

**CITY OF MOBILE**  
**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD**  
**Minutes of the Meeting**  
**December 3, 2007**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Bunky Ralph called the meeting to order at 3:01 p.m. MHDC Staff member called the roll as follows:

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

**In Attendance**

**Mailing Address/Email Address**

W.J. Appling	9 South Joachim Street
Susan Thomas	1744 Hunter Avenue
Jim Walker	Goodwyn, Mills & Cawood
Wendell Quimby	Box 6673 Mobile
Douglas Kearley	10 Wisteria Avenue
Casey Ginn	554 St. Francis Street
Lucy Barr	<a href="mailto:lbarrdesigns@bellsouth.net">lbarrdesigns@bellsouth.net</a>
Beth Schalin	3721 Calderwood Avenue

Tilmon Brown moved to approve the minutes of the last meeting as emailed. The motion was seconded by Cameron Pfeiffer and unanimously approved. Tilmon Brown moved to approve the mid-month Certificates of Appropriateness. The motion was seconded by Jim Wagoner and unanimously approved.

**MID-MONTH APPROVALS**

- 1. Applicant's Name:** Ann and Hastings Read  
**Property Address:** 1225 Selma Street  
**Date of Approval:** November 13, 2007  
This is a renewal of the COA dated 09/25/06 – build a teahouse in the back yard; build a screen porch and raised walkway at the rear and west side. Reroof with slate grey Timberline shingles; add egress rated skylight at east and west side for existing bedroom with no windows. Add dormer for bathroom.
- 2. Applicant's Name:** Varshaben Patel  
**Property Address:** 555 Government Street  
**Date of Approval:** November 13, 2007  
Repair roof using materials to match existing in material, profile, color and dimension. Repaint with the existing color scheme (brick to remain unpainted).
- 3. Applicant's Name:** Ramada Inn Civic Center  
**Property Address:** 255 Church Street  
**Date of Approval:** November 13, 2007  
Repaint the windows and doors in the existing color scheme.
- 4. Applicant's Name:** Dennis Langan Construction  
**Property Address:** 956 Church Street  
**Date of Approval:** November 14, 2007  
Re-roof with black 30-year shingle to match existing roof.
- 5. Applicant's Name:** Charles Barkley  
**Property Address:** 1352 Dauphin Street  
**Date of Approval:** November 14, 2007  
Replace rotten wood as necessary to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Paint house in the existing colors.
- 6. Applicant's Name:** Joseph and Patrice Schilling  
**Property Address:** 1112 Palmetto Street  
**Date of Approval:** November 14, 2007  
Paint residence in the following color scheme:

  - Body – Escape Gray, SW6185
  - Porch Ceiling – Atmospheric Blue, SW6505

7. **Applicant's Name:** Pink Inc.  
**Property Address:** 555 Government Street  
**Date of Approval:** November 15, 2007  
 Replacement of COA dated 11-13-07 – repair roof using materials to match existing in material, profile, color and dimension. Repaint with the existing color scheme (brick to remain unpainted).
8. **Applicant's Name:** American Roofing  
**Property Address:** 1101 Selma Street  
**Date of Approval:** November 16, 2007  
 Repair roofing as necessary to match, redeck as necessary and reframe windows as per existing.
9. **Applicant's Name:** Galvez Company  
**Property Address:** 28 South Royal Street  
**Date of Approval:** November 16, 2007  
 Patch hairline cracks in stucco and repaint in existing color.
10. **Applicant's Name:** Sims Family Partnership LLC  
**Property Address:** 6 South Pine Street  
**Date of Approval:** November 19, 2007  
 Remove asbestos siding north side, remove rotten wood underneath, replace with good wood and replace asbestos siding.
11. **Applicant's Name:** Paul Eaton  
**Property Address:** 5 North Cedar Street  
**Date of Approval:** November 20, 2007  
 Replace rotten wood as necessary with materials to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Paint in existing colors.
12. **Applicant's Name:** Ralph Bennett  
**Property Address:** 152 Roberts Street  
**Date of Approval:** November 26, 2007  
 Repair/replace rotten wood on garage as necessary with new wood to match existing in dimension and profile; install new black shingle roof to match existing; paint new materials in existing color scheme.
13. **Applicant's Name:** Margaret and Gus Meaher  
**Property Address:** 173 South Georgia Avenue  
**Date of Approval:** November 27, 2007  
 Demolish pre-fabricated greenhouse covered with lexan damaged in garage fire. Clean off foundation debris.
14. **Applicant's Name:** Stauter Construction  
**Property Address:** 958 Augusta Street  
**Date of Approval:** November 27, 2007  
 Install operable wood shutters at the front porch window and install wood screens at the remaining windows.
15. **Applicant's Name:** Chris Henken  
**Property Address:** 107 South Dearborn Street  
**Date of Approval:** November 27, 2007  
 Replace rotted porch deck and spindles with wood to match existing in material, profile and dimension.
16. **Applicant's Name:** Patrick Thistlethwaite  
**Property Address:** 22 Hannon Avenue  
**Date of Approval:** November 28, 2007  
 Paint the residence in the following Lowe's colors:
- Body – Light Green
  - Trim – Off White

#### OLD BUSINESS

1. **179-07-CA:** 26 South Lafayette Street  
**Applicant:** Mary Schalin  
**Request:** Install a shed roof dormer.

**APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.** Certified Record attached.

2. **205-07-CA:** 202 Government Street  
**Applicant:** Zito Russell Architects  
**Request:** Install an aluminum garage door as opposed to the proposed iron gate.

**APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.** Certified Record attached.

## **B. NEW BUSINESS**

1. **214-07-CA:** 26 North Royal Street  
**Applicant:** Annie Ingram  
**Request:** Replace a window with a decorative screen.

**APPROVED.** Certified Record attached.

2. **215-07-CA:** 108 Levert Avenue  
**Applicant:** Douglas Kearley  
**Request:** Construct new additions, add dormers and repair/replace existing elements.

**APPROVED.** Certified Record attached.

3. **216-07-CA:** 18 North Monterey Street  
**Applicant:** Douglas Kearley  
**Request:** Construct a lattice fence and add a metal roof to the dog run.

**APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.** Certified Record attached.

4. **217-07-CA:** 1744 Hunter Avenue  
**Applicant:** Douglas Kearley  
**Request:** Alter the original plans to add a second story with dormers and replace the sunroom windows.

**APPROVED.** Certified Record attached.

5. **218-07-CA:** 301 Marine Street  
**Applicant:** Douglas Kearley  
**Request:** Replace the wood privacy fence with a stucco wall.

**APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.** Certified Record attached.

6. **219-07-CA:** 609 Dauphin Street  
**Applicant:** H. Wendell Quimby  
**Request:** Construct a rear addition.

**APPROVED.** Certified Record attached.

7. **220-07-CA:** 112 Ryan Avenue  
**Applicant:** Lucy Barr  
**Request:** Remove existing addition, extend roof and add covered back porch.

**APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.** Certified Record attached.

8. **221-07-CA:** 165 St. Emanuel Street  
**Applicant:** Holmes and Holmes, Architects  
**Request:** Rehabilitate the Hall-Ford House and build a small addition.

**APPROVED.** Certified Record attached.

9. **222-07-CA:** 9 North Cedar Street  
**Applicant:** Casey Ginn  
**Request:** Rebuild the removed addition.

**TABLED.** Certified Record attached.

## **OTHER BUSINESS and ANNOUNCEMENTS**

1. Bill Appling was present to discuss his application that was presented at the last meeting. He explained that the sketch presented for the awning did not reflect the existing condition of the building. The design in the drawing had never been executed because it did not accurately reflect the dimensions of the corner opening. Board members explained that the existing board and batten treatment done in plywood was not appropriate for a storefront. The Board suggested that an inlaid panel treatment might be more appropriate. In any case, a drawing would be required for review. Craig Roberts and Tilmon Brown will help in the design if interior and exterior photos could be provided. Contact Aileen to set up an appointment.
2. Staff brought up the subject of changing the meeting day and time. The first and third Wednesdays of every month were suggested in order to alleviate the problem with Mondays holidays that forced changes in the. It would also avoid the problem of Review Board meetings being on the same days as MHDC meetings. Board members present agreed to the change. Staff will check with Board members who were not present.
3. Staff reminded the Board about the pending appeal of a Board decision by David McDonald at 203 South Warren Street to City Council at 10:30 a.m. on December 3<sup>rd</sup>.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
CERTIFIED RECORD**

**179-07-CA:** 26 South Lafayette Street  
**Applicant:** Mary Schalin  
**Received:** 10/01/07 (+45 Days: 11/14/07)  
**Meeting:** 10/15/07  
**Resubmitted:** 10/17/07                   **Resubmitted:** 11/19/07  
**Meeting:** 10/29/07                   **Meeting:** 12/03/07

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

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

**BUILDING HISTORY**

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

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

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

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. The owners are renovating the top floor of the residence to create more living space. This application was tabled for more information on 10/15/07 and 10/29/07.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “[a]ccessory roof elements not original to the structure...shall be located inconspicuously.”
- C. The proposed work will add an 11’-0”w x 6’-0”h x 4’-0”d shed roof dormer with two 1’-0” x 2’-0” fixed-pane windows on the rear elevation (northwest corner) of the residence. All new materials will match existing materials to include the wood lap siding, wood trim, wood corner boards and shingle roof.

**RECOMMENDATION**

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

Staff recommends approving the application.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Mary Schalin was present to discuss the application. She presented an amended drawing that demonstrated the relationship of the proposed dormer to the existing structure. She stated that the dormer would be bumped in 2’ further than originally proposed. She added that the dormer cannot be seen from the street and would only be visible to someone standing on the roof at an adjacent house. Board members questioned her about the light configuration of the dormer window. It was suggested that the dormer have 4 lights. Ms. Schalin amended the application to include 4 lights in the dormer. The upper

panes would be glass, the lower panes would be mirrors. There were no comments from the public to enter into the record. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to enter into the record.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

There was no additional Board discussion.

#### **FINDING OF FACT**

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report as amended: C. The proposed work will add an 11'0" w x 8'0" x 9'0" shed roof dormer with two 3'0" x 3'0" 2/2 fixed pane windows... The motion was seconded by Craig Roberts and unanimously approved.

#### **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Craig Roberts and unanimously approved. **Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 12/03/08.**

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
CERTIFIED RECORD**

**205-07-CA:** 202 Government Street  
**Applicant:** Zito Russell Architects  
**Received:** 10/30/07 (+45 Days: 12/15/07)      **Resubmitted:** 11/19/07  
**Meeting:** 11/19/07      **Meeting:** 12/03/07

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Church Street East  
**Classification:** Non-Contributing  
**Zoning:** B-4  
**Project:** Multiple renovations.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to previous records, this mid-twentieth century building was originally the Southern Bell Telephone and Telegraph Building. It has undergone a number of alterations throughout the years.

**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. This building is being renovated for the offices of Sullivan-St. Clair. An application was made and approved on 01/06, with the exception of the garage doors. However, though the work was started, it was not completed. A new application was made July 2007, but it was denied due to the coiled garage doors and the vents. In September 2007, the Board approved an application for this project using iron gates at the garage entrances.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “[w]ood or metal garage doors should be simple in design and compatible with the main building.”
- C. The applicant is proposing to install aluminum garage doors per the submitted photo as opposed to an iron gates as originally planned.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the work will not impair the historic integrity of the district. Staff believes the proposed garage doors satisfy the primary concern the Board had with the solid to void ratio of both the Government and Conception Street façades. Staff also believes that the proposed aluminum doors better fit the industrial look of the rest of the project.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Angie Odom from Zito Russell Architects was present to discuss the application. She explained that she could not make the iron doors work in the plan and that she proposed using anodized roll up aluminum doors. She stated that the doors would open slowly. She further stated that finishes had not been looked at, but that she felt the finish would match the proposed paint color. Glass on the proposed doors is hurricane rated. She also stated that she is trying to coordinate all parties to the project. Board members discussed how much space would be needed in the garage to accommodate an iron gate that would swing inward. The Board felt that only 5’ of interior space would be required, and that if it was felt to be a safety issue, a type of interior gate could lower to prevent cars from moving into the space occupied by the door swing. With iron gates, the vents could become a pair of closed shutters to mask the openings. Board members also felt that the Government side was traditional in overall design so that iron would be more appropriate on this elevation. The Conception side was more

modern and the aluminum door would be more appropriate on that elevation. There were no comments from the public to enter into the record. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to enter into the record.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

There was no additional Board discussion.

#### **FINDING OF FACT**

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

#### **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does 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 roll up aluminum door being used on the Conception Street elevation and iron gates being used on the Government Street elevation. The motion was seconded by Craig Roberts and unanimously approved. **Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 12/03/08.**



**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
CERTIFIED RECORD**

**214-07-CA:** 26 North Royal Street (11 North Water Street)  
Applicant: Annie Ingram  
Received: 11/16/07 (+45 Days: 01/01/08)  
Meeting: 12/03/07

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Lower Dauphin  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: B-4  
Project: Replace a window with a decorative screen.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This is the Battle House Hotel, which has been recently renovated as part of the RSA project.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states, “the Board shall not approve an application proposing 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 district...”

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. The northwest corner of the building is currently being turned into Joe Cain’s St. Francis Café.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “[t]he type, size and dividing lights of windows and their location and configuration (rhythm) on the building help establish the historic character of a building. Original window openings should be retained as well as original window sashes and glazing. Where windows cannot be repaired, new windows must be compatible to the existing. The size and placement of new windows for additions or alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.”
- C. The applicant is proposing to replace an existing transom window on the north side of the building with a decorative screen covering an exhaust duct. The color will be matched to the existing exterior louver.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the work will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district. The screen, which is necessary in order to provide exhaust for the proposed restaurant, will fit within the existing opening and the color will be matched to the exterior louver. It will also be located on a side elevation.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Jim Walker with Goodwyn, Mills and Cawood was present to discuss the application. He stated that this opening is required to vent equipment in the kitchen. In response to Board questioning, he stated that there is a grease filter in the hood that will capture grease so that it will not reach the grate. He further stated that the screen could be removed at a later date if required. There were no comments from the public to enter into the record. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to enter into the record.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

There was no additional Board discussion.

**FINDING OF FACT**

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

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Craig Roberts and unanimously approved. **Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 12/03/08.**

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
CERTIFIED RECORD**

**215-07-CA:** 108 Levert Avenue  
**Applicant:** Douglas Kearley  
**Received:** 11/13/07 (+45 Days: 12/29/07)  
**Meeting:** 12/03/07

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Ashland Place  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Construct new additions, add dormers, repair/replace existing elements.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

The circa 1927 Noble House is a one-story brick residence constructed in the English Tudor Revival style.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states, “the Board shall not approve an application proposing 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 district...”

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. This residence came before the Board in February 2004 for a new addition. At that time, the Board granted conditional approval based on the following modifications: placing the addition more to the rear of the existing building, leaving the historic brick unpainted and making a new submission. This new application seeks to address some of those issues.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state that new additions and all renovations should respect the age and style of the residence.
- C. The applicant is proposing the following renovation to the main residence per the submitted plans:
  - 1. Add two shed-roof dormers with wood casement windows to match existing on the north elevation and one shed-roof dormer with wood casement windows to match existing on the south elevation.
  - 2. Clean and repair/replace as needed all exterior elements to include power washing the existing brick, removing all vegetation from the roof and walls, refurbishing the iron rails, reroofing with dimensional shingles, adding terra cotta chimney pots and reinstalling the bronze screens.
  - 3. Construct an addition on the north and east sides of the residence.
    - a. It will feature four sets of paired French doors with transoms, a brick chimney on the south side and a covered walkway with 8x8 wood posts leading to the garage/guest house.
    - b. The design and materials will match existing, including the smooth-faced lap siding on the north and east and salvaged brick on the north, roof pitch, dimensional roof shingles, eaves, foundation and 6/6 wood sash windows.
    - c. An existing window will be removed from the south side and the roof will be reworked to eliminate the central valley.
- D. The applicant is proposing the following renovation to the garage/guest house per the submitted plans:
  - 1. Construct an addition on the south side of the garage/guest house with a design and materials to match existing.
  - 2. Construct an addition on the west side of the garage/guest house with a design and materials to match existing and featuring a covered walkway with 8x8 wood posts leading to the main residence.

**RECOMMENDATION**

There are some elements to the application that are of concern to Staff, including the number of windows that are going to be removed from the rear of the residence. Staff is recommending that the removed windows be reused in other parts of the addition. For example, two of the proposed four French doors in the new addition do not appear to be functional, as they do not lead out to any sort of rear deck or landing. The removed windows can be installed in their place. The windows can also be reused in the garage/guest house additions.

Additionally, because of the configuration of the new addition, a portion of the roof will need to be slightly altered in order to eliminate a central valley that could lead to future water problems. Regarding this the Guidelines state, “[a] roof is one of the most dominant features of a building [and] original or historic roof forms, as well as the original pitch of the roof, should be maintained.” Staff recommends an alternative solution or, barring that, a configuration that will be inconspicuous. As it is currently, the new roofline will be visible from the front of the house.

The remainder of the proposed work appears to address the Board’s issues with the original application. The addition is to the rear of the residence and, though considerable, the majority of the new living space will in fact be added to the rear garage/guest house. Also, the design and materials of the new work will either match or complement the existing residence, including reusing existing brick. The proposed dormers fall under the standards of the Design Review Guidelines. The rest of the work consists of typical maintenance and rehabilitation.

#### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Architect Douglas Kearley was present to discuss the application. In response to Staff comments, he stated that windows in the southeast corner were replacement windows and not historic. In addition he stated that the house had continuing problems with water infiltration. To that end, he was going to remove the valley at the rear and install a built-up roof. This change will also allow for usable space upstairs. The slight change in pitch will not be visible from the street. There were no comments from the public to enter into the record. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to enter into the record.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

There was no Board discussion.

#### **FINDING OF FACT**

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 Jim Wagoner and unanimously approved.

#### **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Craig Roberts and unanimously approved. **Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 12/03/08.**

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**STAFF COMMENTS**

**216-07-CA:** 18 North Monterey Street  
**Applicant:** Douglas Kearley  
**Received:** 11/13/07 (+45 Days: 12/28/07)  
**Meeting:** 12/03/07

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Construct a lattice fence and add a metal roof to the dog run.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to previous records, this is a one-story frame late Victorian residence with Colonial Revival details that was built circa 1914.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states, “the Board shall not approve an application proposing 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 district...”

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. After complaints from several neighborhood residents, staff issued a Notice of Violation regarding the dog run in the back yard to Mr. Drey, the owner. There is currently no fence in the rear and the topography of the site is such that the back is significantly lower than the front.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “[fences] should complement the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District. The height of solid fences in historic districts is generally restricted to six feet...the finished side of the fence should face toward public view.” The Guidelines also state, “accessory structures should complement the design and scale of the main building.”
- C. The proposed work includes the following per the submitted plans:
  - 1. Construct a painted wood lattice fence with a sliding gate along the north and east property lines.
    - a. The fence and gate will be pressure treated, primed and painted wood (color to be determined) with 6x6 wood capped posts ranging from 6’-0” to 8’-0” and spaced at regular intervals.
    - b. As mentioned above, the topography of the site is such that the back is significantly lower than the front, and therefore the fence will range from 5’-0” to 7’-0” tall along the north side. It will then stay at 7’-0” tall along the east side.
  - 2. Install a standing seam galvanized metal roof on the dog run and paint the chain link walls black.

**RECOMMENDATION**

As mentioned above, the Design Review Guidelines generally restricts fences to 6’-0” unless the property abuts a commercial area or multi-family dwelling, and the Board maintains this height restriction. There is also a City ordinance restricting fences to 8’-0” in total height. Because there is an existing retaining wall along the east side that is roughly 2’-0” tall, the total fence height along the east side would be approximately 9’-0” tall with 10’-0” posts. Staff recommends lowering the fence to within an acceptable limit. The remaining elements of the fence, including the wood lattice and rolling gate, fall under the standards of the Guidelines.

In regards to the dog run, as an accessory structure it does not complement the design and scale of the main building, and as such does not fall within the standards of the Guidelines. Also, chain link, though it will be painted black in order to disappear into the background, is not allowed in the districts. Staff recommends an alternate solution.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Architect Douglas Kearley was present to discuss the application. He stated that an adjacent fence was 9'6" due to the slope of the lot. He also stated that the dog run would have a slightly sloped standing seam metal roof. After some discussion with the Board, Mr. Kearley amended his application to have the dog fence lowered to no more than 7 ft. in height and the fence to begin at a maximum of 8 ft. in height working backward to 6 ft.

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

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

There was no additional Board discussion.

## **FINDING OF FACT**

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report as amended – that the dog run will have a maximum fence height of 7 ft. and that the fence will be a maximum of 8 ft. above grade. The motion was seconded by Cameron Pfeiffer 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 Jim Wagoner and unanimously approved. **Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 12/03/08.**

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
CERTIFIED RECORD**

**217-07-CA:** 1744 Hunter Avenue  
**Applicant:** Douglas Kearley  
**Received:** 11/16/07 (+45 Days: 12/31/07)  
**Meeting:** 12/03/07

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Alter the original plans to add a second story with dormers and replace the sunroom windows.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to previous records, this one-story frame residence was built circa 1945. At one point in time the original wood siding was covered with aluminum siding. A picket fence and rear deck was added circa 2002.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

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

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. The Board approved a plan for this residence in April. This application is an alteration of the northeast wing extension; the remainder of the previous application will remain the same.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “[a] roof is one of the most dominant features of a building [and] original or historic roof forms, as well as the original pitch of the roof, should be maintained.” They also state, “[t]he size and placement of new windows for additions or alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.” The Design Review Guidelines generally call for renovations to be sympathetic to the age and style of the building.
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
  - 1. Raise the roof of the new and existing northeast wing of the residence per the submitted plans.
    - a. Removed elements will be reused on the new addition and all new elements will match existing ones, to include the roof materials and pitch, foundation, siding and architectural features.
    - b. Two gabled dormers will be added to the east side, each with a pair of 6/6 wood sash windows to match existing windows.
  - 2. Replace the fixed-pane windows at the sun porch with wood casement windows.

**RECOMMENDATION**

This proposed alteration retains most of the elements of the original plan and the materials are sympathetic to the existing residence. Also, dormers are a typical and historic way to add living space. Therefore, staff feels these aspects of the proposed work will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district. Staff was concerned, however, about raising the roofline at the rear of the residence and spoke with Douglas Kearley, who indicated that the new roof would not be seen from the front.

Staff feels that replacing the fixed-pane windows for casements is appropriate and recommends approving the substitution.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Architect Douglas Kearley and Mrs. Thomas were present to discuss the application. Mr. Kearley explained that the applicants are adding a second floor and installing two dormers. The new roof line will not be seen from the front although the ridge line will match the existing ridge. Casement windows will be wood with true divided lights. There were no

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

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

There was no Board discussion.

#### **FINDING OF FACT**

Michael Mayberry 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**

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Craig Roberts and unanimously approved. **Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 12/03/08.**

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
CERTIFIED RECORD**

**218-07-CA:** 301 Marine Street  
**Applicant:** Douglas Kearley/Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund  
**Received:** 11/20/07 (+45 Days: 01/04/08)  
**Meeting:** 12/03/07

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Oakleigh Garden  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Replace the wood privacy fence with a stucco wall.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to previous records, this one-story frame Victorian residence was built circa 1890.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states, “the Board shall not approve an application proposing 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 district...”

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. The Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund recently purchased the property as part of their effort to revitalize Marine Street and is in the process of rehabilitating the residence. The back yard is currently enclosed with a wood privacy fence along the east and a chain link fence along the north.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “[fences] should complement the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District. The height of solid fences in historic districts is generally restricted to six feet...the finished side of the fence should face toward public view.”
- C. The applicant is proposing to replace the existing 6’-0” wood privacy fence with a new 6’-0” stuccoed CMU wall per the submitted site plan.
  - 1. The wall will be concrete blocks covered in true stucco and capped, and have stuccoed concrete posts at evenly spaced intervals.
  - 2. It will run along the east from the southeast corner to the northeast corner then along the north from the northeast corner to the residence.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the work will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district. The proposed wall falls within the standards of the Guidelines and staff recommends approving the application. The applicant will need to clear any setback issues with Urban Development before installation.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Douglas Kearley was present to discuss the application. He explained that the wall would be the same wall constructed at 300 Marine and will have a sand finish. Board members suggested that the concrete block wall have a substrate to mask the concrete blocks. Mr. Kearley agreed to the stipulation. There were no comments from the public to enter into the record. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to enter into the record.



## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

There was no additional Board discussion.

## **FINDING OF FACT**

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report amending c.1 to include that the wall will have appropriate substrate to hide the concrete blocks and that the wall would have a sand finish. The motion was seconded by Craig Roberts 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 conditioned on the substrate and sand finish. The motion was seconded by Cameron Pfeiffer and unanimously approved.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 12/03/08.**

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
CERTIFIED RECORD**

**219-07-CA:** 609 Dauphin Street  
**Applicant:** H. Wendell Quimby  
**Received:** 11/15/07 (+45 Days: 12/30/07)  
**Meeting:** 12/03/07

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Lower Dauphin  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** B-4  
**Project:** Construct a rear addition.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This modern commercial building is between Wintzells and Café 615.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states, “the Board shall not approve an application proposing 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 district...”

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. There is a parking lot behind this building. There is also no current historic integrity to the rear.
- B. The Design Guidelines call for renovations to be sympathetic to the age and style of the building.
- C. The applicant is proposing to construct a 24’-8” x 21’-0” rear addition with 18”x18” fixed diamond windows and a hollow metal door. All new elements will match existing ones, to include the built-up roof, stucco finish and parapets.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff feels the work will not impair the historic integrity of the building or district and recommends approval.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Wendell Quimby was present to discuss the application. He had no additions to the application.  
There were no comments from the public to enter into the record.  
Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to enter into the record.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

There was no Board discussion.

**FINDING OF FACT**

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

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Craig Roberts and unanimously approved. **Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 12/03/08.**

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
CERTIFIED RECORD**

**220-07-CA:** 112 Ryan Avenue  
**Applicant:** Lucy Barr  
**Received:** 11/19/07 (+45 Days: 01/03/08)  
**Meeting:** 12/03/07

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Ashland Place  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Remove existing addition, extend roof and add covered back porch.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

The circa 1927 Jackson House is a one-story frame Classical Revival residence. There have been three additions to the house in 1939, early 1950s and 1999.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states, “the Board shall not approve an application proposing 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 district...”

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. There is currently a rear sunroom that was built in the early 1950s that the owners wish to remove.
- B. The Design Guidelines state that additions and renovations should respect the age and style of the residence.
- C. The applicant is proposing the following renovation to the main residence per the submitted plans:
  - 1. Remove the 1950s addition at the rear of the residence.
  - 2. Install a rear courtyard featuring a brick wood-burning hearth with an arbor on either side.
  - 3. Install a covered porch at the rear of the residence.
    - a. It will feature French doors and wood columns that match those on other parts of the residence.
    - b. The design and materials will match existing, including the smooth-faced lap siding, roof pitch, roof shingles, overhanging eaves, brick foundation and gable vents.
    - c. The existing roof will be extended to cover the new rear porch.
  - 4. Construct a new addition at the rear of the residence.
    - a. It will be 18'-0" x 16'-0" and contain a new master bath and closets.
    - b. The design and materials will match existing, including the smooth-faced lap siding, roof pitch, roof shingles, overhanging eaves, brick foundation, 6/1 wood sash windows and gable vents.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff feels that the removing the rear sunroom will not negatively impact the residence because it is a non-original and non-historic addition that was built in the 1950s. However, staff is concerned about the number of windows that are going to be removed and is recommending that the removed windows be reused in other parts of the addition. Also, with the new addition, a portion of the roof will need to be slightly altered in order to cover the new porch. Regarding this the Guidelines state, “[a] roof is one of the most dominant features of a building [and] original or historic roof forms, as well as the original pitch of the roof, should be maintained.” However, the existing roofline will not be changed, only extended, and staff feels that this will not impact the residence significantly.

The remainder of the proposed work should not negatively impact the historic integrity of the building or the district. All work is in the back and the design and materials will either match or complement the existing residence. Also, the hearth and arbors will not be attached to the residence.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Lucy Barr was present to discuss the application. In response to Board questioning regarding the large expanse of blank wall at the kitchen area, Ms. Barr stated that the owner preferred corner cabinets and art work in that location rather than a window. There was another location on the house that has a large expanse of blank wall, Ms. Barr explained, that will remain untouched and cannot be seen from the street. Ms. Barr further stated that the owner might consider a window high on the wall between the cabinets if that were the wish of the Board.

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

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

There was no additional Board discussion.

## **FINDING OF FACT**

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

## **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued conditioned upon a window being added to the kitchen area. The applicant can have Staff review and approve the window. The motion was seconded by Craig Roberts and unanimously approved. **Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 12/03/08.**

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
CERTIFIED RECORD**

**221-07-CA:** 165 St. Emanuel Street  
**Applicant:** Holmes and Holmes, Architects  
**Received:** 11/19/07 (+45 Days: 01/03/08)  
**Meeting:** 12/03/07

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Church Street East  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** H-B  
**Project:** Rehabilitate the Hall-Ford House and build a small addition.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to previous records, the Hall-Ford House is a two and a half story Creole Cottage with Neo-Classical influences built circa 1836.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

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

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. The property contains several vacant buildings that will be renovated into a bed and breakfast. A plan for this property was previously proposed, but never completed. The work is slated to begin again; however, this application is sufficiently changed and scaled back from the original design to merit a new review.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines generally call for rehabilitations and new additions to respect the age and style of the building.
- C. Mr. Holmes III is proposing to rehabilitate the property per the submitted drawings. The details of the rehabilitation are outlined in the Certification Application included as supplemental material.
- D. Mr. Holmes III is also proposing to attach a two-story addition to the east side to house mechanical equipment and handicapped bathrooms. All new elements will match existing ones, to include the roof pitch and material, stucco finish, wood siding and 6/6 wood sash windows.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff feels that the current work intended for the property is a more acceptable plan than had been previously proposed. The majority of the work is either reconstructing features that have been removed, such as the porches, or repairing and maintaining existing features with materials to match. Also, staff feels that the new addition follows the standards of the Guidelines.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Nick Holmes III was present to discuss the application. He explained that the new application called for a smaller addition than had previously been approved when the building was part of an inn project. There were no comments from the public for the record. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to enter into the record.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

There was no Board discussion.

## **FINDING OF FACT**

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

## **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Tilmon Brown and unanimously approved. **Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 12/03/08.**

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
CERTIFIED RECORD**

**222-07-CA:** 9 North Cedar Street  
Applicant: Casey Ginn  
Received: 11/19/07 (+45 Days: 01/03/08)  
Meeting: 12/03/07

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Lower Dauphin  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: B-4  
Project: Rebuild the removed addition.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to previous records, this one-story frame Creole Cottage was constructed circa 1834.

**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. Mr. Ginn is currently renovating this property. In October he received a COA to repair/replace rotted and damaged wood as needed; however, the damage proved to be extensive and the rear addition had to be removed.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines generally call for rehabilitations and new additions to respect the age and style of the building.
- C. Mr. Ginn is proposing to rebuild the cabinet-style rear addition to match the removed addition.
  - 1. The design and materials will match what was removed in material, profile and dimension to include the wood sash windows, roofline, roofing, foundation and any other decorative features, but with the exception of the siding.
  - 2. The proposed siding will be board and batten.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff feels that the proposed new addition will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district, as it will be a reconstruction of the removed addition. Mr. Ginn will bring in a complete set of plans with to the review board meeting. Mr. Ginn is proposing a complementary rather than a matching siding in order to differentiate the new addition from the original residence. While board and batten is a historic type of exterior cladding and staff does not object to using it, the Board has generally voted to have siding in new additions match the original siding.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Casey Ginn was present to discuss the application. He did not provide any drawings for the Board to review. Upon questioning, he stated that he was rebuilding the rear addition to match what had been there previously. Board members tried to persuade him that drawings were necessary and that he was being asked to provide the same information as all other applicants. There were no comments from the public to enter into the record. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to enter into the record.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

There was no additional Board discussion.

**FINDING OF FACT**

There was no finding of fact.

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Craig Roberts moved to table the application for additional information. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswald and unanimously approved.