

**MOBILE HISTORIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
CITY OF MOBILE
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD**

Minutes of the Meeting
13 January, 2003

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Cindy Klotz called the Architectural Review Board Meeting to order at 3:05 p.m.

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

Present: Nick Holmes III, Douglas Kearley, Cindy Klotz, Jackie McCracken, Bunky Ralph

Absent: Dennis Carlisle, Karen Carr, Bill Christian, Buffy Donlon, Dan McCleave,

A quorum was declared after the roll was called.

<u>In Attendance</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Item Number</u>
Jeffrey Cosgrove	251 Rapier Avenue	#019-02/03-CA
Leonard Washington	1054 Selma Street	#022-02/03-CA
Art & Karen Green	1738 Hunter Avenue	#018-02/03-CA
John & Karen Luce	1058 Church Street	#025-02/03-CA
Don Williams		#004-02/03-CA #024-02/03-CA
Tom Ford	257 Rapier Avenue	#019-02/03-CA
Stephen Legg	1 Houston Street	#023-02/03-CA

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES: November 18, 2002 Meeting

Douglas Kearley noted that the minutes should be amended to reflect that he and Nick Holmes recused themselves from reviewing 202 South Royal Street. Douglas Kearley moved to approve the minutes as amended; Bunky Ralph seconded, and the motion passed as amended by unanimous vote.

APPROVAL OF THE MID-MONTH CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS:

Nick Holmes, III moved to approve the mid-month certificates as mailed; Bunky Ralph seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

MID-MONTH APPROVALS:

1. 1259 Elmira Street: Alicia Farmer.
Replace rotten wood with new matching existing in profile and dimension. Prepare and prime house for painting. Color selection to be done at a later date.

APPROVED 11/25/02 asc

2. 253 St. Anthony Street: H.M. Yongue and Associates/Douglas Kearley, Arch.
Install signage as per submitted drawing. Double-sided oval sign to measure 1'-8" x 2'-6", mounted on 11'-2" tall, 3" diameter cast iron post painted green, and hung from scroll bracket. Sign to be painted metal, with 1/2" painted border. Sign to be black with white lettering.

APPROVED 11/25/02 weh

3. 258 Roper Street: Nichole Gautier.
Paint house the following Glidden colors:
 Body – Corinthian Column
 Trim – White
 Porch floor and lattice between piers – Metropolis

APPROVED 11/26/02 weh

4. 255 Dexter Avenue: Joe Garret.
Replace rotten wood as necessary to match existing in profile and dimension. Repaint house in the following BLP colors:
 Body – BLP RC34 Falmonth Court
 Shutters – BLP 140-11 Black
 Trim – BLP 147 T, Gloss White

APPROVED 11/26/02 jss

5. 1105 Savannah Street: Dr. George Sinclair/John Dendy Architect.
Construct two car carport based on MHDC stock plan, modified to include design elements found on the main residence. Paint carport to match existing house.

APPROVED 12/3/02 weh

6. 250 St. Anthony Street: Johanna Rogers.
Repaint iron veranda in Bellingrah Green. Touch up trim in existing off-white color. Repaint cheeks to match body.

APPROVED 12/3/02 jss

7. 225 Dauphin Street: Gary Cowles.
Make necessary repairs to trusses, sistering on braces as necessary, repairing roof decking, remove inadequate rotten base from under HVAC and place on steel beams, put down new tar roof.

APPROVED 12/3/02 jss

8. 504 Government Street: Thomas Roofing.
Reroof flat roof on Yerby School Building.

APPROVED 12/3/02 weh

9. 1316 Old Shell Road: Doright Construction Company
Reroof house with 3 tab fiberglass shingles, weathered gray in color.

APPROVED 12/6/02 asc

10. 24 South Reed Avenue: Doright Construction Company
Replace rotten wood on front porch with new to match existing in profile and dimension. Repaint to match existing color scheme.

APPROVED 12/6/02 jdb

11. 60 Semmes Avenue: Liberty Roofing Company
Reroof house with 3 tab fiberglass shingles, weathered gray in color.

APPROVED 12/6/02 asc

12. 1658 Government Street: Eva Namphy.
Replace rotten wood as necessary with new matching existing in profile and dimension. Repaint new boards to match existing color scheme.

APPROVED 12/9/02 weh

13. 554 Eslava Street: Harry McCarron.
Repaint house in the following color scheme:
Body – Devoe Warm Shadow
Trim – white
Shutters and porch – Bellingrath Green

APPROVED 12/9/02 weh

14. 118 North Lafayette Street: David Pettway.
Remove existing handicapped ramp at rear of property. Construct 15' x 15' wood terrace in location of present h/c ramp. Railing to be constructed using MHDC stock railing design. Repair garage end wall. Install 2 wood one-over-one windows.

APPROVED 12/9/02 weh

15. 107 South Royal Street: Allsouth Subcontractors, Inc.
Reroof to match existing black timberline shingles.

APPROVED 12/10/02 asc

16. 207 Church Street: Robert F. Clark and Jeff Deen.
Repair rear, two front windows and shutters as necessary matching the existing in profile and dimension. Paint repairs as necessary to match existing.

APPROVED 12/11/02 jdb

17. 201 South Georgia Avenue: Laura Adams
Repaint house in the following color scheme:
Body – Benjamin Moore HC113, Louisburg Green
Trim, doors and windows – Benjamin Moore Window Crème HC6
Porch floor – Benjamin Moore Light Gray

APPROVED 12/13/02 weh

18. 101 South Monterey Street: David Presnell
Alter previously-approved detached garage plans to enclose 12' bay. Siding materials, corner boards and doors to match that of the existing structure. Paint new materials to match existing.

APPROVED 12/16/02 weh

19. 114 Lanier Avenue: Tommy Bernhardt
Reroof with black timberline shingles.

APPROVED 12/16/02 jss

20. 150-164 Government Street: Dee Gamble/LaClede Hotel

Paint building the following colors:

Body – Downing Earth, SW 2820

Trim – Downing Sand, SW 2822

Ironwork – Black

Doors – Toile Red, SW 0006

APPROVED 12/17/02 weh

21. 1009 Dauphin Street: Wrico Signs/Salvation Army
Install 5’ tall pole sign as per submitted sign design.

APPROVED 12/17/02 weh

22. 1413 Monroe Street: Remove existing vinyl siding. Inspect wood to determine whether wood siding can be restored. In the event wood siding cannot be restored, install new vinyl siding, matching the existing wood siding in profile and dimension.

APPROVED 12/19/02 weh

23. 454 Conti Street: Charles Jones

Repair damaged 5 v-crimp roofing. Replace rafters as needed. Replace damaged siding as needed. All new materials to match existing in profile and dimension. Repaint new siding white to match existing.

APPROVED 12/19/02 asc

24. 170 South Georgia Avenue: Harold Allen

Repair or replace rotten wood with new matching existing in profile and dimension. Repaint house in the existing color scheme:

Body: Shadow Green

Trim: Egyptian Antique White

Accent: Pine Green

APPROVED 12/20/02 jdb

25. 714 Dauphin Street: Tony Cooper, Owner/ Don Williams, Engineer

Demolish non-historic rear additions as per ARB approval. Reconstruction plans pending ARB approval.

APPROVED 12/24/02 weh

26. 266 Dauphin Street: Wendell Quimby

Install new black asphalt shingle roof. Restore exterior to include: Remove/replace deteriorated wood with new wood to match existing; reveal original transom; repair glass as needed. Paint colors and awning colors to be submitted at a later date.

APPROVED 12/30/02 asc

27. 1413 Monroe Street: Brian Harris

Repaint house the following color scheme:

Body - SW 2869 Sage

Trim and Shutters – Classical White 2829

Foundation trim Black or Bellingrath Green

Repair or replace rotten wood as necessary with new wood matching existing in profile and dimension.

APPROVED 12/30/02 asc

PUBLIC HEARING

1. Old Applications:

004-02/03 – CA 714 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Tony Cooper, Owner/Don Williams, Engineer
Nature of Project: Amend previously approved restoration plans to alter entrance locations.
Action by the Board: Approved as submitted. A copy of the Certified Record is attached.

2. New Applications:

018-02/03-CA 1738 Hunter Avenue
Applicant: Arthur and Karen Green
Nature of Project: Construct 4' picket fence at rear of property; construct raised treated wood deck, approximately 12' x 26' as per submitted plans, complete with steps, handrail and lattice wood skirting.

Action by the Board: Approved as submitted. A copy of the Certified Record is attached.

019-02/03-CA 261 Rapier Avenue
Applicant: Jeffrey Cosgrove
Nature of Project: Erect 7' capped privacy fence in rear yard as per submitted plan.

Action by the Board: Approved as submitted with conditions. A copy of the Certified Record is attached.

020-02/03-CA 950 Palmetto Street
Applicant: Jimmy Novak, Owner/ SOS Ironworks, Contractor
Nature of Project: Install 4' high metal fence with matching gate at sidewalk in front yard; install 6' high metal fence with 12' single leaf gate at driveway in side yard, as per submitted plans.

Action by the Board: Approved as submitted. A copy of the Certified Record is attached.

021-02/03-CA 1554 Monterey Place
Applicant: Ray and Laura Palmer
Nature of Project: Construct rear addition, measuring 34' – 2 ½" x 26' – 6", containing 620 square feet, as per submitted plans.

Action by the Board: Approved as submitted with conditions. A copy of the Certified Record is attached.

022-02/03-CA 1054 Selma Street
Applicant: Leonard Washington
Nature of Project: Remove existing 10' x 20' rear porch and reconstruct new den area, measuring 16' x 20'

Action by the Board: Approved as submitted. A copy of the Certified Record is attached.

023-02/03-CA 1 Houston Street
Applicant: York & Legg, Owners, IDI Image Designs, Sign Contractor
Nature of Project: Install new medium density foam board, double sided with routed lettering, painted navy blue with cream lettering, as per submitted sample.

Action by the Board: Approved as submitted. A copy of the Certified Record is attached.

024-02/03-CA 206 State Street
Applicant: Waterfront Rescue Mission, Owner/ Don Williams, Engineer
Nature of Project: Construct an 8 car parking lot for off-street parking as per submitted design.

Action by the Board: Denied as submitted. A copy of the Certified Record is attached.

025-02/03-CA 1058 Church Street
Applicant: John Luce
Nature of Project: Construct 6' wood privacy fence with chamfered top and 6" snake board at bottom as per submitted design.

Action by the Board: Approved as submitted. A copy of the Certified Record is attached.

OTHER BUSINESS:

1. Resolution by the Board to charge a \$5 Application Fee and a refundable \$10 sign deposit. The \$5 is to offset the expense of reproducing 11 sets of plans for the Board. The \$10 is to ensure that signs remain in the public right-of-way and provide notification of meetings. In the event a sign is not returned, the \$10 will cover its replacement.

Passed Unanimously. Copy of the Resolution signed by Chair Cindy Klotz and placed on file in MHDC office.

2. Distribution of the draft form of the Policies and Procedures for the Review Board. Explanation of the draft by Legal Counsel Wanda Cochran.

Wanda Cochran explained that meeting procedures were presented as a draft for the Board to review. She noted that it was very important to keep on track and follow the meeting format. Cochran will rework the motion wording to reflect that the work "...does or does not materially impair the structure or the district". The Board was asked to review the draft and be prepared to discuss at the next meeting.

The Meeting Adjourned at 4:25 p.m.

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

004-02/03 – CA 714 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Tony Cooper
Received: 10/8/02 10/29/02 12/20/02 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 11/21/02 1) 10/21/02 2)11/04/02 3)1/13/03

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-4; General Business
Additional Permits Required: (2) Building, Demolition
Nature of Project: Exterior rehabilitation of existing concrete block building for retail/office use.
Demolition of rear addition and reconstruction of new attached structure.
History of Project: The Board approved this project as submitted at the November 4, 2002 meeting. The owner is now requesting to alter the location of the entrances. The previously-approved plans had entrances off Dauphin and Scott Streets. The revised plans reflect entrances off Scott and Springhill Avenue. The proposed Dauphin Street elevation would have three storefront openings, as reflected in the plan. The proposed Springhill Avenue elevation would have an entrance facing the proposed parking lot. Copies of previous comments and minutes are attached for Board review.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Lower Dauphin Street Commercial District Design Guidelines

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
1	Demolition	Demolish non-historic rear portion
4, B, Example 3	Original Design Slightly Altered	Reconfigure existing façade
4, C, 1	Overall Character	
4, C, 2	Exterior Materials and Finishes	
5	New Construction	Construct new rear wing

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on information contained in the Application, in Staff's judgement:

1. The proposed design is compatible with the Lower Dauphin Street Commercial District Design Guidelines.
2. The proposed design is compatible with existing adjacent buildings in terms of rhythm established by window openings.
3. Proposed materials are in keeping with the compatibility of adjacent historic buildings.
4. The demolition of the non-historic and deteriorated rear of the building is acceptable as the loss would not impair the historic integrity of the district.

5. The proposed new addition is in keeping with the design and scale of the proposed changes to the adjacent historic building.

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Engineer Don Williams was present to answer questions of the Board.

No one from the public was present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application.

FINDING OF FACT

Douglas Kearley moved that based on the facts presented in the application and at the public hearing, the Architectural Review Board finds that staff comments 1-5 be acceptable as findings of fact. Bunky Ralph seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Nick Holmes, III moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. Jackie McCracken seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Review Board Members voting on the Application: Douglas Kearley, Nick Holmes, III, Bunky Ralph, Jackie McCracken, and Cindy Klotz.

Certificate Expiration Date: 13 January, 2004

-

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

018-02/03 – CA 1738 Hunter Avenue
Applicant: Arthur and Karen Green
Received: 12/16/02 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 1/30/03 1) 1/13/03 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Residential
Additional Permits Required: (2) Building, Fence
Nature of Project: Construct raised treated wood deck, measuring 12' x 26', complete with handrail (design provided by MHDC), and lattice wood skirting.
Install 4' high wood picket fence, constructed of 1/2" x 4"
cypress pickets spaced 1 1/2" apart, with Gothic top, in rear yard as per site plan.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Design Review Guidelines

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
3	Site Considerations	Construct 12' x 26' deck
3	Fences Walls and Gates	Install 4' high wood picket fence

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on information contained in the Application, in Staff's judgement:

1. The proposed deck design is compatible with the Design Review Guidelines.
 - a. the fence will not be visible from the street
2. The proposed wood picket fencing is compatible with the Design Review Guidelines
 - a. Gothic wood picket is an approved fencing design and material as stated in the Guidelines

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Arthur and Karen Green were present to answer questions of the Board.

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

FINDING OF FACT

Bunky Ralph moved that based on the facts presented in the application and at the public hearing, the Architectural Review Board finds that staff comments 1 and 2 be acceptable as findings of fact. Douglas Kearley seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Douglas Kearley moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. Nick Holmes, III seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Review Board Members voting on the Application: Douglas Kearley, Nick Holmes, III, Bunky Ralph, Jackie McCracken, and Cindy Klotz.

Certificate Expiration Date: 13 January, 2004

Staff suggests that the Review Board approve the application with the condition that the fence be lowered to 6'

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Jeffrey Cosgrove of 251 Rapier Avenue was present to answer questions.

Tom Ford of 257 Rapier Avenue was present to speak in favor of the installation of the wood privacy fence.

No one was present to speak in opposition to the application.

FINDING OF FACT

Jackie McCracken moved that based on the facts presented in the application, and at the public hearing, the Architectural Review Board finds that revised staff comments 1, a, b and c to be acceptable as findings of fact. Bunky Ralph seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Douglas Kearley moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness, with the condition that the fence be 6' in height and located as indicated on the sketch provided by the applicant at the meeting. Bunky Ralph seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Review Board Members voting on the Application: Douglas Kearley, Nick Holmes, III, Bunky Ralph, Jackie McCracken, and Cindy Klotz.

Certificate Expiration Date: 13 January, 2004

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

020-02/03 – CA 950 Palmetto Street

Applicant: Jimmy Novak

Received: 11/22/02

Submission Date + 45 Days: 1/05/03

Meeting Date (s):

1) 1/13/03 2)

3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden Historic District

Classification: Contributing

Zoning: R-1, Residential

Additional Permits Required: (1) Fence

Nature of Project: Install 4’ and 6’ high metal fence, constructed of 5/8” square pickets with 1” square rails, spaced 3 13/16” between pickets; panel width 72 3/4”. 4’ to be located in front yard, facing Palmetto Street; 6’ high to be located along Marine Street. Matching gates to be placed at the sidewalk and the driveway.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Design Review Guidelines

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
3	Fences Walls and Gates	Install 4’ and 6’ high metal fence

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on information contained in the Application, in Staff’s judgement:

1. The Design Review Guidelines allow fencing that is aluminum and appears to be iron.
 - a. the proposed fence design is an approved fencing material as stated in the Guidelines

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

No one was present to present the application.

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

FINDING OF FACT

Jackie McCracken moved that based on the information contained in the application, the Architectural Review Board finds that staff comments be acceptable as findings of fact. Nick Holmes seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote. The motion included approval to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Review Board Members voting on the Application: Douglas Kearley, Nick Holmes, III, Bunky Ralph, Jackie McCracken, and Cindy Klotz.

Certificate Expiration Date: 13 January, 2004

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

021-02/03 – CA 1554 Monterey Place
Applicant: Ray and Laura Palmer

Received: 12/20/02

Submission Date + 45 Days: 2/04/03

Meeting Date (s):

1) 1/13/03 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way Historic District

Classification: Contributing

Zoning: R-1, Residential

Additional Permits Required: (4) Building, plumbing, electrical, hvac

Nature of Project: Construct one story rear addition, measuring 24' -6" x 34' -2 1/2".

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Design Review Guidelines

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
3	Piers, Foundation and Foundation Infill	Construct rear addition
3	Exterior Materials and Finishes	Construct rear addition
3	Doors and Doorways	Construct rear addition
3	Windows	Construct rear addition
3	Blinds, Shutters and Awnings	Construct rear addition
3	Roofs	Construct rear addition

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on information contained in the Application, in Staff's judgement:

1. The continuous brick foundation with water table will match that of the main residence
2. The exterior wood siding will match that of the main residence, and will be painted to match the existing color scheme.
3. The new wood double patio doors with single panes are compatible with glazing massing of the two-over-two wood windows.
4. Existing two-over-two wood windows will be removed and reused in the addition. An existing Queen Anne double square window will be reused in a new location. An existing, non-historic aluminum window will be removed and replaced with a new wood two-over-two window.
5. Existing wood louvered blinds will be removed from the rear elevation and reused on the side elevation.
6. The pitch of the gable roof is compatible with the existing roof of the main house. The fiberglass asphalt shingles are appropriate according to the guidelines.

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Applicant Ray Palmer was present to answer questions of the Board.

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

Nick Holmes, III noted that the large tempered glass picture window noted on the north elevation over the shower/tub was not compatible with the character-defining windows of the main residence. Jackie McCracken noted that the window was out of proportion with other windows. Douglas Kearley suggested that the large window be replaced with either a horizontal rectangle or a window similar to the existing Queen Anne window.

FINDING OF FACT

Jackie McCracken moved that based on the facts presented in the application, and at the public hearing, the Architectural Review Board finds that Staff Comments 1-6, irrespective of the large tempered glass window noted on the north elevation. Nick Holmes, III seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Nick Holmes, III moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness with the following condition: That the applicant work with staff to redesign the large plate glass tempered window, and the request be approved on a mid-month basis by staff. Douglas Kearley seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Review Board Members voting on the Application: Douglas Kearley, Nick Holmes, III, Bunky Ralph, Jackie McCracken, and Cindy Klotz.

Certificate Expiration Date: 13 January, 2004

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

022-02/03 – CA 1054 Selma Street
Applicant: Leonard Washington

Received: 12/20/02

Submission Date + 45 Days: 2/04/03

Meeting Date (s):

1) 1/13/03 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden Historic District

Classification: Non-Contributing

Zoning: R-1, Residential

Additional Permits Required: (5) Demolition, building, plumbing, electrical, hvac

Nature of Project: Remove existing rear shed porch. Construct one story rear addition, measuring 16' x 20'.

Additional Information: Currently the siding of the main structure is mineral fiber board. This material will be placed on the addition to match the main residence.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Design Review Guidelines

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
	Demolition	Remove existing shed porch
3	Piers, Foundation and Foundation Infill	Construct rear addition
3	Exterior Materials and Finishes	Construct rear addition
3	Doors and Doorways	Construct rear addition
3	Windows	Construct rear addition
3	Roofs	Construct rear addition

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on information contained in the Application, in Staff's judgement:

1. The existing shed porch with concrete block and concrete floor are not historic and detract from the character of the structure and the district.
2. The continuous brick foundation will match that of the main residence
3. The exterior mineral fiber siding will match that of the main residence, and will be painted to match the existing color scheme.
4. The new wood six-panel door is compatible with the residence.
5. Existing wood windows will be removed and reused in the addition.
6. The pitch of the shed roof is compatible with the existing roof of the main house. The fiberglass asphalt shingles are appropriate according to the guidelines.

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Leonard Washington was present to answer questions of the Board. Washington clarified that the existing was mineral fiber siding. Washington also clarified that the existing windows were wood casements.

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

FINDING OF FACT

Douglas Kearley moved that based on the facts presented in the application and at the public hearing, the Architectural Review Board finds that staff comments 1-6 be acceptable as findings of fact. Bunky Ralph seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote. This motion included approval to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Review Board Members voting on the Application: Douglas Kearley, Nick Holmes, III, Bunky Ralph, Jackie McCracken, and Cindy Klotz.

Certificate Expiration Date: 13 January, 2004

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

023-02/03 – CA 1 Houston Street

Applicant: York & Legg

Received: 12/27/02

Submission Date + 45 Days: 2/11/03

Meeting Date (s):

1) 1/13/03 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way Historic District

Classification: Non-Contributing (New Construction)

Zoning: B-1, Buffer Business

Additional Permits Required: (1) Sign

Nature of Project: Install medium density foam painted navy with cream lettering. Double sided oval sign to measure 33.6 sf.

Additional Information: The applicant noted that the sign would be mounted with four concealed brackets.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Sign Design Guidelines

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
A	Mounting and Placement	Install new sign
B	Design	Install new sign
C	Size	Install new sign
D	Materials	Install new sign
E	Lighting	Install new sign

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on information contained in the Application, in Staff's judgement:

1. The proposed new sign will be mounted between two existing brick pillars.
2. The oval design of the sign is not in keeping with the rectilinear profile of the building.
 - a. the current sign has an arched top and a straight bottom, elevated from the brick about 6"
 - b. a rectangular sign, resting on the brick sill, would be a more compatible design.
3. The size of the sign is within the maximum allowed by the Guidelines.
 - a. the maximum allowable is 64 sf.; the request is for 33.6 sf.
4. The medium density foam is not directly addressed by the Guidelines, but has been approved by the Review Board for other locations.
5. Existing ground-mounted flood lights will be reused.

Staff suggests that the Review Board approve the application as amended, changing the shape of the sign from oval to rectangular.

-

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Attorney Stephen Legg was present to represent the law firm of York and Legg. Mr. Legg noted that the oval was appropriate for the building, citing the existing sign had an oval top, and citing other examples along Dauphin Street. Mr. Legg further noted that the sign was tasteful in design, and was designed by Ann Smith, a Mobile native familiar with the historic districts.

No one else was present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Douglas Kearley noted that the oval sign was no different than a fanlight over a rectangular doorway.

FINDING OF FACT

Douglas Kearley moved that based on the facts presented in the application and at the public hearing, the Architectural Review Board finds that staff comments 1-5, irrespective of number 2, be acceptable as findings of fact. Nick Holmes, III seconded the motion.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

A vote was taken. Jackie McCracken, Nick Holmes, III and Douglas Kearley voted in favor of the application. Bunky Ralph and Cindy Klotz voted against the application. The motion passed with a vote of 3/2. This motion included approval to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Review Board Members voting on the Application: Douglas Kearley, Nick Holmes, III, Bunky Ralph, Jackie McCracken, and Cindy Klotz.

Certificate Expiration Date: 13 January, 2004

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

025-02/03 – CA 1058 Church Street

Applicant: John Luce

Received: 12/27/02

Submission Date + 45 Days: 2/11/03

Meeting Date (s):

1) 1/13/03 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden Historic District

Classification: Contributing (one of the Springhill Avenue houses)

Zoning: R-1, Residential

Additional Permits Required:

Nature of Project: Construct 6’ high wood privacy fence with snake board and chamfered cap as per submitted plans.

Additional Information: A revised site plan was provided by the applicants.
The fence will not be painted.

Conflicts of Interest: Douglas Kearley recused himself from review of this application.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Design Review Guidelines

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
3	Fences, Walls and Gates	Construct 6’ privacy fence

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on information contained in the Application, in Staff’s judgement:

1. 6’ wood privacy fences are allowed in rear yards according to the Guidelines.
 - a. the fence will have a chamfered cap to conceal the top edge of the fence boards
 - b. the fence will have a 6” snake board, a historical treatment of the bottom of the fence.

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. and Mrs. John Luce were present to answer questions of the Board. Mr. Luce clarified that the fence would be left natural, not to be painted.

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

FINDING OF FACT/DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Jackie McCracken moved that based on the facts presented in the application and at the public hearing, the Architectural Review Board finds that staff comments 1, a and b, along with the additional site plan provided by the applicant, be acceptable as findings of fact. Bunky Ralph seconded the motion, which passed unanimously. This motion included approval to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Review Board Members voting on the Application: Nick Holmes, III, Bunky Ralph, Jackie McCracken, and Cindy Klotz.

Certificate Expiration Date: 13 January, 2004