

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
October 15, 2008 – 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 3:05.

The Introductory Statement was read by the staff.

The members present were Tilmon Brown, Tom Karwinski, Harris Oswalt, Bunky Ralph, Craig Roberts, Robert Brown, Jim Wagoner and Carlos Gant.

Staff present were: John Lawler, Keri Coumanis, Melissa Thomas and Sandra Franks.

The Minutes of the previous meeting were approved as posted per a motion of Robert Brown.

The Mid-Month Requests were approved as submitted per a motion of Tom Karwinski.

B. MID-MONTH APPROVALS

1. Applicant's Name: Super Quality Masonry

- a. Property Address: 1012 Texas Street
- b. Date of Approval: September 26, 2008
- c. Project: Level foundation and repair piers and infill to match with original bricks where visible.

2. Applicant's Name: Kenneth Palmertree

- a. Property Address: 1111 Old Shell Road
- b. Date of Approval: September 26, 2008
- c. Project: THIS COA REPLACES COA DATED 9-22-06. Add front porch detailing to include: column, railing, wood stairs and stair rail per MHDC drawings. Replace rotten wood as necessary with new materials to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Paint to match existing color scheme.

3. Applicant's Name: Mobile Housing Board

- a. Property Address: 151 S. Claiborne
- b. Date of Approval: 23 September 2008
- c. Project: Repaint per existing colors.

4. Applicant's Name: Ted Sierke

- a. Property Address: 1661 Dauphin
- b. Date of Approval: 2 October 2008
- c. Project: Reroof with charcoal grey shingles. Rebuild chimneys and restucco as per original, reside dormers to match house. Repair two existing chimneys, restucco with smooth stucco, and install new flashing. Retain terra cotta chimney liners. Work to match the existing in profile, dimension and material. Remove existing mineral siding from dormers, repair any rotten sub-sheathing and framing. Install 6" lap 1/2" siding to match the siding on exterior walls of residence. Prime and paint all wood surfaces of dormers to match existing.

5. Applicant's Name: Fred South

- a. Property Address: 18 South Julia Street
 - b. Date of Approval: September 24, 2008
 - c. Project: Repair/ replace rotten trim and siding to match existing in profile, dimension and materials. Paint to match existing color scheme.
- 6. Applicant's Name: William Christian**
- a. Property Address: 510 Monroe Street
 - b. Date of Approval: September 25, 2008
 - c. Project: Repair/ replace rotten siding with materials to match existing in profile, dimension and materials. Paint to match existing color scheme.
- 7. Applicant's Name: Juanita Owens**
- a. Property Address: 100 Herndon Ave
 - b. Date of Approval: October 3, 2008
 - c. Project: Repair roof, including flashing, and replace shingles to match existing or reroof with black or grey 3-tab asphalt shingles. Repair wood siding to match existing in profile, dimension and material.
- 8. Applicant's Name: Jerome Lane for Bob Zimmerman**
- a. Property Address: 18 South Pine Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/22/08
 - c. Project: Repaint house existing colors: body – bronze; deck –bellingrath green; trim – white.
- 9. Applicant's Name: D& T Contracting**
- a. Property Address: 210 S. Cedar
 - b. Date of Approval: September 29, 2008
 - c. Project: Reroof the house matching the existing in material and color: 25 year three tab shingle black or dark gray in color.
- 10. Applicant's Name: Paul Morris**
- a. Property Address: 64 Bradford
 - b. Date of Approval: September 15, 2008
 - c. Project: (Replacement COA for COA dated 10-30-06) Repair/replace 105 siding as necessary with new 105 siding to match existing. Remove awnings from windows

C. APPLICATIONS

- 1. 145-08-CA: 155 South Broad Street**
 - a. Applicant: Adline Clark
 - b. Request: Repair/ restore back porch; install columns.
 - c. **Approved.**
- 2. 146-08-CA: 451 Dauphin Street**
 - a. Applicant: Douglas Kearley
 - b. Request: Install storm windows.
 - c. **Approved.**
- 3. 147-08-CA: 19 N Ann Street**
 - a. Applicant: Ben Cummings

- b. Request: Construct rear screen porch; landscaping.
 - c. **Approved.**
4. **148-08-CA: 1050 New St. Francis Street**
- a. Applicant: Francis A. Poggi, Jr.
 - b. Request: Reroof with metal roofing materials.
 - c. **Approved with conditions.**
5. **149-08-CA: 108 Charles Street**
- a. Applicant: Virginia S. McClinton
 - b. Request: Repairs to rotten wood on porch; install a 4' iron fence.
 - c. **Approved.**
6. **150-08-CA: 260 South Cedar Street**
- a. Applicant: Dr. Helen E. Campbell
 - b. Request: Install a 6'-8" privacy fence.
 - c. **Approved.**
7. **151-08-CA: 153 South Monterey Street**
- a. Applicant: Emanuel Gazzier
 - b. Request: Reroof; remove and replace siding.
 - c. **Approved.**
8. **152-08-CA: 12 Common Street**
- a. Applicant: Katherine Morrisette
 - b. Request: Remove asbestos shingle siding; replace with HardiePlank.
 - c. **Approved, in part. Sent to Design Review Committee.**
9. **153-08-CA: 113 Ryan Avenue**
- a. Applicant: Edward B. Ladd
 - b. Request: Remove fascia boards; replace with HardiePlank.
 - c. **Denied.**
10. **154-08-CA: 208 South Dearborn**
- a. Applicant: Brenda Dennis Elliot
 - b. Request: Replace 4-light window with single-light.
 - c. **Denied.**
11. **155-08-CA: Oakland Terrace**
- a. Applicant: Jane Montgomery Hamilton
 - b. Request: Approve paint colors.
 - c. **Withdrawn.**

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

145-08-CA: 155 South Broad Street
Applicant: Adline C. Clarke
Received: 9/29/08
Meeting: 10/15/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street
Classification: Contributing Property
Zoning: R-1
Project: Repair/ restore back porch; install columns.

BUILDING HISTORY

This Victorian home was built for J. Leslie Taylor, circa 1898.

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 residence has been undergoing renovation. The applicant has a current COA to demolish to later shed-roof additions in the rear of the home. While doing so, they rediscovered the a portion of the original back porch and seek to modify the existing COA to allow for repair/reconstruction of the porch.
- B. The guidelines state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture. Historic porches should be maintained and repaired to reflect their period. Particular attention should be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/ columns, proportions and decorative details. The balustrade of the stairs should match the design and materials of the porch.”
- C. Applicants wish to:
 - 1. repair the fascia and soffit board where the later addition was removed
 - 2. install a 4x4 column at the southeast end of the porch and cover with beveled pol wrap

STAFF ANALYSIS

Staff recommends approval on the condition that the applicant installs either a box column or chamfered post on the rear porch. Further, staff recommends approval provided the applicant expands the scope of work to include the following:

- install a new corner board at the original southeast corner of the home;
- install new tongue and groove porch decking to match existing or repair existing decking where it can be repaired;
- repair existing sill.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Ms. Adline Clarke was present to discuss the application. Ms. Clarke explained that they had discovered the original porch during the previously-approved demolition of the rear shed additions.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Craig Roberts explained to the applicant that there was no need to go to the detail or expense of placing a front porch column on the rear of the porch. Mr. Roberts also advised the applicant to consider a 6" x 6" post.

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 fact C(2) to state that the applicant will install a 6" x 6" column with beveled base. 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: 10/15/09.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

146-08-CA: 451 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Douglas Kearley
Received: 9/10/08
Meeting: 10/1/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street
Classification: Contributing Property
Zoning: B-1
Project: Install storm windows.

BUILDING HISTORY

This is a typical downtown two-story, storefront constructed in 1855.

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 have a current COA on this building to renovate the building. Applicants wish to modify the COA to allow for the installation of storm windows once the storefront is restored.
- B. The Mobile Historic District Design Guidelines state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Use of storm windows is permitted. These should be as unobtrusive as possible and may be single pane or match the sash pattern of the window. Interior storm windows are encouraged.”
 - 2. The Lower Dauphin Street Design Guidelines does not address storm windows.
- C. Applicants propose:
 - 1. Installing Tru-Channel, white, finished aluminum storm windows with clear glass and a single dividing muntin.

STAFF ANALYSIS

Per the information downloaded from the manufacturers website, these windows appear to be appropriate for historic districts, thus Staff recommends approval.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

There was no one present to discuss this application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed to what extent the ARB regulates storm windows. The Board was advised by staff that interior storm windows do not need to be approved, but exterior storm windows are approved provided they are unobtrusive and match the sash pattern of the window.

FINDING OF FACT

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application, 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 in the staff report, 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: 10/15/09.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

147-08-CA: 19 North Ann Street
Applicant: Ben Cummings for Wael and LaVeda Raouf
Received: 09/19/08
Meeting: 10/15/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing Property
Zoning: R-1
Project: Adding a rear screen porch; landscaping.

BUILDING HISTORY

This is a fairly large, neo-classical revival home in the Old Dauphin Way district constructed in 1907.

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 rear/back porch area of this home has undergone numerous changes through the years, including enclosure of the original rear staircase and back porch. The current plans indicate a shed-roofed, screen porch will be added to a later addition to the house.
- B. The Guidelines state,
 - 1. “A roof is one of the most dominant features of a building. Original or historic roof forms, as well as the original pitch of the roof should be maintained. Materials should be appropriate to the form and pitch and color....”
- C. The applicant proposes:
 - 1. Construction of a 8’ x 11’ deck;
 - 2. Construct a shed roof over the deck and install metal roofing
 - 3. Install screening with guardrail
 - 4. Install steps and balustrade
 - 5. Expand brick patio in back yard
- D. Clarifications needed:
 - 1. Will the balustrade match that on second floor rear porch?
 - 2. Will the brackets match those already on the house?
 - 3. Color of the screen?
 - 4. Color of the metal roof?
 - 5. Paint colors match existing?

STAFF ANALYSIS

Staff recommends approval provided the clarifications needed above meet approval and the applicants consult Urban Forestry regarding the placement of brick paving around the live oak tree.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Ben Cummings was present to discuss the application. Mr. Cummings clarified section D of the staff report as enumerated below in the Finding of Fact.

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, amending fact C(2) to state that the metal roof will be metallic, C(3) to state that the screening will be black or aluminum and C(4) to state that the balustrade will match existing on the house, as well as adding facts C(6) to state that the brackets will match existing on the house, and C(7) to state that the colors will match existing on the house. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Craig Roberts 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: 10/15/09.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

148-08-CA: 1050 New St. Francis Street
Applicant: Francis A. Poggi, Jr.
Received: 09/22/08
Meeting: 10/15/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Install metal roof.

BUILDING HISTORY

This cross-gabled Victorian cottage with 6/9 windows was constructed in 1893 by John Rondeau.

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 applicant wishes to install a metal roof on this cross-gabled Victorian. It currently has a diamond-patterned, asbestos tile shingles which mostly likely dates to the 1920-30s.
- B. The Mobile Historic District Guidelines state,
 - 1. “A roof is one of the most dominant features of a building. Original or historic roof forms, as well as the original pitch of the roof should be maintained. Materials should be appropriate to the form and pitch and color....”
- C. The applicant proposes:
 - 1. Installing a modern metal roofing system, specifically 26 gauge, galvalum, silver metal panels.

STAFF ANALYSIS

There was not enough information submitted with this application to properly evaluate it. Some modern roofing systems are appropriate for historic structures, but it is unclear if what the applicant intends to use is appropriate. The applicant will be bringing a sample to the ARB meeting. However, from the information posted on the website (see <http://www.steelroofing.com/gallery.htm?do=showpic&pid=10>), Staff does not believe this material is appropriate.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Francis Poggi and Mr. Felis, the roofing contractor, were present to discuss this application. The applicants brought a sample of the proposed roof to be installed. Mr. Poggi explained that the house had a problem shedding water and that he was looking for a durable roof product.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Craig Roberts explained the Board had determined that only standing seam or a 5-V-Crimp metal roof are appropriate for historic structures. Mr. Roberts further explained that the roofing material presented would not be appropriate and there would be concerns with how this roof met the cornice work or fascia board on the house. Mr. Poggi said he would be amenable to switching to a 5-V-Crimp roof or pressed metal shingles.

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 fact C(1) to state that the roof would be either 5-V-Crimp or pressed metal shingles. 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 provided that the applicant supply installation details to the staff.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/15/09.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

149-08-CA: 108 Charles Street
Applicant: Virginia S. McClinton
Received: 09/29/08
Meeting: 10/15/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Repair rotten wood on porch; construct 4' picket fence.

BUILDING HISTORY

This raised, center hall, one and half story with Colonial Revival details was most likely constructed in 1915 by Virginia H. Whiting.

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 applicant intends to make some routine maintenance repairs on her front porch. The applicant also wishes to install a 4' picket fence across the front yard of the property and two pedestrian gates at the walkway.
- B. The Mobile Historic District Guidelines for fences states the following:
 - 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.” While the current guidelines do not address the height of picket fences across the front yard, the Board has determined that 3' open fences are appropriate for historic districts.
 - 2. The Guidelines state repairs to existing materials should match the original in profile, dimension and material.
- C. Applicant proposes:
 - 1. Repair rotten wood at base of two corner columns;
 - 2. Repair rotten wood on porch deck;
 - 3. Repair/replace rotten lattice;
 - 4. Install a 4' iron picket fence across front yard to tie in with existing privacy fence, per submitted plan;
 - 5. Install a two-4' gate to match fence materials, per submitted plan.

STAFF ANALYSIS

Staff recommends approval for the rotten wood repair on items C(1-3). The applicant has been advised and intends to match the existing materials.

The applicant has submitted an acceptable design and material for the fence. Staff has advised the applicant of the height limitation for front yard fences; however, the applicant wishes to exceed the 3' height requirement and construct a 4' fence. The applicant has submitted an example of a 4' iron fence in the neighborhood. The applicant further believes she needs the extra height for safety reasons.

Recently, the Board has denied the request for several 4' wood picket, front yard fences where there was not precedent in the neighborhood for fences exceeding 3'. In Oakleigh, there are several iron fences. However, at this juncture, Staff recommends denial.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Virginia McClinton was present to discuss the application. Ms. McClinton discussed the 3' height limitation and indicated that there were many 4' (or higher), front yard, iron fences throughout the neighborhood. Ms. McClinton also explained that her porch is 7' from the ground and, thus, a 4' fence would be more proportional to the home rather than a 3' fence. Ms. McClinton explained that she was purchasing a custom made iron fence and does not intend to plant any hedges.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Karwinski stated that an iron fence is much more transparent than a wooden fence and may be the reason to exceed the 3' height limitation. Mr. Wagoner concurred with the applicant regarding the fact that a 4' fence may be more appropriate for this raised home. The Board determined (1) given the fact that the house was raised seven feet from the ground; (2) there was a precedent for 4' iron fences in the neighborhood; and (3) the applicant choice of fence materials was iron rather than wood, a 4' fence may be more appropriate for this property rather than a 3' fence.

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, amending fact C(5) to state two double-5' wide gates would be installed at the walkways. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Craig Roberts 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. Bunky Ralph opposed.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/15/09.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

150-08-CA: 260 South Cedar Street
Applicant: Dr. Helen E. Campbell
Received: 09/29/08
Meeting: 10/15/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: New Construction
Zoning: R-1
Project: Raise a 6' privacy fence to 8' or, in the alternative, raise a 6' privacy fence to 6'-8".

BUILDING HISTORY

New construction in the Church Street East 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 applicant wants to raise an existing 6' privacy fence two feet (in alternating sections) in order to add more privacy to her backyard. Staff has been working with this applicant and she has now agreed to raise the fence only 8". Please note the work has already taken place. Since this height still exceeds the height limitation found in our Guidelines, this project is being submitted to the Board.
- B. The Mobile Historic District Guidelines for fences states the following: "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 proposes:
 - 1. Adding 8" in alternating sections to an existing 6' privacy fence, per submitted plans.

STAFF ANALYSIS

Staff recommends denial. Though the applicant wishes to shield/disguise her view of the neighbor's greenhouse, staff believes this can be accomplished through landscaping. Staff does not believe this case presents sufficient reasons to depart from the rules stated in the Guidelines.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Dr. Helen Campbell was present to discuss the application. Dr. Campbell explained that the fence was increased in height in order to shield her neighbor's view of her yard. Dr. Campbell explained that the fence was complete at this time and she would like to retain it as is.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. The Board determined that since this fence adjoined an 8' fence, the fence may exceed the 6' height limitation.

FINDING OF FACT

Tom Karwinski 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

Tom Karwinski 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.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/15/09.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

151-08-CA: 153 South Monterey Street
Applicant: Emanuel Gazzier
Received: 09/22/08
Meeting: 10/15/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way Historic District
Classification: Contributing Property
Zoning: R-1
Project: Repair/ replace exterior siding

BUILDING HISTORY

This is a contributing residence in the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. As a Dutch Colonial Revival replete with a gambrel roof, it is a somewhat rare house form for Mobile. There is brick veneer on the first floor and lap siding on the second floor.

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 applicant has indicated he wants to do some repairs on the roof and exterior of the home, including removing the lap siding and replacing it with new siding. The applicant submitted an application in October 2003 to repair the siding. Its unclear where that work took place, however, there is drop siding on the south elevation where there would have been lap siding.
- B. The Mobile Historic District Guidelines state,
 - 1. “The exterior material of a building helps define its style, quality and historic period. The original siding should be retained and repaired. Replacement of exterior finishes, when required, must match the original in profile, dimension and material.”
- C. The applicant is proposing to:
 - 1. Remove existing 3-tab shingle roof, re-deck with plywood and re-roof with 3-tab shingles;
 - 2. Install new flashing around the chimneys;
 - 3. Remove all siding to get rid of rot and insulate;
 - 4. Replace with identical siding;
 - 5. Repair rotten wood on fascia and eaveboards;
 - 6. Install security lights.
- D. Clarifications:
 - 1. Is it necessary to replace all the siding?
 - 2. Will the drop siding on the south elevation be removed?
 - 3. Where will the security lights be placed?

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The applicant's application was not complete. Staff has attempted to ascertain more information about the applicant's intentions. The applicant believes it is necessary to remove all of the siding from the second floor of his home in order to alleviate rot and to insulate the home.

Staff does not recommend wholesale removal of exterior, original siding unless it is absolutely necessary. In this case, it does not appear necessary and staff would recommend the rotten wood be removed ONLY as necessary. Any siding removed must be replaced with wood siding and match the existing profile and dimension on the house.

Staff recommends approval for the roof repairs.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Emanuel Gazzier was present to discuss the application. Mr. Gazzier further explained that he wished to replace rotten siding on the house. Mr. Gazzier wants to replace the siding with 1" x 6" with a 1"-1/2" lap on it to provide for a 4" reveal. Mr. Gazzier also intends to replace the roof.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Board members discussed the applicant's options for roofing materials. Board members wanted the record to state that any new siding must match existing historic siding on the front of the house, not the replacement, non-conforming siding, which has been applied to walls on the house. Ms. Ralph and Mr. Roberts suggested uplighting as opposed to downlighting.

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, amending fact C(4) to state that new materials must match the original lap siding and C(5) to state that any new materials must match the existing. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Craig Roberts 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: 10/15/09.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

152-08-CA: 12 Common Street
Applicant: Dennis Overton and Katherine Morrissette
Received: 9/18/08
5Meeting: 10/15/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-contributing Property
Zoning: R-1
Project: Repair siding.

BUILDING HISTORY

This is a non-contributing residence in the Old Dauphin Way District; though, it was most likely constructed around 1932.

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 front of this home has asbestos shingle siding, however, the back and sides of the building have lap siding.
- B. The Mobile Historic District Guidelines state,
 - 1. “The exterior material of a building helps define its style, quality and historic period. The original siding should be retained and repaired. Replacement of exterior finishes, when required, must match the original in profile, dimension and material.”
- C. Applicant proposes:
 - 1. Remove the asbestos siding on the front of the house
 - 2. Replace with HardiePlank?
- D. Clarifications:
 - 1. Is the lap siding on the side of the house HardiePlank?

STAFF ANALYSIS

The applicants indicate they received permission to place HardiePlank on the side and back of this home and now want to remove the asbestos siding on the front and replace with HardiePlank. Our records do not indicate whether the HardiePlank was approved. Staff recommends approval for removal of the asbestos shingle siding; however, the new materials must match the existing siding on the side of the house. Staff will ascertain before the 10/15 meeting whether the existing siding is wood or HardiePlank.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Ms. Katherine Morrissette was present to discuss the application. Ms. Morrissette stated that she wished to replace the front siding and any other rotten wood, redo the front steps, remove the iron work and repaint.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Tom Karwinski offered a design review committee. There was a discussion among the board members as to whether approve the application or table until after the design review committee met. Mr. Oswalt advised that some of the work could be approved on a mid-month basis. Mr. Brown advised the applicants once they received a COA to move forward with any work on the sides or the back of the home, but wait on the front until after the DRC met. The DRC will meet with the applicant during the week of Oct. 20.

FINDING OF FACT

Tom Karwinski moved, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph 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 with DRC to address front elevation of house. Carlos Gant opposed.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/15/09. Assigned to Design Review Committee with Tom Karwinski.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

153-08-CA: 113 Ryan Avenue
Applicant: Edward B. Ladd
Received: 9/25/08
Meeting: 10/15/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Ashland Place
Classification: Contributing Property
Zoning: R-1
Project: Replace fascia boards with HardiePlank.

BUILDING HISTORY

This two-story Colonial Revival dates to approximately 1920 and is a contributing structure in Ashland Place.

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 applicant would like to remove existing wood materials and replace with HardiePlank. The applicant indicated modern paint materials are not adhering to the wood siding and therefore the house requires regular routine maintenance. The applicant believes HardiePlank will be an improvement over the wood siding. Though the application is only for replacement of the fascia boards, the applicant indicated in conversations with staff he was considering wholesale replacement of the exterior siding.
- B. The Mobile Historic District Guidelines state,
 - 1. “The exterior material of a building helps define its style, quality and historic period. The original siding should be retained and repaired. Replacement of exterior finishes, when required, must match the original in profile, dimension and material.”
- C. Applicant proposes:
 - 1. Removing existing fascia boards and replacing with HardiePlank
 - 2. Paint to match existing color schemes.

STAFF ANALYSIS

Staff recommends denial. The ARB does not allow wooden, architectural elements to be replaced by HardiePlank.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Edward B. Ladd and Mary Hunter Slaton were present to discuss the application. Mr. Ladd explained that he wished to replace the wood on his house with HardiePlank because it is not cost effective to keep

repainting the wood. Mr. Ladd urged the Board to look favorably upon replacement. Mr. Ladd indicated that one would not be able to tell the difference between the wood and HardiePlank and that he would sheath the house in plywood, if necessary.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Brown explained that the Board does not allow cement or fiber-based sidings to be used in the existing structure. Mr. Roberts recommended the applicant look into cedar or redwood as a replacement; that HardiePlank is thinner than wood and does not produce the same reveal as wood. Mr. Brown explained that HardiePlank required a substrate and that sheathing the house in plywood would alter all of the historic reveals.

FINDING OF FACT

Jim Wagoner moved, 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

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

Denied.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

154-08-CA: 208 South Dearborn
Applicant: Brenda Dennis Elliot
Received: 9/12/08
Meeting: 10/1/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Replace 4-light window on porch with single-light.

BUILDING HISTORY

This is a 1-1/2 story Creole cottage directly across from British Park in the Church Street East historic district. There are somewhat identical houses along the street.

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 house has a mid-month COA for routine maintenance on the exterior; however, the applicant would like to change the front window.
- B. The Mobile Historic District Guidelines state the following: “The 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.”
- C. Applicant proposes:
 - 1. Removing muntins from 4-paned divided light window and installing a single pane of glass

STAFF ANALYSIS

Staff recommends denial. Though this window is smaller than the others on the house, it appears to be original and is located over the landing on the interior stairs. Staff recommends the applicant replace the broken panes of glass only, rather than removing the muntins and replacing with a single pane of glass.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

There was no one present to discuss this application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Staff clarified for the Board that the applicant had an existing COA to do repairs on the home; however, the proposed treatment for this window needed to be addressed by the Board. The Board proposed Staff work with the applicant in order to retain the 4-paned window.

FINDING OF FACT

Bunky Ralph moved, based upon the evidence presented in the application, 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, based upon the facts as amended by the Board, the application does impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness not be issued. The motion was approved unanimously.

Denied.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

APPLICATION WITHDRAWN

155-08-CA: 8 Oakland Terrace
Applicant: Jane Montgomery Hamilton
Received: 9/29/08
Meeting: 10/15/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing Property
Zoning: R-1
Project: Approve paint colors.

BUILDING HISTORY

This house represents the early twentieth-century transition from neo-classical revival styles to bungalows.

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 owner of this property has submitted paint colors for review.
- B. The MHDC ordinance stipulates that paint colors for houses in historic districts must be submitted for approval to the ARB.
- C. Applicant proposes:
 - 1. Repainting house with submitted color scheme. See attached paint chip.

STAFF ANALYSIS

Though the Staff generally approves paint colors, the proposed color for the body of the house is a bit deep for a bungalow, thus Staff has referred the applicants to the ARB. Staff has also suggested the applicants consult historic color charts at Sherwin Williams.

APPLICATION WITHDRAWN

Other Business

Mr. Banks Ladd requested permission to speak to the Board regarding his application before the Board on October 1, 2008. Ms. Ralph made a motion to allow him to address the Board and the Board granted him permission to speak.

Mr. Ladd informed the Board he was preparing to appeal the ARB decision regarding his application to construct an addition at 106 LeVert Avenue, as well as preparing new plans for the addition. Mr. Ladd indicated there are discrepancies in the record and that the Board's Finding of Facts was in error. Specifically, Mr. Ladd did not request the Board vote on a verbal amendment to the plan involving the second floor, west wall of the residence. The record reflects otherwise. A discussion was held. No Board action was taken at this time.