

CITY OF MOBILE
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

Minutes of the Meeting
December 19, 2005

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:02 p.m. by Chair, Cindy Klotz.

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

Members Present: Bunky Ralph, Harris Oswalt, Cindy Klotz, Joe Sackett, Tilmon Brown, Cameron Pfeiffer, alternates Jim Wagoner and David Barr.

Members Absent: Douglas Kearley, Michael Mayberry, Robert Brown, David Tharp (present for last agenda item).

Staff Members Present: Ed Hooker, Anne Crutcher, John Lawler.

<u>In Attendance</u>	<u>Mailing Address</u>	<u>Item Number</u>
Gary Barile	1019 Pace Parkway 36683	015-05/06-CA
Helen Buttram and contractor, Talmadge Cain	315 S. Monterey Street	019-05/06-CA
K.V. Fordham	154 Kenan 36606	020-05/06-CA

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

Tilmon Brown moved to approve the mid-month Certificates of Appropriateness. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswalt. Jim Wagoner questioned items 23 and 42 that included approval of metal roofs. Staff responded that these houses met the criteria in which a metal roof would be considered appropriate. Following the discussion, the motion was unanimously approved.

MID-MONTH APPROVALS

1. Applicant's Name: Slate and Tile Company/Scott Phillips
Property Address: 1152 New St. Francis Street
Date of Approval: 10/31/05 asc
Work Approved: Repair roof matching rigid asbestos shingles.

2. Applicant's Name: Len Stemann
Property Address: 160 Dexter Avenue
Date of Approval: 10/31/05 weh
Work Approved: Replace storm-damaged wood privacy fence with materials matching existing in materials, profile and dimension. Construct 8' x 12' wood deck approximately 1' above grade. Install 3' decorative fence around existing concrete slab within existing fence.

3. Applicant's Name: Eleanor Hollis
Property Address: 1719 Laurel Street
Date of Approval: 10/31/05 weh
Work Approved: Replace storm-damaged wood privacy fence with materials matching existing in materials, profile and

dimension. Install new section of fence from rear of property to rear of house. Install new gate a driveway to match existing fence in materials, profile and dimension.

4. Applicant's Name: Diversified Roofing/Terry Weeks
Property Address: 115 South Dearborn Street
Date of Approval: 11/1/05 weh
Work Approved: Re-roof with charcoal blend shingles to match existing.
5. Applicant's Name: Superior Roofing
Property Address: 1511 Church Street
Date of Approval: 11/2/05 weh
Work Approved: Re-roof building with 3 tab fiberglass shingles, black in color.
6. Applicant's Name: Aaron Wheeler
Property Address: 257 Charles Street
Date of Approval: 11/3/05 jdb
Work Approved: Re-roof building with Timberline shingles, hickory in color.
7. Applicant's Name: The Lathan Company
Property Address: 955 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 11/3/05 weh
Work Approved: Re-roof building with Timberline shingles, charcoal gray in color.
8. Applicant's Name: The Lathan Company
Property Address: 1111 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 11/3/05 weh
Work Approved: Re-roof building with Timberline shingles, charcoal gray in color.
9. Applicant's Name: Tommy Mitchell
Property Address: 1500 Brown Street
Date of Approval: 11/4/05 weh
Work Approved: Re-roof building with 3 tab fiberglass shingles, black in color.
10. Applicant's Name: Thomas Roofing
Property Address: 109 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 11/4/05 jdb
Work Approved: Re-roof built up bitumen roof with new materials to match existing in profile, dimension and materials.
11. Applicant's Name: Damion Roofing Company
Property Address: 104 LeVert Avenue
Date of Approval: 11/7/05 weh
Work Approved: Re-roof flat roof with materials to match existing in profile, dimension and color.

12. Applicant's Name: Albert Westley James
Property Address: 403 Marine Street
Date of Approval: 11/7/05 asc
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood on fascia and sills with new materials matching existing in profile and dimension. Paint new materials to match existing color scheme.
13. Applicant's Name: Pat Weiss
Property Address: 66 South Georgia Avenue
Date of Approval: 11/7/05 asc
Work Approved: Install working wood louvered shutters as per original window shutters. Paint shutters in Monroe Street Green.
14. Applicant's Name: Pat Weiss
Property Address: 66 South Georgia Avenue
Date of Approval: 11/7/05 jdb
Work Approved: (Replacement CoA for CoA dated 4/24/03) Repair existing garage/outbuilding. Raise existing building and construct pier foundation and floor system. Wall in garage opening and install 2 windows with operable louvered blinds. Siding to match existing. Paint to match color scheme of main house.
15. Applicant's Name: Gulfbelt Properties/Insurance General Contractors
Property Address: 1107 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 11/8/05 asc
Work Approved: Install new architectural shingle roof, charcoal black in color.
16. Applicant's Name: Amanda Bray/Caroline Street Contractor
Property Address: 962 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 11/8/05 asc
Work Approved: Replace fascia, soffit, column and jigsaw work as necessary with new materials to match existing.
17. Applicant's Name: Delzak Builders
Property Address: 1760 New Hamilton Street
Date of Approval: 11/8/05 asc
Work Approved: Install new roof using Estate Gray architectural shingles.
18. Applicant's Name: Delzak Builders/ Joe Ringhoffer
Property Address: 1211 Government Street
Date of Approval: 11/8/05 asc
Work Approved: Install new architectural shingle roof using Georgia Brick shingles. Reuse tile ridge cap.
19. Applicant's Name: Joan Hoffman
Property Address: 13 North Julia Street
Date of Approval: 11/8/05 jss
Work Approved: Rer00f house with charcoal gray asphalt shingles. Replace shell driveway with concrete driveway. Replace deteriorated fence as per original.

20. Applicant's Name: June Chambliss
Property Address: 400 Michigan Avenue
Date of Approval: 11/9/05 jss
Work Approved: Repair rotten siding. Replace with like in dimension and profile.
21. Applicant's Name: Collie Loper
Property Address: 1414 Church Street
Date of Approval: 11/9/05 asc
Work Approved: Repair any rotten eave wood and install new black asphalt shingle roof.
22. Applicant's Name: William W. Gadd III
Property Address: 1053 Savannah Street
Date of Approval: 11/9/05 asc
Work Approved: Install new architectural shingle roof, black in color. Install new wood siding on rear of house to match profile and dimension of existing siding. Install French door on rear elevation. Paint exterior white with white trim. Shutters and porch floor, green.
23. Applicant's Name: Sunshine Metal Works/Rollin C. Broughton
Property Address: 204 South Ann Street
Date of Approval: 11/9/05 asc
Work Approved: Install new metal roof using low profile Oxford shingles, slate gray in color per submitted sample. (NOTE: Board members considered the low profile product appropriate for the building, but will revisit the use of this shingle type in subsequent applications on a case-by-case basis.)
24. Applicant's Name: Charles Jones
Property Address: 454 Conti Street
Date of Approval: 11/10/05 jss
Work Approved: Re-roof with asphalt charcoal gray shingles.
25. Applicant's Name: Tom Karwinski
Property Address: 17 South Lafayette Street
Date of Approval: 11/14/05 asc
Work Approved: Repair leak on front porch roof, replace/repair rotten rafter ends, rake rafters and tongue & groove sheathing. Flash roof and add 1x4 fascia board. Replace damaged wood siding as necessary with new wood to match existing in profile and dimension. Prime and paint new materials to match existing color scheme.
26. Applicant's Name: Lucky Roofing Company
Property Address: 304 Marine Street
Date of Approval: 11/15/05 asc
Work Approved: Re-roof building with 3 tab fiberglass shingles, black in color.

27. Applicant's Name: Clay Abney
Property Address: 18 North Reed Street
Date of Approval: 11/16/05 weh
Work Approved: Construct 12 x 24 wood frame outbuilding as per submitted MHDC stock plans. Materials to match the main house in materials, profile and dimension. NOTE: Historic District Overlay Ordinance will allow setbacks close to property line.
28. Applicant's Name: Scott Philips
Property Address: 261 South Ann Street
Date of Approval: 11/16/05 jdb
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary with new materials to match existing in profile, materials and dimension. Paint the house and garage as follows:
Body - SW Colonial Revival Gray
Trim – Roycroft Vellum
Re-roof with Timberline shingles, charcoal gray in color.
29. Applicant's Name: Candice Baldwin
Property Address: 11 South Reed Street
Date of Approval: 11/16/05 jdb
Work Approved: Repaint house in the following color scheme:
Body – light green
Trim – off white
Porch and lattice work at foundation – Bellingrath Green
Front door to remain natural stained wood
30. Applicant's Name: Presley Roofing Company
Property Address: 112 South Bayou Street
Date of Approval: 11/16/05 asc
Work Approved: Repair steeple roof with materials to match existing in profile, dimension and color.
31. Applicant's Name: Cooper Roofing Company
Property Address: 218 South Dearborn Street
Date of Approval: 11/17/05 asc
Work Approved: Re-roof building with 30 year 3 tab fiberglass shingles, charcoal in color.
32. Applicant's Name: Montiel Custom Homes
Property Address: 1351 Springhill Avenue
Date of Approval: 11/17/05 asc
Work Approved: Re-roof to match existing with 3 tab shingles, charcoal in color.
33. Applicant's Name: Thomas Roofing Co./Richard Watters/Kroutter and Watters
Property Address: 158 South Jackson Street
Date of Approval: 11/17/05 jdb
Work Approved: Re-roof building to match existing with 3 tab shingles, charcoal in color.

34. Applicant's Name: Shelter Roofing Company
Property Address: 1352 Old Shell Road
Date of Approval: 11/17/05 weh
Work Approved: Replace storm-damaged roof with 3 tab shingles to match existing in profile, dimension and color.
35. Applicant's Name: Sons Real Estate Investments
Property Address: 1419 Brown Street
Date of Approval: 11/18/05 asc
Work Approved: Re-roof porch roof with materials to match existing in material, profile, dimension and color.
36. Applicant's Name: Dan Wilson Construction
Property Address: 126 Government Street
Date of Approval: 11/21/05 weh
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood on window sills with new materials matching existing in profile, dimension and material. Paint new materials to match existing color scheme.
37. Applicant's Name: John Kern, Jr.
Property Address: 906 Augusta Street
Date of Approval: 11/21/05 weh
Work Approved: Remove existing non-historic deteriorated lean-to rear porch.
38. Applicant's Name: Detailed Roofing Company
Property Address: 1221 Selma Street
Date of Approval: 11/21/05 weh
Work Approved: Re-roof building with 3 tab fiberglass shingles, black in color.
39. Applicant's Name: Hugh McCain, Jr.
Property Address: 67 North Reed Street
Date of Approval: 11/22/05 jss
Work Approved: Re-roof with charcoal gray shingles.
40. Applicant's Name: Wachovia Bank as Trustee for NJ Stallworth Trust
Property Address: 1604 Springhill Avenue
Date of Approval: 11/23/05 weh
Work Approved: Re-roof building with 3 tab fiberglass shingles, dark gray in color.
41. Applicant's Name: Lucky Roofing Company
Property Address: 1054 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 11/28/05 asc
Work Approved: Re-roof flat roof with materials to match existing in profile and dimension.
42. Applicant's Name: Janet Bolton
Property Address: 32 South Reed Street
Date of Approval: 11/28/05 weh
Work Approved: Paint house in the following colors:

Body – medium gray
Trim – light gray
Porch floor, door and foundation piers – dark green
Install metal roof as per submitted design

43. Applicant's Name: George and Bunky Ralph
Property Address: 258 Stocking Street
Date of Approval: 11/29/05 asc
Work Approved: Re-roof house with 3 tab fiberglass shingles, rustic hickory in color.
44. Applicant's Name: Greg Reese
Property Address: 155 South Warren
Date of Approval: 11/30/05 weh
Work Approved: Re-roof building with 3 tab fiberglass shingles, charcoal gray in color.
45. Applicant's Name: Margaret Rushing
Property Address: 1106 Selma Street
Date of Approval: 11/30/05 weh
Work Approved: Re-roof with dimensional shingles, Estate Gray in color.
46. Applicant's Name: Alice Holifield
Property Address: 14 North Ann Street
Date of Approval: 12/2/05 jss
Work Approved: Repair storm damaged siding, roofing and windows on south side of building with materials to match existing in profile, dimension and color. Paint new materials to match existing color scheme.
47. Applicant's Name: Jay Maintenance
Property Address: 165 South Monterey Street
Date of Approval: 12/2/05 asc
Work Approved: Re-roof building with 3 tab shingles to match existing in profile, dimension and color.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. **015-05/06-CA** 109 Bradford Avenue
Applicant: Gary Barile
Nature of Request: After-the-fact request to remove rear porches.
- DENIED Certified Record attached.**
2. **016-05/06-CA** 18 North Monterey Street
Applicant: Owen Drey
Nature of Request: Construct cooking shed and gazebo in rear yard as per submitted plans. Construct wall on north side of house.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

3. **017-05/06-CA** 1010 Selma Street
Applicant: Mr. and Mrs. Marvin Fairley
Nature of Request: Remove deteriorated non-historic rear addition and construct new rear addition as per submitted plans.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

4. **018-05/06-CA** 6-8 North Joachim Street
Applicant: Center for the Living Arts/Saenger Theater
Nature of Request: Install signage as per submitted design.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

5. **019-05/06-CA** 315 South Monterey Street
Applicant: Helen Buttram
Nature of Request: Install metal roof as per submitted sample.

DENIED. Certified Record attached.

6. **020-05/06-CA** 1611 Government Street
Applicant: K.V. Fordham
Nature of Request: Remove aluminum siding from rear porch. Install glass storefront behind existing porch columns and railing as per submitted plans.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

7. **021-05/06-CA** 57 South Catherine Street
Applicant: Ken Heyl
Nature of Request: Install parking on residential lot to accommodate Bed & Breakfast traffic as per submitted site plan.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

OTHER BUSINESS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Board members asked about the status of case involving the removal of a sun porch from an Ashland Place house. Staff reported that the owner had received a stop work order from the Urban Development Department and MHDC and a verbal stop work from the police, but continued to remove the porch. The owner is scheduled to appear in court on January 9, 2006.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:10 p.m.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

015-05/06-CA 109 Bradford Avenue
Applicant: Gary Barile
Received: 11/08/05 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 12/23/05 1) 12/19/05 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Nature of Project: After-the-fact request to remove rear porches.

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

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
3	Porches	Remove remaining rear porches

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

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

- A. The Guidelines state that “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture...Particular attention should be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions and decorative details.”
 1. The subject structure is a ca. 1920s yellow brick apartment complex with four apartments.
 2. Rear service porches were an integral part of the architectural design of these type apartments.
 3. The porches are shown on the 1925 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map.
 4. Demolition of three quarters of the porches has already occurred .
 5. The property is under a stop work order.
 6. Mortise pockets in the brick and old growth lumber further confirm the porches were original to the structure.

Staff recommends denial of the application as submitted. Staff further recommends that the rear porches be reconstructed following approval of the plans by the ARB.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

The owner was present to discuss the case. He has owned the building for 7 or 8 years and the porches were enclosed when he purchased it. He explained that he did not know that he needed to have permission from the Board to remove the porches. He further explained that there is no significant value to the porches and that, for the tenants, there is no appeal to be on the porches looking at Walgreen's Pharmacy. The building is not turn of the century and the porches are on the rear of the building so he felt they were not important. He considered that the porches posed a safety hazard and he wished to remove them in order to have a mid-town look with stairs at the rear. He stated that there are 4 people living in the complex and that the doors on the rear elevations are blocked so that, even with the removal of the porches, they pose no safety issue. Staff stated that the left porch has been entirely removed while the right side porch was still in place.

The Chair stated that any plans to alter the rear elevation must be approved by the Board prior to construction.

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. The motion was seconded by Joe Sackett 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 according to the Guidelines and that the application be denied. The motion was seconded by Cameron Pfeiffer and approved with Harris Oswalt voting in opposition.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

016-05/06-CA 18 North Monterey Street
Applicant: Owen Drey
Received: 11/08/05 **Meeting Date (s):**
 Submission Date + 45 Days: 12/23/05 1) 12/19/05 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Nature of Project: Construct cooking shed, gazebo and stucco-covered wall as per submitted plans.

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

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
3	Accessory Structures	Construct cooking shed and gazebo
3	Fences, Walls and Gates	Construct 6’ stucco covered wall

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

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

- A. COOKING SHED - The Guidelines state that “The appropriateness of accessory structures shall be measured by the guidelines applicable to new construction. The structure should compliment the design and scale of the main building.”
1. The main residence is a one and ½ story frame late Victorian with Colonial Revival details, constructed in 1914.
 2. The topography of the site is such that the rear is significantly lower than the front.
 3. The cooking shed measures 17’ x 13’ and is located on the north property line.
 4. 8’ load bearing fiberglass columns and a brick veneer rear wall support a hipped roof, constructed at a pitch of 5 to 12.
 5. Roofing material is 16 oz. copper.
 6. Flooring material is flagstone over concrete slab.
 7. The east and west elevations have pressure treated lattice panels between the fiberglass columns.

- B. GAZEBO - The Guidelines state that “The appropriateness of accessory structures shall be measured by the guidelines applicable to new construction. The structure should compliment the design and scale of the main building.”
1. The main residence is a one and ½ story frame late Victorian with Colonial Revival details, constructed in 1914.
 2. The topography of the site is such that the rear is significantly lower than the front.
 3. The gazebo measures 17’ x 13’ and is located on the south property line.
 4. 8’ load bearing brick veneer columns support a hipped roof, constructed at a pitch of 5 to 12.
 5. Roofing material is 16 oz. copper.
 6. Flooring is to be flagstone over concrete slab.
 7. The east and west elevations have pressure treated lattice panels between the brick columns.
- C. STUCCO COVERED WALL – The Guidelines state that “These should compliment the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District.”
1. The main residence is a one and ½ story frame late Victorian with Colonial Revival details, constructed in 1914.
 2. The main house is constructed on brick piers.
 3. The proposed 6’ high wall is to be located along the north property line at the sidewalk.
 4. Two iron gates, one pedestrian gate and one vehicular gate, are to be constructed in the wall.
 5. There is another fence constructed at the sidewalk directly across the street from 18 North Monterey, between North Monterey and North Reed Street.
 6. The location of this fence along with the Historic District Overlay Ordinance will allow the construction of the proposed wall at the sidewalk.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

There was no one present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record. Board questioned staff regarding the location of the pergola and cooking shed as well as the location of the wall at the sidewalk. Staff responded that the gazebo would be located to the north and the cooking shed to the south on the lot. Traffic Engineering would not allow a structure higher than 3 ft. to begin less than 25 ft. from the corner and that the Historic District overlay ordinance would permit the construction at the wall at the sidewalk.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Tilmon Brown wanted to stipulate that the stucco should have a smooth sand, rather than rough, finish.

FINDING OF FACT

Harris Oswalt moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and at the public hearing, that the Board adopt the facts in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph 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 according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued conditioned upon the stucco having a smooth sand finish. The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 12/19/06.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

017-05/06-CA 1010 Selma Street
Applicant: Mr. & Mrs. Marvin Fairley
Received: 12/02/05 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 1/19/06 1) 12/19/05 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Nature of Project: Remove existing deteriorated rear addition & construct new rear addition as per submitted plans.

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

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
3	Additions	Construct rear addition

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

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

1. The existing rear shed addition is not in character with the original historic structure
2. The existing rear shed addition has no architectural or historic significance.
3. The existing rear shed addition is in deteriorated condition.
4. The proposed new rear addition follows the massing and scale established by the original historic structure.
5. Brick piers under the addition will match existing historic piers.
6. Wood siding on the addition will match existing historic wood siding.
7. Windows in the addition will match existing historic windows, wood true divided light.
8. Roof materials, gables and pitch will match existing.

Staff recommends approval of the addition as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 12/19/06.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

018-05/06-CA 6-8 North Joachim Street
Applicant: Center for the Living Arts
Received: 12/02/05 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 1/16/06 1) 12/19/05 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Nature of Project: Install signage as per submitted design.

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

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

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

1. The Saenger Theater, constructed ca. 1927, is a major downtown landmark.
2. The Review Board previously approved a marquis sign for placement vertically in the alcove over the main entrance.
3. A variance was granted by the Board of Zoning Adjustment to allow the proposed vertical marquis sign to exceed the maximum 64 square feet.
4. The revised sign design is proposing a horizontal sign located above the entrance canopy.
5. This design will not impair the visual character of the alcove.
6. The proposed sign measures 10’ long by 5’ high with 2’ high illuminated letters.
7. The proposed sign is designed to have chasing lights on the border and on the letters
8. Chasing lights are common for Saenger signs, being found on both the Hattiesburg, MS and New Orleans, LA. Saenger Theater signs.
9. The proposed sign colors are gold letters and border on a burgundy background.
10. The proposed sign will measure 100 square feet in size, which exceeds the maximum allowable 64 square feet of signage allowed by the Sign Ordinance.
11. A variance has been requested to allow the horizontal sign to exceed the allowable 64 square feet.
12. This application will be considered by the Board of Zoning Adjustment at the January meeting.
13. Based on the fact that the Saenger Theater occupies one half of a city block, and has no other signage on the exterior, the amount of signage requested is not excessive.

Staff recommends approval of the design as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

There was no one present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record. Staff explained that the proposed sign is 5' x 10' and is in a horizontal position and smaller than the previously approved sign. Since the sign ordinance states that there is a maximum allowable signage of 64 square feet, the applicant will seek a variance.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Chair Cindy Klotz felt that a sign approval in excess of 64 sq. ft. must be justified. Board members considered that item 13 in the staff report justified the exception. In addition, the building's historic sign was larger than the proposed sign.

FINDING OF FACT

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the facts adopted by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district under the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswalt and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 12/19/06.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

019-05/06-CA 315 South Monterey Street
Applicant: Helen Buttram
Received: 12/02/05 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 1/16/05 1) 12/19/05 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Leinkauf Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Nature of Project: Install metal shingle roof on residence as per submitted sample.

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

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
3	Roofs	Re-roof with metal roofing

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

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

- A. The Guidelines state that “A roof is one of the most dominant features of a building. Original or historic roof forms, as well as the original pitch, should be maintained. Materials should be appropriate to the form and pitch and color.”
 1. The subject structure is a ca. 1925 Craftsman Bungalow with a complex roof consisting of an end gable over the porte cochere, hipped over the main residence, and a prominent dormer with a hipped roof.
 2. The existing roof is a 3 tab asphalt shingle.
 3. The proposed roof is a steel panel emulating architectural grade shingles, gray in color.
 4. Historically, Bungalows in Mobile were constructed with either wood shakes or asbestos tile roofs.
 5. Historically, Bungalows in Mobile were not constructed with metal roofs.
 6. Due to the configuration of the roof, the roofing material will be highly visible from public view.
 7. The use of metal panels would greatly change the architectural character of the residence.

Staff recommends denial of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

The owner and her contractor were present to answer Board questions regarding the application. The owner, who had not read the staff report, stated that she appreciates living in the historic district and has tried to explore roofing materials that will resist wind. Shingles currently on her house were severely damaged by Hurricane Katrina. The metal shingle she proposes to use advertises that it resists 160 mile per hour winds and has a lifetime guarantee. Architectural shingles have a limited wind guarantee and are not a “lifetime” shingle. The proposed metal shingle also provides some insulation value that should improve the heat build up in the attic. The proposed shingle mimics a slate or wood shake profile. The owner chose the charcoal gray color to have it blend with the district.

There was discussion concerning other houses on which metal shingles have been approved and installed. With the current popularity of metal shingle roofs, the Board has adopted an interim policy on metal shingles and asks the following questions:” 1) “Do the shingles mimic the original shingles that would have been on the house” and 2) “Will the house look the same after installation of the metal shingles?” Although the same metal shingle as proposed by the applicant was installed at 1054 Palmetto Street (corner of Palmetto and George), the house is Victorian in style. In this case, the metal shingles are appropriate to the style and period of the house and, in fact, replicate the original wood shakes that are still visible under the deteriorated architectural shingles.

204 S. Ann Street had an asbestos shingle roof that was flat in appearance. The new metal roof used in that instance mimics the flatter profile of the asbestos roof.

Board members stated that, until shingles are actually installed, it is often difficult to know what the finished effect will be.

Chair Cindy Klotz stated that a lower profile shingle would be more appropriate to a Bungalow and that Ms. Buttram might have more success in getting the Board to approve a lower profile shingle. An architectural shingle would also be appropriate.

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

Bunky Ralph stated that she did not agree with item 7 and considered it subjective.

FINDING OF FACT

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the information provided in the application and at the public hearing, that the Board adopt the facts in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswald and approved with 3 members voting in opposition.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by David Barr. Two members voted in favor of the motion and 5 in opposition to the motion. The application was denied.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

020-05/06-CA 1611 Government Street
Applicant: K.V. Fordham
Received: 12/05/05 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 1/22/06 1) 12/19/05 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Leinkauf Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Conflicts of Interest: Cameron Pfeiffer stated that she served on the Mobile Revolving Fund for Historic Properties with Keith Fordham, but that the Fund was not involved in this property and she would have no difficulty in rendering an impartial decision on the application.
Nature of Project: Remove aluminum siding from rear porch. Install glass storefront behind existing porch columns and railing as per submitted plans.

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

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
3	Porches	Reconfigure rear porch

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

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

- A. The Guidelines state that “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture...Particular attention should be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions and decorative details.”
1. The subject structure is a ca. 1920s two story stucco-covered residence.
 2. The existing rear porch was closed in and sheathed in aluminum siding.
 3. The proposed porch alteration includes the removal of the aluminum siding, and installation of plate glass in a wooden frame behind the existing columns.
 4. This is the preferred method for closing in rear porches.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

The current owner was present to discuss the application. He explained that he is completing work on the house and is selling it to a couple relocating to Mobile. He had not seen the report, but after reviewing it, is in agreement with the staff recommendation.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the facts adopted by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic 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: 12/19/06.

- B. STUCCO-COVERED WALL – The Guidelines state that “Parking areas should be screened from view by the use of low masonry walls, wood or iron fences, or landscaping.”
1. The applicants are proposing to erect a 5’ high stucco-covered masonry wall with brick columns.
 2. This wall will screen the parked cars from public view.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

There was no one present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record. Board members questioned staff regarding the two 13 ft. wide curb cuts. Staff responded that they provided circulation on the site and that parking would be placed 67 ft. from the front sidewalk. Staff also reported that the applicant had obtained a use variance to operate a B&B on the site and a variance to use stamped concrete and gravel in parking areas on the site. In addition, no existing trees on the site would be affected. Staff also explained that an existing chain link fence is located at the rear of the property.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and at the public hearing, that the Board adopt the facts in the Staff report. The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the facts adopted by the Board, that the application does impair the historic structure and the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued contingent upon the following: 1) the masonry wall must have a smooth sand finish; 2) plantings should be installed in front of the wall and 3) a landscape plan of this area must be submitted to Staff for approval. The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 12/19/06.