setbacks,
- Landscape questions such as fencing.

Staff is recommending the application be denied for lack of information; and that the Board act as a Design Review Committee to provide guidance in the design of the buildings, similar to the method used to review the Federal Court House.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF COMMENTS

126-06-CA: Hope VI Houses, Façade 2 – Lot 321 on Jefferson Street
Applicant: Mobile Housing Board/Watermark Design Group
Received: 11/13/06 (+45 Days: 12/28/06)
Meeting: 11/27/06

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Construct two-story residence.

BUILDING HISTORY

This is currently an empty lot.

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. Build Two-Story Single Resident House Per Submitted Plans
1. Currently, Lot 321 on South Jefferson Street is an empty lot across from the Sav-A-Lot in a commercial area of the Church Street East Historic District.
 2. The Guidelines for New Residential and Commercial Construction state “the goal of new construction should be to blend into the historic district but to avoid creating a false sense of history...by using historic examples as a point of departure it is possible for new construction to...fit into the historic district.”
 3. The property owner is proposing to build a residence on the lot. The front façade will face west. The plan includes the following:
 - a. Build a two-story, frame residence on masonry piers with wood lattice insert. Siding will be Hardi Plank and have 4” trim boards.
 - b. Maintain a building setback typical of the setbacks of the residences in the district.
 - c. Install six-over-six clad windows with true divided lights. Some windows will be paired.
 - d. Install a door with transom on the front elevation and a side door leading to the driveway.
 - e. Install exterior masonry chimney.
 - f. Install architectural asphalt shingles.
 - g. Install a PVC guardrail with fiberglass columns at the front porch.
 - h. Install staircase at front porch per MHDC stock design.
 - i. Install a graded driveway.
 - j. Paint.
- B. Other Elements
1. There are a number of additional items that include:
 - a. Install a concrete sidewalk.
 - b. Reconfigure curb cuts.

- c. Remove any trees that are within the footprint of the new construction.
2. These items will need to be addressed by Right-of-Way and/or Urban Forestry once the Architectural Review Board has reviewed them.

RECOMMENDATION

There are a number of elements that need to be addressed in the application, which include

- Door design and materials,
- Window placement (per changes suggested by architect),
- Colors for paint, masonry and roof,
- Column and guardrail design,
- Chimney design,
- Driveway materials,
- Defined setbacks,
- Landscape questions such as fencing.

Staff is recommending the application be denied for lack of information; and that the Board act as a Design Review Committee to provide guidance in the design of the buildings, similar to the method used to review the Federal Court House.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF COMMENTS

127-06-CA: Hope VI Houses, Façade 3 – Lot 320 on Jefferson Street and Lot 6 on Scott Street
Applicant: Mobile Housing Board/Watermark Design Group
Received: 11/13/06 (+45 Days: 12/28/06)
Meeting: 11/27/06

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-4 (Jefferson Street) and R-1 (Scott Street)
Project: Construct two-story residence.

BUILDING HISTORY

These are currently empty lots.

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. Build Two-Story Single Resident House Per Submitted Plans
1. Currently, Lot 320 on South Jefferson Street is an empty lot across from the Sav-A-Lot in a commercial area of the Church Street East Historic District.
 2. Currently, Lot 6 on Scott Street is an empty lot at the corner of Scott and Canal Streets in a residential area of the Church Street East Historic District. It abuts the Crystal Ice factory.
 3. The Guidelines for New Residential and Commercial Construction state “the goal of new construction should be to blend into the historic district but to avoid creating a false sense of history...by using historic examples as a point of departure it is possible for new construction to...fit into the historic district.”
 4. The property owner is proposing to build residences on these lots. The front façade for Lot 320 will face west. The front façade for Lot 6 will face east. The plan includes the following:
 - a. Build a two-story, frame residence on masonry piers with wood lattice insert. Siding will be Hardi Plank and have 4” trim boards.
 - b. Maintain a building setback typical of the setbacks of the residences in the district.
 - c. Install six-over-six clad windows with true divided lights. Some windows will be paired.
 - d. Install a door with transom on the front elevation and a side door leading to the driveway.
 - e. Install exterior masonry chimney.
 - f. Install architectural asphalt shingles.
 - g. Install a PVC guardrail with fiberglass columns at the front porch.
 - h. Install staircase at front porch per MHDC stock design.
 - i. Install a graded driveway.
 - j. Paint.
- B. Other Elements
1. There are a number of additional items that include:

- a. Install a concrete sidewalk.
 - b. Reconfigure curb cuts.
 - c. Remove any trees that are within the footprint of the new construction.
2. These items will need to be addressed by Right-of-Way and/or Urban Forestry once the Architectural Review Board has reviewed them.

RECOMMENDATION

There are a number of elements that need to be addressed in the application, which include

- Door design and materials,
- Window placement (per changes suggested by architect),
- Colors for paint, masonry and roof,
- Column and guardrail design,
- Chimney design,
- Driveway materials,
- Defined setbacks,
- Landscape questions such as fencing.

Staff is recommending the application be denied for lack of information; and that the Board act as a Design Review Committee to provide guidance in the design of the buildings, similar to the method used to review the Federal Court House.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF COMMENTS

128-06-CA: Hope VI Houses, Façade 4 – Lot 7 on Monroe Street and Lot 5 on Scott Street
Applicant: Mobile Housing Board/Watermark Design Group
Received: 11/13/06 (+45 Days: 12/28/06)
Meeting: 11/27/06

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Construct two-story residence.

BUILDING HISTORY

These are currently empty lots.

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. Build Two-Story Single Resident House Per Submitted Plans
1. Currently, Lot 7 on Monroe Street is an empty lot at the corner of Monroe and Scott Streets in a residential area of the Church Street East Historic District.
 2. Currently, Lot 5 on Scott Street is an empty lot in a residential area of the Church Street East Historic District. The rear of the lot abuts the Crystal Ice factory.
 3. The Guidelines for New Residential and Commercial Construction state “the goal of new construction should be to blend into the historic district but to avoid creating a false sense of history...by using historic examples as a point of departure it is possible for new construction to...fit into the historic district.”
 4. The property owner is proposing to build residences on these lots. The front façade for Lot 7 will face north. The front façade for Lot 5 will face east. The plan includes the following:
 - a. Build a two-story, frame residence on masonry piers with wood lattice insert. Siding will be Hardi Plank and have 4” trim boards.
 - b. Maintain a building setback typical of the setbacks of the residences in the district.
 - c. Install six-over-six clad windows with true divided lights. Some windows will be paired.
 - d. Install a door with transom on the front elevation and a side door leading to the driveway.
 - e. Install exterior masonry chimney.
 - f. Install architectural asphalt shingles.
 - g. Install a PVC guardrail with fiberglass columns at the front porch.
 - h. Install staircase at front porch per MHDC stock design.
 - i. Install a graded driveway.
 - j. Paint.
- B. Other Elements
1. There are a number of additional items that include:

- a. Install a concrete sidewalk.
 - b. Reconfigure curb cuts.
 - c. Remove any trees that are within the footprint of the new construction.
2. These items will need to be addressed by Right-of-Way and/or Urban Forestry once the Architectural Review Board has reviewed them.

RECOMMENDATION

There are a number of elements that need to be addressed in the application, which include

- Door design and materials,
- Window placement (per changes suggested by architect),
- Colors for paint, masonry and roof,
- Column and guardrail design,
- Chimney design,
- Driveway materials,
- Defined setbacks,
- Landscape questions such as fencing.

Staff is recommending the application be denied for lack of information; and that the Board act as a Design Review Committee to provide guidance in the design of the buildings, similar to the method used to review the Federal Court House.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF COMMENTS

129-06-CA: Hope VI Houses, Façade 5 – Lots 248, 250 and 254 on Monroe Street
Applicant: Mobile Housing Board/Watermark Design Group
Received: 11/13/06 (+45 Days: 12/28/06)
Meeting: 11/27/06

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Construct one-story residence.

BUILDING HISTORY

These are currently empty lots.

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. Build One-Story Single Resident House Per Submitted Plans
1. Currently, Lots 248, 250 and 254 on Monroe Street are empty lots in a residential area of the Church Street East Historic District. The rears f these lots abut Church Street Cemetery.
 2. The Guidelines for New Residential and Commercial Construction state “the goal of new construction should be to blend into the historic district but to avoid creating a false sense of history...by using historic examples as a point of departure it is possible for new construction to...fit into the historic district.”
 3. The property owner is proposing to build residences on these lots. The front façades for all of them will face south. The plan includes the following:
 - a. Build a one-story, frame residence on masonry piers with wood lattice insert. Siding will be Hardi Plank and have 4” trim boards.
 - b. Maintain a building setback typical of the setbacks of the residences in the district.
 - c. Install six-over-six clad windows with true divided lights. Some windows will be paired.
 - d. Install a door with transom on the front elevation and a side door leading to the driveway.
 - e. Install exterior masonry chimney.
 - f. Install architectural asphalt shingles.
 - g. Install a PVC guardrail with fiberglass columns at the front porch.
 - h. Install staircase at front porch per MHDC stock design.
 - i. Install a graded driveway.
 - j. Paint.
- B. Other Elements
1. There are a number of additional items that include:
 - a. Install a concrete sidewalk.
 - b. Reconfigure curb cuts.

- c. Remove any trees that are within the footprint of the new construction.
2. These items will need to be addressed by Right-of-Way and/or Urban Forestry once the Architectural Review Board has reviewed them.
3. Of particular importance in this application are landscape and/or site issues such as fencing. Not only is the cemetery wall abutting the property historically significant and fragile, but there is also the slight possibility of unearthing graves when digging the foundation for these residences. Staff has already received letters of concern regarding these questions.

RECOMMENDATION

There are a number of elements that need to be addressed in the application, which include

- Door design and materials,
- Window placement (per changes suggested by architect),
- Colors for paint, masonry and roof,
- Column and guardrail design,
- Chimney design,
- Driveway materials,
- Defined setbacks,
- Landscape questions such as fencing.

Staff is recommending the application be denied for lack of information; and that the Board act as a Design Review Committee to provide guidance in the design of the buildings, similar to the method used to review the Federal Court House.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF COMMENTS

130-06-CA: Hope VI Houses, Façade 6 – Lots 4 and 8 on Monroe Street and Lot 9 on Scott Street
Applicant: Mobile Housing Board/Watermark Design Group
Received: 11/13/06 (+45 Days: 12/28/06)
Meeting: 11/27/06

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Construct one-story residence.

BUILDING HISTORY

These are currently empty lots.

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. Build One-Story Single Resident House Per Submitted Plans
1. Currently, Lots 4 and 8 on Monroe Street are empty lots in a residential area of the Church Street East Historic District.
 2. Currently, Lot 9 on Scott Street is an empty lot in a residential area of the Church Street East Historic District.
 3. The Guidelines for New Residential and Commercial Construction state “the goal of new construction should be to blend into the historic district but to avoid creating a false sense of history...by using historic examples as a point of departure it is possible for new construction to...fit into the historic district.”
 4. The property owner is proposing to build residences on these lots. The front façade for Lots 4 and 8 will face north. The front façade for Lot 9 will face west. The plan includes the following:
 - a. Build a one-story, frame residence on masonry piers with wood lattice insert. Siding will be Hardi Plank and have 4” trim boards.
 - b. Maintain a building setback typical of the setbacks of the residences in the district.
 - c. Install six-over-six clad windows with true divided lights. Some windows will be paired.
 - d. Install a door with transom on the front elevation and a side door leading to the driveway.
 - e. Install exterior masonry chimney.
 - f. Install architectural asphalt shingles.
 - g. Install a PVC guardrail with fiberglass columns at the front porch.
 - h. Install staircase at front porch per MHDC stock design.
 - i. Install a graded driveway.
 - j. Paint.
- B. Other Elements
1. There are a number of additional items that include:

- a. Install a concrete sidewalk.
 - b. Reconfigure curb cuts.
 - c. Remove any trees that are within the footprint of the new construction.
2. These items will need to be addressed by Right-of-Way and/or Urban Forestry once the Architectural Review Board has reviewed them.

RECOMMENDATION

There are a number of elements that need to be addressed in the application, which include

- Door design and materials,
- Window placement (per changes suggested by architect),
- Colors for paint, masonry and roof,
- Column and guardrail design,
- Chimney design,
- Driveway materials,
- Defined setbacks,
- Landscape questions such as fencing.

Staff is recommending the application be denied for lack of information; and that the Board act as a Design Review Committee to provide guidance in the design of the buildings, similar to the method used to review the Federal Court House.