

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
January 7, 2009 – 3:00 P.M.
Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER – Chair

The meeting was called to order by the chair Tilmon Brown at 3:01.

The Introductory Statement was read by the staff.

The members present were Tilmon Brown, Tom Karwinski, Harris Oswalt, Bunky Ralph, Craig Roberts, Jim Wagoner, Andrew Martin and Bradford Ladd.

Staff present was: Devereaux Bemis, Keri Coumanis, and John Lawler.

The Minutes of the previous meeting were approved as posted per a motion by Tom Karwinski.

The Mid-Month Requests were approved as submitted per a motion by Andrew Martin.

B. MID-MONTH APPROVALS

1. Applicant's Name: Marian Boykin

- a. Property Address: 19 South Reed Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 12/11/08
- c. Project: Reroof with 3 tab shingles

2. Applicant's Name: Diane Kubat

- a. Property Address: 1309 Chamberlain Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 12/15/08
- c. Project: Replace windows to match existing; Repair/replace rotted siding as needed to match existing in material, dimension and profile; Paint per submitted paint colors: Montpelier Ashlar Gray, Gilded Linen, Dark Kettle Black all by Lowes/ Valspar.

3. Applicant's Name: Michelle Bryant

- a. Property Address: 958 Old Shell Road
- b. Date of Approval: 12/15/08
- c. Project: Replace rotten porch decking with tongue and groove to match, replace rear wooden awning.

4. Applicant's Name: J. DeWayne Gardner for Dauphin Way United Methodist

- d. Property Address: 31 Lee Street
- e. Date of Approval: 12/15/08
- f. Project: Exterior repairs, repaint and reroof.

5. Applicant's Name: John E. Nichols, Sr.

- a. Property Address: 1356 Dauphin Street
- b. Date of Approval: 11/24/08
- c. Project: Stabilize chimney on roof. Chimney is to remain and a plan for preserving the chimney will be presented to the Architectural Review Board.

6. Applicant's Name: Jill Dabbs

- a. Property Address: 1258 Elmira Street

- b. Date of Approval: 12/16/08
 - c. Project: Replace rotten wood; paint new materials in existing color scheme; install wood porch railing per MHDC stock design; repair/replace existing fencing as necessary to match existing.
7. **Applicant's Name: Mobile Bar Pilots, LLC**
- a. Property Address: 201 N Jackson
 - b. Date of Approval: 12/18/08
 - c. Project: Install fence; construct wall, per submitted plans.
8. **Applicant's Name: Matthias and Manja Leyk**
- a. Property Address: 18 N Ann Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 12/19/08
 - c. Project: Repair/replace rotted siding as needed to match existing in material, dimension and profile; Paint per submitted paint colors: Benjamin Moore Yarmouth Blue (main), Van Deusen Blue (accent) and white (columns and windows).
9. **Applicant's Name: Chris Miller**
- a. Property Address: 1708 McGill Ave
 - b. Date of Approval: 12/24/08
 - c. Project: Repair/replace rotted siding as needed to match existing in material, dimension and profile; Paint to match existing colors.
10. **Applicant's Name: Rentz Home Maintenance for Irvin G. Rentz**
- a. Property Address: 11 Lee Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 12/28/08
 - c. Project: Replace rotten boards to match existing.
11. **Applicant's Name: G. Pearson Construction for Cheryl Mitchell**
- a. Property Address: 32 Lee Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 12/29/08
 - c. Project: Exterior repairs to siding and windows as needed; reroof; repaint to match existing.

C. APPLICATIONS

- 1. **001-09-CA: 256 Roper Street**
 - a. Applicant: Lisa Carwie
 - b. Request: Install Fence
 - c. **Approved. Certified record attached.**
- 2. **002-09-CA: 20 South Reed Avenue**
 - a. Applicant: Claudia Zimmerman
 - b. Request: Construct new shed
 - c. **Approved. Certified record attached.**
- 3. **003-09-CA: 656 Church Street**
 - a. Applicant: Brian DeGrego
 - b. Request: Addition
 - c. **Approved. Certified record attached.**

4. **004-09-CA: 1562 Blair Avenue**
 - a. Applicant: Kristen and Greg Deaper
 - b. Request: New house
 - c. **Approved. Certified record attached.**

5. **005-09-CA: 601 Dauphin Street**
 - a. Applicant: Douglas Kearley
 - b. Request: Patio addition/covering
 - c. **Approved. Certified record attached.**

6. **006-09-CA: 110 S Catherine Street**
 - a. Applicant: Raymond Lamb
 - b. Request: Picket fence request
 - c. **Approved with conditions. Certified record attached.**

7. **007-09-CA: 1550 Government Street**
 - a. Applicant: Stephen L. Zito
 - b. Request: Exterior renovations
 - c. **Approved. Certified record attached.**

8. **008-09-CA: 50 Bradford Ave**
 - a. Applicant: Stephanie French
 - b. Request: Storage shed & 6' privacy fence
 - c. **Approved in part; tabled in part. Certified record attached.**

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Ordinance Changes were not discussed.
2. Holiday Inn Signage
 - a. When asked in the meeting about other internally-lit plastic signage in the district, incorrect information was given to the ARB. Currently, the Riverview Hotel does have upper story, internally-illuminated signage. Staff wanted to clarify this in case the ARB feels they need to reconsider their decision regarding the Holiday Inn's signage.
 - b. Staff discussed the above issue with the Board.
3. Election of Chairman and Vice Chairman
 - a. Tilmon Brown was elected Chairman.
 - b. Bunky Ralph was elected Vice Chairman.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

001-09-CA: 256 Roper Street
Applicant: Lisa Carwie
Received: 12/09/08
Meeting: 1/07/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Non-Contributing Property
Zoning: R-1
Project: Privacy fence

BUILDING HISTORY

This home was a much later addition to Oakleigh Garden and is therefore a non-contributing property within the district. The building recently underwent a renovation in order to gain a more traditional appearance.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the 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 applicants wish to install a back yard, privacy fence.
- B. The Mobile Historic Guidelines, state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “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.”
- C. Applicant propose:
 - 1. 6’ privacy fence, per submitted plan;
 - a. Follow rear and side yard property lines;
 - b. North fence line to extend to northeast corner of house;
 - 2. dog-eared;
 - 3. gates to be placed at entrance to side yards.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The fence complies with the applicable guidelines; therefore, Staff recommends approval.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

There was no one present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

No board discussion took place.

FINDING OF FACT

Jim Wagoner moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application the Board finds the application in the staff report as written.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Jim Wagoner moved that, based upon the facts, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 01/07/10

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

002-09-CA: 20 South Reed Avenue
Applicant: Claudia Zimmerman
Received: 12/09/08
Meeting: 1/07/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing Property
Zoning: R-1
Project: New storage shed

BUILDING HISTORY

This is a one-story, neo-classical revival bungalow in the Old Dauphin Way district.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the 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 applicants are seeking approval for the construction of a new storage shed. The shed will be located in the backyard of the property.
- B. The Mobile Historic Guidelines, state, in pertinent part: “...An accessory structure is any construction other than the main building on the property. It includes but is not limited to garages, carports, pergolas, decks, pool covers, sheds and the like. The appropriateness of accessory structures shall be measured by the guidelines applicable to new construction. The structure should complement the design and scale of the main building.”
- C. Applicants propose:
 - 1. 14’ x 18’ sq. ft. structure;
 - 2. Placed on a concrete slab;
 - 3. 3-tab shingles to match the house;
 - 4. Clad in wood siding to match the house;
 - 5. Beaded board soffit to the match the house;
 - 6. One-over-one, wood clad windows to match the house;
 - 7. Paint scheme to match the house.
- D. Clarifications needed:
 - 1. Site plan or approximate location of shed on property.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The design and scale of the storage shed complements the main building; therefore it complies with the design guidelines and is appropriate for a historic district. Though Staff recommends approval, a site plan approximating where the shed will be located on the property should be provided.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

James Hamilton was present to discuss the application. Mr. Hamilton clarified that the storage shed would be placed in the rear, right corner of the property, in accordance with the setback requirements.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

FINDING OF FACT

Harris Oswalt moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, amending facts to add fact C(8) that the shed would be located in the right, rear corner of the backyard.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Harris Oswalt moved that, based upon the facts as amended by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 01/07/10

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

003-09-CA: 656 Church Street
Applicant: Brian DeGrego and Patricia Brown
Received: 12/16/08
Meeting: 01/07/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Contributing Property
Zoning: R-1
Project: Addition

BUILDING HISTORY

This four room shotgun house was constructed around 1900. It was saved from demolition by the Mobile Revolving Fund in 1992.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the 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 applicants are seeking approval for a rear addition to this shotgun home. It appears a one-room rear addition was added to the home at an earlier date. The applicants appeared before the ARB on November 5, 2008; however, the application was tabled in order to give the applicants time to generate better drawings.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior standards state:
 - 1. “Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.
 - 2. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.
 - 3. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.”
- C. Applicants propose:
 - 1. adding 22’ by 17’6” to the back of the house
 - a. addition will remain within the existing plane of the structure
 - b. wood siding will match existing
 - c. existing north wall door and windows to be relocated to new north wall
 - d. height of addition will be less than existing structure thereby delineating the new from the old

- e. metal roof to match existing
 - 2. 18'8" by 20'5" deck to west façade
- D. Clarifications needed:
- 1. material of new window units
 - 2. detail/design for deck railing

STAFF ANALYSIS

Under the current design guidelines, only true-divided light windows which match the existing historic windows in design, material and profile are appropriate for historic districts. Staff needs more information regarding the proposed window units to determine if they are appropriate for the district. However, the design and scale of the addition complements the existing historic structure. Therefore, Staff generally recommends approval.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Brian DeGrego and Patricia Brown were present to discuss the application. The applicants informed the Board that the deck would go around the tree. The applicants clarified that the new window units will match the existing windows and where necessary, the new deck railing will match the front porch railing. Applicants will mimic or reinstall the existing cornerboard to differentiate the new from the old.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

FINDING OF FACT

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, adding facts to state that the new windows will match the existing and the deck railing will match the porch railing.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the facts as amended by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 01/07/010

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

004-09-CA: 1562 Blair Avenue
Applicant: Kristen and Greg Dreaper
Received: 12/17/08
Meeting: 1/07/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing Property
Zoning: R-1
Project: New residential construction

BUILDING HISTORY

This parcel is one of two vacant lots on Blair Avenue. At one time, there was a one-story bungalow on the site, however, it burned and was demolished in 2006. From the records, it appears that the owners of that bungalow also owned the adjacent lot, which was never built on. However, this lot has now been subdivided out in order to accommodate the proposed, new construction.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the 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 applicants are seeking approval for the construction of a new residence. The proposed residence resembles, in both form and massing, the historic residence which burned in 2006.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior standards state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “ the goal of new construction should be to blend into the historic district, but to avoid creating a false sense of history. . .
 - 2. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment. . .
 - 3. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.”
- C. Applicants propose:
 - 1. Construction of a 84’ by 32’, one-story, dwelling featuring
 - a. End-gabled roof with asphalt shingles
 - 1. front end, triple gable windows
 - 2. brackets at eaves on front and rear
 - b. Front porch with four, paneled, Hardie board columns
 - 1. center door flanked by double windows

- c. Craftsman style front door with transoms and sidelights
- d. Matching Craftsman windows throughout
 - 1. 1/1, single hung
- e. Hardie plank siding
- f. Brick band foundation
- g. Finished ceiling height is 10 feet
- h. Attached garage at rear

D. Clarifications needed:

- 1. Front door materials
- 2. Window materials
- 3. Garage door materials

STAFF ANALYSIS

The style and massing of the proposed residence is appropriate for the historic district. Though the design and details seek to emulate a historic structure, given the new materials, it is less likely this new building will be mistaken for a historic one. As demonstrated by the site plan, the applicants intend to maintain the traditional setback on the street. Please note: the existing driveway (which appears on the site plan) will be removed and replaced with a driveway completely on this parcel.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Greg Deaper was present to discuss the application. The applicant clarified that the front door will be wood and the windows will be vinyl-clad, wood windows. The applicant further stated he had not yet picked out a garage door, but would confer with Staff prior to installing both the garage door and the front door. The Board questioned the color of the brick foundation, the unevenness of the brick foundation at the rear, the width of the driveway and the placement of the building on the lot. The applicant stated that he was aware of the setback issues. The applicant agreed to provide brick samples and make the skirting around the garage even with the skirting for the house.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

FINDING OF FACT

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, adding facts C(1)i-k to state that the color of the home will be Cityscape by BLP, the brick will be submitted to staff, the garage and front door will be submitted to staff, and the brick skirting will be contiguous.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Jim Wagoner moved that, based upon the facts as amended by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 01/07/10

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

005-09-CA: 601 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Douglas Kearley
Received: 12/19/08
Meeting: 01/07/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street
Classification: Contributing Property
Zoning: B-4
Project: Patio addition

BUILDING HISTORY

The Peters Building, ca. 1891, is a contributing, two-story, frame structure located within the Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the 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 applicants are seeking approval for an open wood patio cover over their outdoor eating area. Over the past few years, the applicants have applied for approval for similar plans to enhance the restaurant’s outdoor seating. Though these plans were approved, they were not constructed. More recently, a hip roof addition at the same location as this proposed shed roof addition was approved in 2006.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior standards state:
 - a. “Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.
 - b. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.
 - c. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.”
- C. Applicants propose:
 - a. Approximately 18’ by 35’ shed roof addition at rear of building, per submitted plan
 - i. located above current outdoor concrete patio/dining area
 - b. Approximately 12’4” tall at bottom of slope of shed roof
 - c. Featuring parapet wall and wood siding to match existing on east elevation
 - d. Chamfered posts at evenly spaced intervals on south elevation

- e. Decorative gable on south elevation with either wood details to match brackets at front of building or inset “W”
- f. Other optional features:
 - i. Folding wood blinds on east elevation
 - ii. Horizontal rails between posts

STAFF ANALYSIS

The shed-roof addition complies with the guidelines, therefore, Staff recommends approval. The optional treatments for the deck, including the vertical rails and wood blinds, appear to be appropriate as well. Staff strongly encourages the replication of the bracket detail as the decorative feature for the rear gable.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Douglas Kearley was present to discuss the application. The applicant explained that they would like to have either option for the detail on the decorative gable.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

FINDING OF FACT

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report as written.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the facts as found by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued using either submitted design for the decorative gable.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 01/07/010

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

006-09-CA: 110 S Catherine Street
Applicant: Raymond Lamb
Received: 12/10/08
Meeting: 1/07/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing Property
Zoning: R-1
Project: Picket fence

BUILDING HISTORY

This one-story bungalow faces South Catherine Street at the corner of South Catherine and Luling in the Old Dauphin Way District

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the 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 applicants are seeking approval for a new 4’ picket fence along their southern and western property lines. The applicants own a double lot – both the lot their house is situated on which faces South Catherine and a vacant lot directly west which faces Luling. The applicants intend to fence the Luling street lot and the southern portion of the South Catherine Street lot. Therefore, the picket fence on the Luling Street will fence what would have been platted as a front yard. See attached site plan.
- B. The Mobile Historic Guidelines, state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “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.”
- C. Applicants propose:
 - 1. 4’ wood picket fence
 - 2. To follow southern and western property lines in part, per submitted plan.

STAFF ANALYSIS

Staff has consulted with the zoning staff. Because this wood picket fence will follow a property line along Luling Street, the fence would have to meet the side yard setback of 20 feet. Therefore, at this location the applicants are limited to 3’ under the zoning ordinance. Staff recommends approval provided the applicants construct a 3’ wood picket fence.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Raymond Lamb was present to discuss the application. The applicant explained he believed a 4' fence would be better since his children played in the backyard. Staff and board members explained that since this was a corner lot, anything higher than 3' would need a variance from the board of zoning adjustment. Staff explained that the applicant could place a fence as high as 6' at the rear property line.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

FINDING OF FACT

Harris Oswalt moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, amending facts C(1)-(2) to state that the picket fence would be 3' along the west and south property lines and 4' along the north property line.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the facts as amended by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 01/07/10

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

007-09-CA: 1550 Government Street
Applicant: Zito Russell Architects
Received: 12/22/08
Meeting: 01/07/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing Property
Zoning: B-4
Project: Exterior renovations

BUILDING HISTORY

This is a non-contributing building within the Old Dauphin Way district.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the 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. Traditionally, this site was owned and occupied by the locally-owned Delchamps grocery store. The current tenant, Winn-Dixie, intends to renovate both the interior and exterior of the building, as well as expand into the adjacent, un-leased space. In doing so, these plans will require changes and upgrades to the exterior of the building, including a new front façade, reorganized entryways and exits, new signage and decorative elements along the south facade.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior Standards state that additions or changes to non-historic buildings within a historic district should be designed so that there is the least possible intrusion into the character of the surrounding district and neighborhood.

The Mobile Historic District Sign Guidelines read, in pertinent part:

- 1. Internally lit signs are prohibited.
 - 2. Lighted signs shall use focused, low intensity illumination.
- D. Applicants propose
- 1. alterations to the front or east façade, per submitted plan, including
 - a. new entrance canopy at south east corner of building constructed of spandrel glass and stucco to replace existing brown aluminum canopy
 - b. new columns flanking new entrance canopy of stucco with accents
 - c. new sliding, aluminum doors
 - d. new EIFS cornice with metal coping running entire length of east façade

- e. new metal canopy to replace existing brown aluminum canopy at northeast portion of façade
 - f. new stucco finish, EIFS with metal coping and decorative pilasters to match front columns along southern façade
 - g. paint per submitted paint scheme (see renderings).
2. new signage
- a. 182 sq. ft. total
 - b. Wall mounted
 - c. Internal neon behind translucent face
 - d. Letters will be painted metal can letters with acrylic face

STAFF ANALYSIS

The applicants consulted with staff prior to submitting this application. Of the schemes presented, staff strongly recommended the applicants use this scheme, which represents Winn Dixie's newest prototype for its stores. Staff believes the application presents an overall improvement in the design and use of this site. Staff has further determined that the changes in the building footprint are minimal and therefore do not further impair the integrity of the adjacent district. However, Staff strongly urges the applicants to consider its approach to the parking lot and landscaping. Staff believes an updated plan for landscaping; both within the parking lot and around the building could minimize the negative impact of the parking lot and the building on the historic district.

Under the sign design guidelines, internally-illuminated, acrylic-faced signage is not allowed within historic districts. Therefore, the signage as presented in this application is inappropriate for the district. The ARB routinely approves open-faced neon or reverse-channel lettering as appropriate signage within historic districts.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Steve Zito, Wendell Covin and Lee Ayo were present to discuss the application. Mr. Ayo further explained the plans to expand the store and that the proposed design was the new Winn Dixie prototype. The Board discussed landscaping and signage. The applicants agreed to have a sign contractor resubmit their signage plans once the project was further along.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board spoke to the landscaping and sign issues. There was general agreement that landscape improvements to the parking would greatly improve the sites blending with the historic areas of the neighborhood. There was also general agreement that the pylon sign was not appropriate along the Government Street corridor and the Board would approve any future requests to remove it. Staff did inform the Board and the applicant that landscaping could not be required since the renovations did not reach the threshold that would trigger new landscaping.

FINDING OF FACT

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, amending the facts to delete D(2), the request for signage.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the facts as amended by the Board, the application as amended does not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued with the understanding that a sign application would be brought at a later date.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 01/07/10

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

007-09-CA: 50 Bradford Ave
Applicant: Stephanie & Doug French
Received: 12/19/08
Meeting: 01/07/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing Property
Zoning: R-1
Project: Fence and Accessory Structure

BUILDING HISTORY

This is a contributing bungalow in the Old Dauphin Way district.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the 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 house is located at the corner of Bradford Avenue and Azalea Street. The applicants are seeking de facto approval for a rear storage structure. At this time, the applicants would also like approval to install a 6’ wood privacy fence and iron fence.
- B. The Mobile Historic District Guidelines state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “...An accessory structure is any construction other than the main building on the property. It includes but is not limited to garages, carports, pergolas, decks, pool covers, sheds and the like. The appropriateness of accessory structures shall be measured by the guidelines applicable to new construction. The structure should complement the design and scale of the main building.”
 - 2. “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.”
- C. Applicants propose
 - 1. approval for a newly constructed, wooden storage shed;
 - 2. approval to install a 6’ wood privacy fence, per submitted plan,
 - a. To run length of north property along Azalea Street frontage
 - b. To run length of south property line
 - 3. approval to install a 6’ aluminum fence to be placed at rear property line
 - 4. and aluminum gate to be placed at northeast corner of house.

STAFF ANALYSIS

Staff visited the site and concluded the accessory structure, as built, complies with the guidelines. Because it is constructed of wood and features a gable roof, similar to the main building, the accessory structure is appropriate for a historic district. Furthermore, it is modest in scale and placed to the rear of the property, as recommended by the guidelines.

Under the guidelines, residential property owners may construct 6' wooden privacy fences along side and rear property lines within historic districts. However, the zoning ordinance prohibits solid wood fences along side yards where the side yard fronts a street. Thus, property owners of corner lots wishing to construct a privacy fence along a side yard which fronts a street must apply for a variance. Therefore, Staff has consulted with the Urban Development department. At this juncture, the only fence which can be approved for the Azalea Street property line, which would comply with both the zoning ordinance and the ARB guidelines, is either a 3' wood picket or iron fence.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Stephanie French was present to discuss the application. Ms. French explained that the storage shed has already been constructed. Ms. French further explained her fence plans. Staff explained, due to corner location of the property, the applicant would need a zoning variance to install a privacy fence. The Board explained privacy fences for corner lots in historic districts have been determined to be inappropriate. Mr. Roberts inquired about the material of the shed and whether plywood sheds were appropriate for historic districts. Mr. Roberts offered to do a design review meeting with the applicants regarding the shed. The applicant agreed. The applicant asked to be able to move forward with demolition of an existing metal shed.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

FINDING OF FACT

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, deleting fact C(1), amending fact C(2) to state that the fence will be a 6' wood privacy fence along the south property line, amending fact C(3) to state that a metal fence as high as 5' will be placed along the west and rear, north property lines, amending fact C(4) to state that the gates will be placed per submitted plan and either flat top or rounded and adding facts C(5) to stated that the metal shed will be demolished and C(7) the house will be painted Monorail Silver.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the facts as amended by the Board, the application for the fence does not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. Bunky Ralph further moved that the application for the storage shed be tabled in order for the applicant to meet with a design review committee.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 01/07/10