

CITY OF MOBILE
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

Minutes of the Meeting
March 13, 2006

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:01 p.m. by Chair, Bunky Ralph. Ed Hooker, Architectural Engineer, called the roll as follows:

Members Present: Tilmon Brown, Douglas Kearley, Cindy Klotz, Harris Oswalt, Cameron Pfeiffer, Bunky Ralph, Joe Sackett, David Tharp.

Members Absent: Robert Brown, Michael Mayberry.

Staff Members Present: Ed Hooker, Anne Crutcher, Devereaux Bemis, John Lawler

<u>In Attendance</u>	<u>Mailing Address</u>	<u>Item Number</u>
David McConnell	1201 Chimney Top Dr W	037-05/-06-CA 038-05/06-CA
Pat Patrick	5224 Halls Mill Rd. 36619	037-05/06-CA
Lucy Barr	211 Lanier	041-05/06-CA
Sumner Adams	211 Lanier	041-05/06-CA
Darrel Williams	203 S. Warren	045-05/06-CA
Green Suttles	4110 Moffet Rd.	observer
Jennifer Sands	P.O. Box 1827	042-05/06-CA
David Rasp	273 Dauphin St.	043-05/06-CA
Linda Snapp	762 Downtowner Loop	042-05/06-CA
Thomas E. Latham	762 Downtowner Loop	042-05/06-CA
John Vallas	3290 Dauphin St.	042-05/06-CA
Melissa Thomas	50 St. Emanuel St.	033-05/06-CA
Rusty Reid	50 St. Emanuel St.	033-05/06-CA

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

Tilmon Brown moved to approve the mid-month Certificates of Appropriateness. The motion was seconded by Douglas Kearley and unanimously approved.

MID-MONTH APPROVALS

1. Applicant's Name: K.V. Fordham
Property Address: 654 Marine Street
Date of Approval: 1/21/06 weh
Work Approved: Repair or replace damaged wood with materials matching existing in material, profile and dimension. Repaint in existing color scheme.
2. Applicant's Name: Jo Ann Yarborough/ Caroline Street Contracting
Property Address: 1150 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 1/21/06 asc
Work Approved: Install new weathered wood architectural shingle roof; replace areas of fascia and soffit with new wood to match existing.
3. Applicant's Name: The Lathan Company
Property Address: 1464 Church Street

- Date of Approval: 1/31/06 jss
 Work Approved: Repair shingle roof with materials matching existing in material, profile and dimension.
4. Applicant's Name: The Lathan Company
 Property Address: 359 Church Street
 Date of Approval: 1/31/06 weh
 Work Approved: Repair shingle roof with materials matching existing in material, profile and dimension.
5. Applicant's Name: Robert E. Gibney
 Property Address: 1006 Dauphin Street
 Date of Approval: 2/1/06 asc
 Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary on fascia and front porch with new materials to match existing in profile, materials and dimension. Repaint building in the existing color scheme.
6. Applicant's Name: Ralph Reynolds Roofing
 Property Address: 1316 Dauphin Street
 Date of Approval: 2/1/06 asc
 Work Approved: Install new roof using 3 tab charcoal shingles to match existing.
7. Applicant's Name: Roger Muller
 Property Address: 1556 Bruister
 Date of Approval: 2/2/06 weh
 Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary with new materials matching existing in profile, dimension and materials. Repaint in the following color scheme:
 Body – Ruskin Room Green SW0042
 Trim – Classic Light Buff SW 0050
 Door and window accent – deep eggplant/black
 Porch floor – light gray
 Porch ceiling – robin's egg blue
 Lattice on infill – black or buff
 Remove paint on brick columns & return to original brick.
8. Applicant's Name: AmSouth Bank
 Property Address: 31 North Royal Street
 Date of Approval: 2/2/06 jss
 Work Approved: Re-roof with materials matching existing in profile, dimension and material.
9. Applicant's Name: Dorothy Taldon
 Property Address: 1252 Old Shell Road
 Date of Approval: 2/2/06 weh
 Work Approved: Re-roof with gray 3 tab fiberglass shingles. Replace rotten wood as necessary with materials to match existing in materials, profile and dimension. Repaint building: body – sage green, trim – white (or in existing color scheme.)

10. Applicant's Name: Hot Diggity Dog
Property Address: 153 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 2/2/06 jdb
Work Approved: Prepare for painting and repaint building trim currently painted in the existing color scheme.
11. Applicant's Name: Paul Diaz
Property Address: 358 Michigan Avenue
Date of Approval: 2/3/06 weh
Work Approved: Repaint building in existing color scheme (body to match existing and trim to be Classical white.) replace rotten wood as necessary to match existing in profile, dimension and material.
12. Applicant's Name: Harold Gerhardt
Property Address: 1208 New St. Francis Street
Date of Approval: 2/6/06 weh
Work Approved: Repaint house in the following color scheme:
Body – Wet Concrete
Trim – Cloud White
13. Applicant's Name: Mr. and Mrs. Marvin Fairley
Property Address: 1010 Selma Street
Date of Approval: 2/6/06 weh
Work Approved: Re-roof entire house with materials to match existing in color, profile and dimension.
14. Applicant's Name: Caroline Presley/Rose McPhillips
Property Address: 60 South Conception Street
Date of Approval: 2/7/06 asc
Work Approved: Re-roof building with architectural shingles, dark brown in color to match existing.
15. Applicant's Name: Warren Butler
Property Address: 114 Lanier Avenue
Date of Approval: 2/7/06 weh
Work Approved: Replace storm damaged fence.
16. Applicant's Name: ACO Employment/Wrico Signs
Property Address: 9 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 2/8/06 weh
Work Approved: Install double faced sign measuring 3' x 4', or 24 square feet, as per submitted design.
17. Applicant's Name: Weather Guard Metal Roofing
Property Address: 1219 Elmira Street
Date of Approval: 2/8/06 jss
Work Approved: Re-roof building with galvalume, 26 gauge standing seam metal roof. Color to match existing.

18. Applicant's Name: Reynolds Roofing Co/ Mrs. Alva H. Whiddon
Property Address: 557 Church Street
Date of Approval: 2/8/06 jss
Work Approved: Repair roof with materials to match existing in profile, dimension, materials & color.
19. Applicant's Name: Coulson Roofing Co.
Property Address: 71 North Reed Avenue
Date of Approval: 2/9/06 asc
Work Approved: Re-roof building with architectural shingles, pewter in color.
20. Applicant's Name: Hot Diggity Dogs
Property Address: 153 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 2/10/06 asc
Work Approved: Install MDO double face projecting sign 36" x 27", totaling 13.5 sq. ft. Colors to be red, blue, and yellow as per submitted drawing.
21. Applicant's Name: Willie Lucky
Property Address: 262 Marine Street
Date Approved: 2/13/06 jdb
Work Approved: Re-roof building with 3 tab shingles, black in color.
22. Applicant's Name: J. Maintenance and Contracting
Property Address: 1508 Eslava Street
Date Approved: 2/13/06 jss
Work Approved: Replace rotten fascia on main house with materials to match existing materials in profile and dimension. Re-roof back building with 3 tab shingles to match existing in profile, dimension and color.
23. Applicant's Name: Bobby Gipson
Property Address: 504 Eslava Street
Date Approved: 2/14/06 weh
Work Approved: Re-roof building with dimensional shingles, black in color.
24. Applicant's Name: Universal Glass
Property Address: 157 Dauphin Street
Date Approved: 2/14/06 weh
Work Approved: Replace damaged glass front door with glass door matching existing in materials, profile and dimension.
25. Applicant's Name: O. C. Wiggins
Property Address: 112 South Georgia Avenue
Date Approved: 2/14/06 weh
Work Approved: Re-roof with 3 tab asphalt shingles, black in color.
26. Applicant's Name: Richard Dorman
Property Address: 6 North Jackson Street
Date Approved: 2/14/06 asc
Work Approved: Re-glaze existing windows. Replace rotten window sills

with new wood to match existing in profile, dimension, and material. Paint doors and windows to match existing color scheme.

27. Applicant's Name: Bill Finch
Property Address: 1106 Savannah Street
Date Approved: 2/17/06 weh
Work Approved: Replace front porch flooring with materials matching existing in material, profile and dimension. Repaint porch to match existing color scheme. Touch-up painting as necessary on exterior elevations.
28. Applicant's Name: Oakland and Kelly McCulloch
Property Address: 58 North Monterey Street
Date Approved: 2/17/06 km
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Reglaze windows. Repaint house: colors to be submitted later. Paint new materials to match existing color scheme.
29. Applicant's Name: Len Stemman
Property Address: 160 Dexter Avenue
Date Approved: 2/20/06 weh
Work Approved: Add additional gravel to existing gravel drive as necessary.
30. Applicant's Name: Mobile Public Library/ Holmes & Holmes, Architects
Property Address: 701 Government Street
Date Approved: 2/21/06 weh
Work Approved: Repaint existing steel casement windows dark green in color. Paint existing wood doors bronze. Paint building to match color of new pre-cast concrete panels.
31. Applicant's Name: Christ Church Cathedral/Holmes & Holmes, Architects
Property Address: 115 St. Emanuel Street
Date Approved: 2/21/06 weh
Work Approved: Re-roof sanctuary with new built-up roof with materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Re-roof Rectory & Chapter House with new asphalt shingles to match existing in color, profile and dimension.
32. Applicant's Name: Christ Church Cathedral/ Holmes & Holmes Arch.
Property Address: 115 St. Emanuel Street
Date Approved: 2/21/06 weh
Work Approved: Re-roof sanctuary with new built-up roof with materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Re-roof Rectory and Chapter House with new asphalt shingles to match existing in color, profile and dimension.
33. Applicant's Name: Kendow Roofing
Property Address: 1701 Springhill Avenue
Date Approved: 2/21/06 weh

- Work Approved: Re-roof building with materials to match existing.
(3-tab shingles, brown wood in color)
34. Applicant's Name: S. Adam Davis
Property Address: 1119 Church Street
Date Approved: 2/21/06 weh
Work Approved: Re-roof with architectural shingles, charcoal in color.
35. Applicant's Name: A&A Roofing
Property Address: 1130 Montauk Avenue
Date Approved: 2/21/06 weh
Work Approved: Re-roof building with materials to match existing in
profile, dimension and color.
36. Applicant's Name: Sillings Construction Co.
Property Address: 1660 Old Shell Road
Date Approved: 2/21/06 weh
Work Approved: Re-roof building with dimensional shingles, gray in
color.
37. Applicant's Name: Thelma Collins
Property Address: 607 St. Francis Street
Date Approved: 2/22/06 weh
Work Approved: Re-roof building with 3 tab onyx black shingles.
38. Applicant's Name: Juanita Owens/ Caldwin & Osborn
Property Address: 112 Garnet
Date Approved: 2/23/06 asc
Work Approved: Install new timberline black shingle roof.
39. Applicant's Name: Pete's Home Improvements
Property Address: 60 Houston Street
Date Approved: 2/24/06 weh
Work Approved: Repair foundation with existing materials to match
existing where necessary.
40. Applicant's Name: Graham Roofing
Property Address: 1756 New St. Francis Street
Date Approved: 3/1/06 weh
Work Approved: Re-roof with 3 tab shingles, black to match existing.
41. Applicant's Name: Presley Roofing
Property Address: 50 St. Emanuel Street
Date Approved: 3/1/06 weh
Work Approved: Re-roof building with 3 tab fiberglass shingles,
weathered wood in color.

OLD BUSINESS:

1. **033-05/06-CA** 50 St. Emanuel Street
Applicant: Tilmon Brown, Contractor
Nature of Request: Construct balcony as per submitted plans.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

NEW BUSINESS:

- 1. 034-05/06-CA** 7 North Royal Street
Applicant: Lyons, Pipes & Cook/TAG Architects
Nature of Request: Modifications to existing buildings as per submitted plans.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

- 2. 035-05/06-CA** 211 Michigan Avenue
Applicant: Ora & Teri Raines
Nature of Request: After the fact approval of a roofing system over an existing rear deck, as per submitted photographs.

APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. Certified Record attached.

- 3. 036-05/06-CA** 1104 Old Shell Road
Applicant: Mobile Revolving Fund
Nature of Request: Rehabilitate historic structure as per submitted plans. Construct rear addition.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

- 4. 037-05/06-CA** 6 North Jackson Street
Applicant: Richard Dorman
Nature of Request: Replace main entry door with new wood & glass mahogany door to match existing in size. Replace four existing doors with new raised panel mahogany doors to fit existing openings. Paint existing door surround & replace hardware.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

- 5. 038-05/06-CA** 1601 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Cunningham Bounds Crowder Brown & Breedlove
Nature of Request: Remove existing cedar shutters and replace with aluminum hurricane-rated shutters as per submitted information.

APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. Certified Record attached.

- 6. 039-05/06-CA** Flo-Claire Gatehouse, McDonald Avenue at Government Street
Applicant: Flo-Claire Neighborhood Association
Nature of Request: Install neighborhood signage to match original signage as per submitted photograph.

APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. Certified Record attached.

- 7. 040-05/06-CA** 1070 Government Street
Applicant: Vaughan and Linda Drinkard
Nature of Request: Install metal fence around the front and side of residence as per submitted site plan and design.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

- 8. 041-05/06-CA** 211 Lanier Avenue
Applicant: Mr. & Mrs. Sumner Adams/Lucy Barr Designs
Nature of Request: One story addition to right side, two story addition to rear as per submitted design.

APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. Certified Record attached.

- 9. 042-05/06-CA** 1510 Government Street
Applicant: Starbucks/ Clark Geer Latham & Associates
Nature of Request: Construct new free-standing restaurant as per submitted plans.

APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. Certified Record attached.

- 10. 043-05/06-CA** 72 South Royal Street
Applicant: David Rasp
Nature of Request: Renovate building for use as a bar/restaurant as per submitted plans.

APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. Certified Record attached.

- 11. 044-05/06-CA** 200 South Ann Street
Applicant: Bob and Carol Carmack
Nature of Request: Install metal roofing on residence as per submitted sample.

TABLED. Certified Record attached.

- 12. 045-05/06-CA** 203 South Warren Street
Applicant: David McDonald
Nature of Request: Enclose existing rear porch as per submitted plans;
Construct new rear porch as per submitted plans.

TABLED. Certified Record attached.

OTHER BUSINESS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

**1. National Alliance of Preservation Commissions Trip to Baltimore
July 27-30, 2006**

Ed Hooker reported that no information regarding the conference is posted on the NAPC web site.

2. 306 Marine Street Update

Hubert Stokes sold the property to a relative, Sims Stokes in Texas. Tilmon Brown's nephew is trying to purchase the property to restore.

3. Guidelines

Tilmon Brown asked about the status of the guidelines. Ed Hooker reported that a draft had been sent to committee members with a deadline of April 1st for comments. Staff will incorporate any changes into a second draft and forward it to all Board members. Following the Board's acceptance of the guidelines, they will be made available for public comment.

4. Enforcement

Cindy Klotz would like to discuss the issue of enforcement. Devereaux reported that he will be meeting with attorneys to discuss this issue and will report back to the Board at the next meeting.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

033-05/06-CA 50 St. Emanuel Street
Applicant: Peter F. Burns, Owner/Tilmon Brown, Contractor
Received: 3/2/06 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 4/15/06 1) 2/13/06 2) 3/13/06 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District
Classification: Non-Contributing (de-certified)
Zoning: B-4, General Business
Conflicts of Interest: Tilmon Brown recused himself from discussion and voting on the application.
Nature of Project: Construct balcony as per submitted plans.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
Design Review 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 ca. 1850 two story masonry building was considered non-contributing due to unsympathetic alterations over time.
2. There are actually two historic buildings with different second floor window heights, different cornice lines, and roof.
3. The 1904 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map shows that originally the corner building had a balcony, but there was no balcony on the Conti Street elevation of the back building.
4. The original balcony had a shorter run down Conti Street than the one proposed.
5. The proposed balcony is designed in two sections, respecting the fact that there are two separate buildings.
6. The balcony on the front building, at the corner of St. Emanuel and Conti Streets, is more classical in design.
7. The balcony on the front building features 4” cast pipe columns approximately 15’-6” in height with Lawler #6008 and #6009 decorative column wrap and capital.
8. The balustrade is constructed using square pickets spaced at 4” on center, with Lawler decorative element # 9604 spaced between six pickets, or 28” on center.
9. Due to the location on the sidewalk of existing utilities, column spacing along Conti Street cannot be uniform.
10. In order to alleviate the long span between the third and fourth columns from the corner, decorative corner brackets and a center scroll have been proposed (King Metals # 13-61-2).

11. The balcony on the rear building, along Conti Street, is proposed to be constructed of new design elements, and is similar in design to the balcony approved and constructed on the Port City Brewery Building on Dauphin at Joachim Street.
12. Design elements for the rear balcony include 4” square tube columns with Lawler #8398 bases; horizontal stainless steel cables spaced at 4” on center stretched between 2” x 2” square tube vertical pickets; and 2” x 2” tube steel quarter moon brackets.
13. Plans call for three new doors where there are currently existing original historic windows, all located on the Conti Street elevation.
14. While plans call for doors opening onto the proposed balcony, no information was provided regarding these doors, which will be made from existing original historic window openings.
15. The Board should request more information on how the alteration of existing original historic windows will effect the character of the building.

Staff recommends approval of the application with the condition that additional information be provided regarding the alteration of windows to doors to allow egress onto the balcony.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Melissa Thomas and Rusty Reid were present to answer Board questions. At the meeting additional information was submitted regarding the doors to the balcony. The door presented will be a 15 light French wood door per the submitted photograph and be painted to match the trim. In response to a Board question regarding the choice of a 15 rather than 12 light door, Mr. Reid responded that since windows are 6/6 light, the upper portion of the door will match the existing windows while the lower 3 lights will be out of view.

There was no one else 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

Cindy Klotz proposed adding fact 16. Wood doors will be 15 light and painted to match the trim color. The doors will fill the door opening and have no transom.

FINDING OF FACT

Cindy Klotz moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and at the public hearing, that the Board finds the facts in the staff report with the addition of fact 16 as above. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswalt and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Cindy Klotz moved that, based upon the facts adopted by the Board, that the application does not impair the building or the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswalt and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 03/13/07.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

034-05/06-CA 7 North Royal Street
Applicant: Lyons, Pipes & Cook/TAG Architects
Received: 2/17/06 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 4/3/06 1) 3/13/06 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4, General Business
Conflicts of Interest: Cindy Klotz recused herself from discussion and voting on the application.
Cameron disclosed that she had worked for the firm several years ago.
Nature of Project: Modifications to existing building as per submitted plans. Alterations include the
addition of a gallery across the front elevation and the addition of windows in the south
elevation.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District Guidelines

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. The subject building falls under Building Condition 2 – Original Design Slightly Altered due to the fact the that the original design is visible, but some elements have been removed or changed.

1. The ca. 1866 Stickney Building is a contributing structure within the Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District.
2. The subject structure currently has a later first floor storefront system consisting of transoms above glass display cases.
3. The proposed alterations to the first floor storefront level include new transoms over new glazed openings and a new central double leaf entrance.
4. A two story balcony is proposed to be constructed across the front elevation.
5. 1904/25 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map shows that the building originally had a balcony.
6. Balcony elements include round steel columns matching those found on 3 and 5 North Royal Street, and a Gothic-inspired balcony railing.
7. A standing seam copper roof is proposed for the balcony.
8. There are no proposed alterations to the second floor level.
9. Two floor-length windows will allow access onto the proposed covered balcony.
10. Originally, 7 North Royal Street was one of a series of buildings along Royal Street.
11. Due to the loss of the building to the north of the subject building, the north wall of the subject building is now visible.
12. The applicants are requesting to install seven new windows in the north elevation to allow light into the interior.

13. The applicants are requesting to install a new exit door at the west end of the north elevation, which corresponds to an exit stair on the floor plan.
14. The applicants are proposing to apply a stucco finish coat to the north elevation to protect the soft brick.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

The applicant nor his representative was present to speak on behalf of the application. There was no one else present to speak in favor of or against the application. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record. Staff explained that the applicant was removing a non-historic storefront and adding a balcony similar to adjacent balconies.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

Douglas Kearley 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 David Tharp and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

David Tharp moved that, based upon the facts adopted by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic building or the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Douglas Kearley and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 03/13/07.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

035-05/06-CA 211 Michigan Avenue
Applicant: Ora and Teri Raines
Received: 2/16/06 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 4/3/06 1) 3/13/06 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Leinkauf Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Conflicts of Interest: Cameron Pfeiffer recused herself from discussion and voting on the application since she filled out the application and submitted photographs of the project on behalf of the owner.
Nature of Project: After-the-fact approval of a roofing system over an existing rear deck, as per submitted photographs.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
Design Review 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 ca. 1899 Gass House is a contributing structure within the Leinkauf Historic District.
2. The applicants are requesting permission to continue work on a roof system over an existing rear deck.
3. The deck in question was approved by the ARB in 1994.
4. The deck in question is located on the northeast corner of the residence, and is barely visible from either Michigan Avenue or Elmira Street.
5. A Stop Work Order was placed on the property due to the fact that the owners began construction of the roof system without a Certificate of Appropriateness or a building permit.
6. A number of later additions with various roof types are constructed at the rear of the subject structure.
7. The roof of the porch cover is a hipped roof.
8. The addition of a roof on an existing deck will transform an open deck essentially into a porch.
9. In the past, the Board has denied such actions unless the addition of extra detailing incorporates all aspects of a true porch – i.e. columns, balustrade, finished ceiling, etc.
10. 4x4 wood posts have been affixed to the top of existing porch newels to support the new roof system.
11. Typically, a continuous column that is integral with the porch railing system is used to support a porch roof system.

Staff recommends approval of the application with the following conditions:

That the design incorporate true columns similar to those on the front porch.

That the ceiling be of a finished material, (beadboard or similar)

That the porch cornice, soffit & fascia match that of the main house.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

The applicants nor their representative were not present.

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 did report that the owners had received a stop work order from Urban Development since they had failed to obtain Review Board approval or a city building permit.

The Board asked if a copy of the staff report was sent to the applicant. Staff responded that the report was mailed to Mr. and Mrs. Raines, but that no comments were received by Staff.

In response to Board questions, Staff clarified that the support columns were affixed to existing newel posts with metal clamps and the stability of the structure was questionable.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

Cindy Klotz 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 David Tharp and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Cindy Klotz moved that, based upon the facts adopted by the Board, that the application does impair the historic building and the district. The motion was seconded by David Tharp and unanimously approved.

Cindy Klotz moved that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued with the following conditions:

1. That the design incorporate true columns similar to those on the front porch;
2. That the ceiling be of a finished material, (beadboard or similar);
3. That the porch cornice, soffit & fascia match that of the main house.

The motion was seconded by Jim Wagoner and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 03/13/07.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

036-05/06-CA 1104 Old Shell Road
Applicant: Mobile Revolving Fund
Received: 2/3/06 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 3/20/06 1) 2/13/06 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Conflicts of Interest: Douglas Kearley, Cameron Pfeiffer and Devereaux Bemis recused themselves from discussion and voting on the application.
Nature of Project: Additions to rear of structure as per submitted plan. Addition to measure 12' x 21'-4".

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
Design Review 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 subject structure is a one story frame L-shaped structure with a recessed front porch under the main roof.
2. The subject structure was declared unsafe by Mobile City Council in 2002 after it was determined that the owners had died, leaving no heirs.
3. The property was acquired by the Mobile Revolving Fund in 2004.
4. The subject lot measures approximately 42' x 74'.
5. The proposed rear addition measures 12' x 21'-4".
6. There are no issues concerning setbacks or lot coverage.
7. An existing deteriorated enclosed rear porch is to be removed,
8. This area will be reconstructed to resemble a porch enclosed with tempered glass panels, and will serve as a connector to the proposed addition.
9. A covered stoop is proposed for the west elevation.
10. Proposed foundation materials are brick piers to match those existing on the historic structure.
11. Both the existing foundation and the addition foundation to have new framed lattice panels between piers.
12. Proposed siding is wood lap siding to match that existing on the historic structure.
13. Proposed windows are two-over-two wood double hung, putty glazed with true divided lites to match existing on the historic structure.
14. The applicants are proposing to re-roof the entire structure in GAF Timberline architectural grade shingles, slate gray in color.

15. A 6' high wood privacy fence with cap is proposed to enclose the rear yard as shown on the site plan.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff presented the application in the absence of Revolving Fund representation.

No one else spoke 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

Cindy Klotz 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 Tilmon Brown and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

David Tharp moved that, based upon the facts adopted by the Board, that the application will not impair the building or the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswalt and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 03/13/07.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

037-05/06-CA 6 North Jackson Street
Applicant: Richard Dorman/ David T. McConnell
Received: 2/21/06 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 4/7/06 1) 3/13/06 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-4, General Business
Nature of Project: Replace main entry door with new wood & glass mahogany door to match existing in size. Replace four existing fixed doors with new raised panel mahogany doors to fit existing openings. Paint existing door surround & replace hardware.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
Design Review 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 first floor of the subject structure was constructed ca. 1845; the second and third floors were constructed in 1994. The current structure is a two and one-half story masonry structure with end gable parapet walls.
2. The subject structure is a non-contributing structure within the Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District.
3. The existing painted pine entry door in question is not original to the subject structure nor is it historic.
4. The proposed replacement door is to be made out of mahogany, and will match the existing door in profile and dimension.
5. The central storefront consists of four fixed wood doors with four panes above flat panels.
6. The existing storefront in question is not original to the subject structure nor is it historic.
7. The proposed replacement wood doors are to be made out of mahogany, and will have four panes above raised panels.
8. All new doors will be finished with 3 coats of urethane.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

David McConnell was present to answer Board questions. He stated that of the 4 doors to be replaced, the outer 2 are fixed, the inner two are operable. He also stated that the doors had rotted and he had conferred with Staff on appropriate substitutes.

There was no one else 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

The Board modified fact 5: The central storefront consists of four wood doors with 4 lights above flat panels. The middle two doors are operable, the outer two are fixed.

FINDING OF FACT

Tilmon Brown 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 modifying fact 5 as above. The motion was seconded by Douglas Kearley and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the facts adopted by the Board, that the application does not impair the building or the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by David Tharp and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 03/13/07

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

038-05/06-CA 1601 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Cunningham Bounds Crowder, Brown & Breedlove
Received: 2/21/06 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 4/7/06 1) 3/13/06 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way Historic District
Classification: Non-Contributing (new construction)
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Nature of Project: Remove 58 pair of cedar shutters & replace them with 66 pair of aluminum hurricane-rated shutters as per submitted information.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
Design Review 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 does not comply with the Design Review Guidelines and could impair the historic integrity of the district. The building itself would not be impaired as it is not a historic building.

- A. The Design Review Guidelines state that “Blinds and shutters should be sized to fit the reveal of the window opening precisely.”
1. The subject structure is non-contributing to the Old Dauphin Way Historic District due to its age.
 2. The wings of the subject structure were added around 1985.
 3. The applicant is requesting to remove wood shutters and replace them with aluminum shutters with fixed louvers.
 4. A sample pair of shutters has been installed on the south side of the east wing of the subject structure.
 5. The sample shutters do not fit within the brick window opening, but rather are mounted on the outside of the window opening and close over the opening.
 6. Traditional shutters are designed to fit within the window opening.
 7. Due to the way the replacement shutters are hung, they must be longer and wider than traditional wood shutters.
 8. The detailing of the proposed aluminum shutter is dissimilar to wood shutters in design in that the louvers are fixed and there is no vertical bar simulating the operable louvers.
 9. The louvers are fixed in place, are too large, and the open space between them resembles a vent in design rather than a shutter.

While Staff is not opposed to synthetic shutters, the consensus is that the proposed shutter does not replicate the look and feel of real wood shutters well enough to be used for this application. Staff recommends that these particular type of shutters be denied, but encourages the applicant to continue searching for an appropriate shutter out of an alternative material.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

David McConnell, contractor on the project, and Pat Patrick from Shutter Works appeared on behalf of the applicant. Mr. McConnell submitted a sample that had narrower louvers than the original submission. He also stated that the shutters would operate like conventional shutters and be mounted to the window casing rather than the brick. The shutters are powder coated and can be manufactured to any specifications, for example, a crosspiece could be added.

The Board requested a horizontal division in the shutter.

There was no one else 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

The Board modified facts in the staff report as a result of evidence presented at the meeting as follows:

5. The sample shutters will fit within the brick window opening and will be mounted on the brick mould.

8. The detailing of the proposed aluminum shutter is similar to wood shutters in design in that the louvers are fixed and there is a cross bar at midpoint.

Facts 7 and 9 were eliminated.

FINDING OF FACT

Tilmon Brown 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 Cindy Klotz and approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the facts adopted by the Board, that the application does not impair the building or the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued conditioned on the shutters having a cross piece. The motion was seconded by Cindy Klotz and approved unanimously.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 03/13/07.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

039-05/06-CA Flo-Claire Entrance Gates, Intersection of McDonald Avenue & Government St.
Applicant: Flo-Claire Neighborhood Association
Received: 2/21/06 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 4/7/06 1) 3/13/06 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Leinkauf Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: N/A
Conflicts of Interest: Cameron Pfeiffer, who is president of the Leinkauf Association, recused herself from discussion and voting on the application.
Nature of Project: Install neighborhood signage to match original signage as per submitted photograph.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
Design Review 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 district.

1. The Flo-Claire entrance gate houses were constructed ca. 1908 to define the entry to the subdivision.
2. When originally constructed, a sign spelling FLO-CLAIRE stretched between the interior columns of the sign. Also, at secondary entrances to the neighborhood at West Street & Government Street, white columns with the letters spelling FLO-CLAIRE were constructed.
3. Over time, this sign and these letters were removed.
4. The applicants have provided a photograph showing the signage as originally constructed.
5. The applicants are requesting to re-install a sign spelling FLO-CLAIRE at the main entrance of the neighborhood.
6. The letters will be cast aluminum 12"-14" wide by the width of the space between the columns.
7. The applicants are requesting to re-install lettering on the columns at secondary streets of marking the entrances to the neighborhood.
8. The letters will be cast aluminum 12"-14" high, installed in a vertical format.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

There was no one present from the Flo-Claire Neighborhood Association to answer Board questions. Staff reported that complaints were called in from residents of the Leinkauf District opposed to the installation of the sign. They felt that the sign will emphasize the Flo-Claire subdivision, only a portion of

the neighborhood, when Leinkauf Historic District should be seen as a whole. Also expressed was the notion that Flo-Claire subdivision wanted to break from the Leinkauf neighborhood. Three complainants called in their objections. One complaint was faxed to the MHDC office and is attached. There was no one else present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Staff had no comments from city departments to read into the record.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board can only rule on issues of design. Neighborhood disputes must be resolved by the neighborhood. The Board noted that the sign is shown in a historic photograph, although the letter style cannot be distinguished. Specifics of the sign design are also not included in the application.

FINDING OF FACT

Cindy Klotz 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 David Tharp and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Cindy Klotz moved that, based upon the facts adopted by the Board, that the application did not impair the historic district. The motion was seconded by David Tharp and unanimously approved.

Cindy Klotz moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness conditioned upon an acceptable letter style and mounting being submitted to staff for approval. The motion was seconded by Douglas Kearley and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 03/13/07.

LEINKAUF HISTORIC DISTRICT
LEINKAUF NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION
c/o Heather R. Guidry, Esq., LNA Secretary
1504 Church Street
Mobile, Alabama 36604

March 13, 2006

Transmission Via Facsimile (FAX) 251-268-7966
Mobile Historic Development Commission
Attn: Mr. Devereux Bemis, Director
P. O. Box 1827
Mobile, Alabama 36604

*RE: Flo-Claire Neighborhood Association
February 2006 Flo-Claire Entrance Gates Sign Permit Application*

Dear Director Bemis:

I am writing regarding the February 2006 sign permit application that has been submitted to the Architectural Review Board by the Flo-Claire Neighborhood Association for specific Flo-Claire signage and entrance gates. As Secretary of the Leinkauf Historic District's Leinkauf Neighborhood Association ("LNA"), please consider this a formal objection to the application on behalf of the LNA, an objection which I request you also formally make part of the record at the March 13, 2006 Public Hearing, by orally reading it into the record.

While any efforts to aid in the revitalization of the Leinkauf Historic District are highly encouraged by the LNA, unfortunately, the LNA believes strongly that the allowance of specific "Flo-Claire" signage at the entrance gates at the intersection of McDonald Avenue and Government Street, to deliberately separate what was at one time called the Flo-Claire Subdivision from every other street in the District, will greatly impair the historic value and integrity of the Leinkauf Historic District itself. Specifically, the reasons that the LNA strongly objects to this application include, but are not limited to, the following:

First, it is important to have a general understanding of the history of the Leinkauf Historic District and the LNA to better understand the reasons for this objection. The LNA is a formal entity which was created on August 4, 1992 by charter members William R. Faircloth, Herrie Oswald, Henry A. Smith, Marilyn Y. Smith, Dan Sumner, Jr., Nancy Sumner, Joseph A. Mahoney, II, Thomas T. Zinsan, Mark C. McDonald, Lydia H. Craft, Rose Mary Stewart and Brian B. Stewart, and which has operated with an elected Board of Directors since that time. As set forth in the LNA By-Laws some fourteen years ago, the purpose of the organization is to assist in the preservation and restoration of historic sites and structures in the Leinkauf Historic District; enhance the neighborhood community; engender a spirit of, and promote, good neighborliness; and enhance the beauty of the District through revitalization projects in the District. LNA membership is open to all home and property owners in the District.

The Leinkauf Historic District was created in December of 1986 and is comprised of 333 primary structures covering an area of approximately 110 acres, including the street intersection at issue in this application. Of these structures, 287 are contributing primary structures, 46 are noncontributing primary structures, 23 are noncontributing secondary structures, 9 are contributing secondary structures and 9 are compatible one story garages (non contributing). Originally, the District was composed of five entire subdivisions and portions of four others, all platted between 1890 and 1919, including: 1) a very small portion of the Osazam Tract (early 1800s); 2) remnants of the Deater Tract (1835 and then later redivided); 3) Glendale Park (1900, northern 1/3 of the district); 4) Tuttle Property (1893); 5) Tuttle Addition (1896, formerly part of Deater); 6) Elizabeth Porter Subdivision (1901); 7) Flo-Claire Subdivision (1908, previously McDonald farm); 8) McDonald-Southern Realty Subdivision (1909, formerly McCarron farm); and 9) the Bestor Subdivision. Flo-Claire was one of the first middle class suburbs. However, in December of 1986 when the Leinkauf Historic District formally applied for, and received, its National Registration of Historic Places designation and status from the U.S. Department of Interior, National Park Service, **ALL** of the subdivisions, including Flo-Claire, collectively became the Leinkauf Historic District. Thus, today, the Leinkauf Historic District encompasses a significant area, bounded on the North by Government Street, on the East by Park Terrace, on the East by South Ann Street, and on the South by Edlava and Lamar Streets. And, put simply, the Flo-Claire Subdivision is the Leinkauf Historic District and is **not** a separate historic area or neighborhood.

Given that there is already an entity which governs the Leinkauf Historic District, including what was once known as the Flo-Claire Subdivision, the LNA feels that the recent creation of a separate Flo-Claire Neighborhood Association, in addition to the LNA, is not only redundant, but stands in contradiction to the LNA By-Laws which have governed the Leinkauf Historic District since 1992. Additionally, the LNA believes that the creation of a separate Flo-Claire Neighborhood Association undermines both the spirit of good neighborliness which the LNA has diligently strived to achieve and the sense of community comradery in the District itself. The general consensus among Leinkauf Historic District residents, is that the Flo-Claire Neighborhood Association was created to deliberately and consciously isolate that section of the District apart from the rest, and LNA has been quite shocked to see such isolationism take place. Thus, this most recent endeavor of the recently formed Flo-Claire Neighborhood Association to further demarcate a particular street or section of Leinkauf, apart from the Leinkauf Historic District in which that street or section exists, is particularly harmful to the historical integrity of the District.


In a nutshell, this is more than simply about signage. The LNA feels that this application represents a continued attempt on the part of certain Leinkauf Historic District residents to create artificial boundaries between what was once known as the Flo-Claire Subdivision and the rest of the District. For instance, last year, residents of Flo-Claire participated in the 2005 Historic Homes Tour, and rather than feature the historic homes as part of the Leinkauf Historic District, **which they are**, apparently, steps were taken to essentially "re-name" or "re-label" the area as the Flo-Claire Historic District. This type of action is wholly contrary to the Leinkauf Historic District's National Historic status as well as spirit of community which each historic district needs, to continue the preservation, beautification and revitalization process. The LNA has been quite surprised by these actions. Additionally, the creation of some sort of artificial distinction between Flo-Claire and the rest of the Leinkauf Historic District, through what amounts to "false" signage, may impact the

District's historic status, as the Flo-Claire Neighborhood Association is, apparently, taking what appear to be deliberate steps to separate themselves apart from the District, which would result in the loss of some 29 historic homes on McDonald Avenue. Indeed, the precedent that could be set here by awarding a COA, could be devastating to the Leinkauf Historic District. For instance, if each of the old subdivisions and portions thereof decided to suddenly create their own mini-historic districts, it would operate to eradicate the District, and moreover, create very divisive lines among neighbors.

Second, it is important to note that in 2001 and 2002, the LNA applied for, and was awarded, a COA for masonry street markers and posts to be erected at each street border of the District, including the very McDonald and Government Street intersection at issue in the present application. These masonry street markers would be similar to those already located in the District, such as those at that particular intersection. They would include Leinkauf Historic District in black lettering. The LNA took great pains to create this street marker campaign, in a sincere effort to establish an "identity" at the main entrances to this great District, including the McDonald and Government Street intersection. Plans are in the works to begin construction of these masonry street markers this year. As such, to now allow one street in the District to set itself apart with a completely different marker or sign and essentially rename itself Flo-Claire would undermine all of the LNA's efforts. And, to issue a COA for Flo-Claire signage would wholly contradict the COA which was already issued to the LNA for Leinkauf Historic District signage at the very same location. Moreover, the allowance of a Flo-Claire street marker would completely eradicate its identity as part of the Leinkauf Historic District, as the public would see Flo-Claire signage and believe it to be some sort of Flo-Claire Historic District, something which does not even exist. Clearly, the use of signage to establish such "personalized" areas within the Leinkauf Historic District would, at a minimum, confuse the public as to which historic district they are viewing, and at worse result in a loss of national registry status (as mentioned previously). Finally, the LNA truly believes in a sense of community and togetherness in the Leinkauf Historic District, and an application such as this, isolating one section of the District apart from the others, will operate to create a significant rift in the District and will only result in divisiveness and in an overall lack of hospitality, community and general good neighborliness.

For these reasons, the LNA strongly objects to the issuance of any COA for Flo-Claire signage in the Leinkauf Historic District. While, as an alternative, the LNA would support the issuance of a COA for Leinkauf Historic District signage at the proposed location, because a COA has already been issued to the LNA for just that, including for the intersection at issue, the LNA is already working on masonry street markers for same.

With best regards, I am sincerely,


Heather R. Cuddy, Esq.
Secretary, Leinkauf Neighborhood Association
(On behalf of same)

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

040-05/06-CA 1070 Government Street
Applicant: Vaughan & Linda Drinkard
Received: 3/01/06 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 4/14/06 1) 3/13/06 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-2, General Business
Nature of Project: Install metal fence and gates 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	Fences, Walls & Gates	Install 5' fence

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 “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 Piser House is a ca. 1903 two and one-half story brick structure combining the Queen Anne and half-timbering styles of architecture.
 2. The subject structure is located on the northeast corner of Government and South Hallett Streets.
 3. The subject structure is a contributing structure within the Oakleigh Garden Historic District.
 4. The proposed fence is 4'-9" high with 5' high end and intermediate posts, painted black.
 5. There are 5 gates:
 - 3' wide gate on the west property line
 - Double leaf 3' gate (6' total) along the south property line at front of structure
 - Double leaf 7' gate (14' total) along east property line (at parking area)
 - 12' electric sliding gate at driveway
 - double leaf 8' gate (16' total) at east end of property on south elevation
 6. The proposed fence matches the fence installed around the law offices of Gardner & Middlebrooks, at the corner of Government and Roper Streets.
 7. The proposed fence will not impair the integrity of the structure or the district.

Staff recommends approval of the request as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Neither the owner nor his representative was present to discuss the application. There was no one else 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. The Board asked Staff if the building is currently being used as a residence. Staff responded in the affirmative.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no additional Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

Cindy Klotz 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 Jim Wagoner and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 03/13/07.

APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

041-05/06-CA 211 Lanier Avenue
Applicant: Mr. and Mrs. Sumner Adams/ Lucy Barr Designs
Received: 3/01/06 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 4/14/06 1) 3/13/06 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Ashland Place Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Conflicts of Interest: Harris Oswalt disclosed that the applicant is a cousin.
Nature of Project: One story addition to right side, two story addition to rear as per submitted design.

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

Sections	Topic	Description of Work
3	Additions	Construct rear addition

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
Design Review 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

1. The ca. 1909 Sims House is a two story residence with stucco-covered exterior walls and a barrel-style tile roof.
2. The subject structure is somewhat square in plan, with a symmetrical 5 bay main façade, and a one story sunroom to the left of the main block.
3. The roof is a monolithic hipped roof.
4. There are two components of the proposed addition; a one story wing mirroring the sunroom on the left side of the elevation, measuring 11’ x 32’-11” ; and a two story rear addition measuring 26’-10” x 37’.
5. The proposed addition almost doubles the ground footprint of the existing historic structure.
6. The proposed one story wing is rectangular in design and features a pair of wood French doors with arched transom above facing Lanier Avenue. A new stoop with steps leading to the front yard is also proposed.
7. Exterior walls of the proposed one story wing are to be stucco painted to match the existing historic exterior walls.
8. Windows for the proposed addition are wood to match existing.
9. Floor and ceiling height in the proposed addition is to match existing.
10. The proposed two story rear addition is to be constructed on the west elevation of the subject structure, and consists of a large family room and covered porch. The family

room measures approximately 25' x 26' and the covered porch measures approximately 12' x 26'.

11. Exterior walls of the proposed two story rear addition are to be stucco painted to match the existing historic exterior walls.
12. Windows in the proposed two story rear addition are to be wood, double hung nine-over-fifteen lite.
13. A pair of wood French doors with arched transom above allows access from the family room to the porch.
14. Floor height in the proposed two story rear addition will match that of the main house.
15. Ceiling height of the family room in the proposed two story rear addition will be 12'.
16. Ceiling height of the porch in the proposed two story rear addition will be 16'-4".
17. Five arches, three on the west elevation and one each on the north and south elevation replicate the arches found on the main façade of the subject structure.
18. A hipped roof covered in barrel-style tile is proposed to be tied into the existing historic roof.
19. The ridge line of the addition is not to exceed that of the existing historic roof.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Sumner Adams and Lucy Barr were present to answer Board questions.

Staff remarked that, upon consultation with other staff members, it was suggested that the fanlight be removed from over the French doors in order that the two wings would appear secondary to the main entrance.

Ms. Barr and Mr. Adams agreed that there would be no problem in removing the fan light and that the door will be at the same height as the opposite door.

The Board also questioned the use of larger windows in the addition. Ms. Barr stated that both casement and double hung windows are present in the building, but that going to a larger size window was necessary to be proportional to the scale of the addition.

There was no one else 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.

The Board questioned staff about site coverage. Staff responded that the lot was large and could accommodate a large addition. Approximately 30% of the site will be built on; the overlay district allows 50% of the site to be built upon.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board modified facts in the staff report to read:

5. The size of the lot will accommodate the massing of the addition.

13. A pair of wood French doors with no transom allows access from the family room to the porch.

FINDING OF FACT

Cindy Klotz 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 Douglas Kearley and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

David Tharp moved that, based upon the facts adopted by the Board, that the application will not impair the historic character of the building or the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Joe Sackett and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 03/13/07.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

042-05/06-CA 1510 Government Street
Applicant: Starbucks/ Clark Geer Latham & Associates
Received: 3/01/06 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 4/14/06 1) 3/13/06 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way Historic District
Classification: Non-Contributing (new construction)
Zoning: LB-2, Limited Business
Conflicts of Interest: Cindy Klotz and Douglas Kearley disclosed that a Council person had contacted them to discuss the facts of the case and both stated that they could not participate in ex-parte discussions.
Nature of Project: Construct new free-standing restaurant as per submitted plans..

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 involving building issues complies with the Design Review Guidelines and will not impair the historic integrity of the structure and the district. However, issues of parking and drive-thru egress in front of the building would impair the integrity of the Old Dauphin Way Historic District.

The building site is located on the north side of Government Street between Etheridge and Catherine Streets. The proposed building measures approximately 26’ wide by approximately 61’-6” long, and contains approximately 1,750 square feet.

The building faces south towards Government Street, and the front building line is located at a distance of 100’ from the sidewalk. A 3’-4” high brick band wraps around all elevations of the building. Dividing the brick from the stucco is a 3 5/8” stone moulding. Above the stone moulding is a smooth stucco wall finish system. Foundation is slab-on-grade. The ground plan is somewhat rectangular in design. The overall wall height is 18’- 6” to the top of the moulded parapet, with a raised area defining the entrance at the southeast corner measuring 20’-6”. The glazing system is bronze anodized aluminum with clear insulated glass. A flat roof will be hidden behind the parapet wall. A hipped roof with Ludowici Spanish tile covers the southeast corner. Decorative cornice brackets support the overhang of the hipped roof section.

The following are proposed building materials:

- a. foundation – concrete slab-on-grade
- b. façade – brick veneer and stucco over wood studs
- c. doors – clear glass in bronze anodized frames
- d. windows –clear glass in bronze anodized frames
- e. awnings – fabric awning, medium green in color
- f. roof – flat concealed behind a parapet

hipped with barrel-style Ludowici Spanish tile

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
Guidelines for New Commercial and Residential Construction in Mobile's Historic Districts

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
3	Design Standards for New Construction	Construct new restaurant
3,I	Placement and Orientation	
3,II	Massing and Scale	
3,III	Façade Elements	
3,IV	Materials and Ornamentation	
3, IV, A	Appropriate Materials for New Residential Construction	

3,I

- I. Placement and Orientation:** The guidelines state that new construction should be placed on the lot so that setback and spacing approximate those of nearby historic buildings.
- A. Setbacks in the Old Dauphin Way Historic District range from buildings constructed at the sidewalk to buildings such as the Shoppes of Midtown with a large setback.
 - B. The proposed setback is approximately 100' with one row of parking and drive-thru circulation toward Government Street.
 - C. Other fast food restaurants on Government Street, such as Wendy's, Taco Bell, Arby's and McDonald's all have a minimum setback from the sidewalk and have no front yard parking. All parking is contained within the side and rear of the lots at these locations.

3,II

II. Massing and Scale:

- A. The guidelines state that new construction should reference the massing of forms of nearby historic buildings.
 - 1. There are multiple examples of small scale commercial structures in the Historic Districts.
 - 2. The proposed building is a 1 story frame, stucco and brick veneer structure.
- B. The guidelines state that new buildings should have foundations similar in height to those of nearby historic buildings.
 - 1. There are no other historic commercial buildings within this block.
 - 2. Adjacent commercial buildings have a slab-on-grade foundation.
 - 3. The proposed foundation is concrete slab-on-grade.
- C. The guidelines state that new construction should consider roof shapes, pitches and complexity similar to or compatible with those of adjacent historic buildings.
 - 1. A variety of commercial roof shapes exist in the Old Dauphin Way Historic District, but the most common are flat roofs behind a parapet.

3, III

III. Façade Elements:

- A. The guidelines state that new construction should reflect the use of façade elements of nearby historic buildings.
 - 1. The use of clear glass in bronze anodized frames is a common design element found in new construction throughout the Historic Districts and will match those of the Shoppes of Midtown.

2. The use of a brick veneer water table and a stone moulding, along with a moulded cornice at the parapet add interest to the building.
3. Pilasters with a 1 ½” projection help break up the building massing.
4. The use of 16” square decorative medallions at the pilasters adds visual interest.

3, IV

IV. **Materials and Ornamentation:**

- A. The guidelines provide a list of appropriate materials for compatible new construction.
 1. There are a number of commercial brick veneer structures in the Old Dauphin Way Historic District.
- B. The guidelines state that the degree of ornamentation used in new construction should be compatible with the degree of ornamentation found in the design of nearby historic buildings. Profiles and dimensions should be consistent with examples in the district.
 1. The Board encourages use of modern materials and design methods in new construction.

V. **Signage:**

- A. A monument sign is proposed to be placed along the sidewalk fronting Government Street.
- B. No additional information was provided regarding size, materials, lighting etc.
- C. Building signage is depicted on the Government Street elevation.
- D. The signage scales to 40 square feet.
- E. No additional information was provided regarding materials, lighting, etc.
- F. The total allowable signage for the site is 64 square feet.

VI. **Landscaping:**

- A. Two live oak trees are proposed to be placed to the north of the sidewalk as per the City of Mobile’s Landscape Ordinance.
- B. A three foot high solid hedge is proposed to screen front yard parking from Government Street.
- C. A complete landscaping plan should be submitted.

Staff recommends approval of the application with the following conditions:

1. That the parking spaces be removed from in front of the building.
2. Require that all trees be 4” trees to fall under the Tree Ordinance for maintenance purposes.
3. A complete signage package should be submitted.
4. A complete lighting package should be submitted.
5. A complete landscaping package should be submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

John Vallas, Linda Snapp and Tommy Latham were present to discuss the application.

Latham explained that the site was not rectangular, that, in fact, it had a shared drive with the adjacent development making it wider in the rear than at the front.

John Vallas took exception to Staff report item I. C. He considered that the fast food places sited did not present comparable situations. Taco Bell is moved forward on the lot but has a large enough rear lot that stacking is not a problem; McDonalds has 4 curb cuts onto the block and has parking on the east and west sides of the building very close to Government Street; Arby’s and Wendy have multiple curb cuts and are both a sea of asphalt.

He noted that Starbucks has approved this site plan with 17 parking spaces although the usual requirement is 22-23 spaces.

He stated that 40 ft. of green space will buffer the building and row of parking at the front from Government Street. He noted that other projects on Government Street such as CVS and Storage

Max have parking closer than 40 ft.; parking at Murray House is approximately 40 ft. from the street.

Mr. Latham explained that the 40 ft. buffer with 3 ft. hedge will not be a detention pond since none is required on the site; it will be green space. He compared this site plan to parking areas at McGill High School where parking is shielded by 3 ft. planting buffers. Mr. Latham also explained that the large quantity of parking in the main Shoppes of Midtown site has been reduced to an excess of only 20 spaces since restaurants and other shops have opened. He agreed with all aspects of the staff report with the exception of item 1.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board added facts in I. as follows:

I. D. Other fast food restaurants on Government Street such as Wendy's Taco Bell, Arby's and McDonalds have multiple curb cuts to Government Street and this parcel has none.

I. E. Other buildings on Government Street with parking in front of the building include CVS, Murray House and Storage Max.

FINDING OF FACT

Douglas Kearley 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 and facts I. D & E as stated above. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswalt and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the facts adopted by the Board, that the application will not impair the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued conditioned on the submission of signage, lighting and landscaping details. The motion was seconded by David Tharp and approved with Bunky Ralph voting in opposition.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 03/13/07.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

043-05/06-CA 72 South Royal Street
Applicant: David Rasp
Received: 3/01/06 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 4/14/06 1) 3/13/06 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East Historic District
Classification: Non-Contributing (condition)
Zoning: B-4, General Business
Conflicts of Interest: Douglas Kearley recused himself from discussion and voting on the application.
Nature of Project: Renovate building for use as a bar/restaurant as per submitted plans.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District Guidelines

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. The subject building falls under Building Condition 3 – Original Design Significantly Altered due to the fact the that the original design is not discernable; most elements have been removed or changed.

1. The Sentinel Bonding Co. Building is a non-contributing one story masonry structure within the Church Street East Historic District.
2. The subject structure appears on the 1925 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map.
3. The subject lot measures approximately 118’ x approximately 26’.
4. The subject building measures approximately 67.46’ x approximately 26’.
5. The subject structure currently has a painted plywood front façade.
6. The existing storefront includes small plate glass windows on either side of a single recessed entry.
7. The proposed new entry is designed using modern polished chrome storefront with tempered green glass.
8. A canopy created by a series of three pyramid-shaped elements is constructed of tempered frosted wire glass and aluminum, and is to be lit internally.
9. The canopy will extend from the front face of the building out 5’ above the sidewalk.
10. Due to the loss of the building to the south of the subject building, the south wall of the subject building is now visible.
11. The applicants are proposing to apply a stucco finish coat to the south elevation to provide a uniform appearance for the south elevation.

12. A 5' high stucco-covered wall is proposed for the south property boundary to create an enclosed courtyard for dining.
13. An 8' high stucco-covered wall is proposed for the west property line.
14. There is no transition between the 5' and 8' wall.
15. This courtyard dining area will be highly visible from both Government and Royal Streets.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

Staff further recommends, from a design standpoint, that the applicant may wish to install a vertical divider in the proposed transom over the double entry doors to maintain the verticality of the proposed façade.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

David Rasp was present to discuss the application. In response to Board questions, Mr. Rasp explained that he would agree to installing the transom divider recommended in the staff report. He also explained that the name of the business had not been decided, making the submission of a sign package premature. He planned to install the sign in the middle canopy triangle. He also stated that the stucco would be smooth and that he planned to use very little lighting in the courtyard area--probably small ground lights.

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

The Board amended items 12 and 13. in the staff report to state that the stucco would be smooth.

FINDING OF FACT

Cindy Klotz 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 with the amendment noted above. The motion was seconded by Tilmon Brown and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

David Tharp moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board that the application does not impair the building or the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued conditioned on a vertical division being installed in the transom, the submission of lighting stucco color to be approved by staff. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswald and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 03/13/07.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

044-05/06-CA 200 South Ann Street
Applicant: Bob and Carol Carmack
Received: 3/01/06 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 4/14/06 1) 3/13/06 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Leinkauf Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Nature of Project: Install metal 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 one and one-half story wood frame with a predominant end gable facing Ann Street and cross gable facing Selma Street.
 2. The house, constructed between 1910 and 1925, features Tudor Revival-style detailing.
 3. The subject structure is located on the southwest corner of South Ann and Selma Streets.
 4. The existing roof is a diamond asbestos shingle.
 5. The proposed roof is a steel sheet, charcoal gray in color.
 6. Historically, houses of this type in Mobile were constructed with either wood shakes or asbestos tile roofs.
 7. Historically, houses of this type in Mobile were not constructed with metal roofs.
 8. Due to the configuration of the roof, and the location of the subject structure on the corner, the roofing material will be highly visible from public view.
 9. The use of a steel panel roof would greatly change the architectural character of the residence.

Staff recommends denial of the application as submitted. Staff further recommends that the Board consider approving a metal shingle or an architectural-grade asphalt shingle.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

The applicant was not present to discuss the application.

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.

The Board questioned Staff about the roofing material. Staff presented a sample that represented the proposed roofing color. He explained that the roofing was a panelized metal system. A sheet with a rib at mid-point would extend from the ridge to the eave creating an industrial, rather than residential, appearance.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Board members discussed whether a decision on the application could be made since a sample had not been submitted. The Board concluded that more information was required to make an informed decision on the application.

FINDING OF FACT

There was no finding of fact.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Cindy Klotz moved that, based upon a lack of information, that the application be denied. The motion was seconded by David Tharp and unanimously approved.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

045-05/06-CA 203 South Warren Street
Applicant: David McDonald
Received: 3/6/06 Meeting Date (s):
Submission Date + 45 Days: 4/19/06 1) 3/13/06 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East Historic District
Classification: contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Nature of Project: Enclose rear porch as per submitted plans. Construct new rear porch 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	Enclose existing rear porch Construct new 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 or the district.

- A. The Guidelines state that “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture. Historic porches should be maintained and repaired to reflect their period... When rear and side porches are to be enclosed, one recommended method is to preserve the original configuration of columns, handrails and other important architectural features.”
 - 1. The ca. 1866 Taber House is a one and a half story wood frame residence with Greek Revival styling.
 - 2. A one story service wing is located at the rear of the main residence.
 - 3. This wing is smaller in scale and closer to the ground than the main residence.
 - 4. There is a 3 bay inset porch on the south elevation of the rear wing.
 - 5. The applicants are requesting to enclose this porch, utilizing the existing columns and railing system to retain the appearance of a porch.
 - 6. The applicants are proposing to install louvered wood blinds as sheathing between the columns.
 - 7. A new porch is proposed for the east and south elevations of the main residence.
 - 8. The new porch elements (columns, railing, roof) will match that of the existing porch.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Darrel Williams, architect, appeared on behalf of his client. He explained that the enclosure of the wing and addition of a new porch will accommodate a growing family and an owner works out of the house. The newly enclosed wing will provide a space that is 20 ft x 30 ft. to be used for expansion of the kitchen and den. The added porch will provide greater accessibility to the house from the existing carport to the south of the main house. He stated that the existence of the carport makes designing an addition on the site difficult. He explained further that the features of the new porch will match those of the old wing and details such as retaining the columns on the wing and installing shutters behind the rail system will retain the integrity of the existing wing.

When presenting the application, Staff stressed that the existing rear wing may be an original kitchen building that served the block and actually pre-dates the main portion of the house dating from 1866. Altering the wing will alter a significant part of the city's history.

Devereaux Bemis explained further that legend has it that kitchens were often present in the downtown area and that they served families on the entire block. Specifics on how the kitchen system functioned is not known.

Whatever the research outcome, historic porches should be maintained and repaired to reflect their period. As stated in the Guidelines, "one recommended method is to preserve the original configuration of columns, handrails and other important architectural features."

Bob Hanks, who lives across the street at 200 S. Warren, supported the application since it will not be visible from the street. In addition, he stated that, once you are in the house and in the existing wing, there is no sense that the wing is earlier than the main house. He could not speak to the issue of the historic integrity of the wing, however.

There was no one else 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

The Board suggested changing references to the wing in facts A 2 and 3 to "historic kitchen." The Board also expressed concern that the issue of the wing being a "historic kitchen" has not been fully explored. It was felt that it might be advantageous to the members to visit the house and actually look at the wing.

FINDING OF FACT

There was no finding of fact.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Cindy Klotz moved to table the application for further information including the submission of a section detail of the proposed railing with enclosure. The motion was seconded by Cameron Pfeiffer and unanimously approved. The architect will try to arrange a time when Board members can visit the site.