

CITY OF MOBILE
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

Minutes of the Meeting
March 27, 2006

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m. by Chair, Bunky Ralph.
Ed Hooker, MHDC Architectural Engineer, called the roll as follows:

Members Present: Douglas Kearley, Harris Oswalt, Cameron Pfeiffer, Bunky Ralph,
David Tharp, Jim Wagoner.

Members Absent: Robert Brown, Tilmon Brown, Cindy Klotz, Michael Mayberry, Joe
Sackett.

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

<u>In Attendance</u>	<u>Mailing Address</u>	<u>Item Number</u>
Max Morey		047-05/06-CA
Linda Snapp	30900 Wellington Ct, Spanish Ft.	047-05-06-CA
Nick Madeloni	467 Dauphin Street	

David Tharp moved to approve the minutes of the last meeting as emailed. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswalt and unanimously approved.

Harris Oswalt moved to approve the mid-month Certificates of Appropriateness. The motion was seconded by David Tharp and unanimously approved.

MID-MONTH APPROVALS

1. Applicant's Name: Bernadette Simon
Property Address: 1062 Elmira Street
Date of Approval: 3/3/06 weh
Work Approved: Repair or replace rotten wood with materials matching existing in profile, material and dimension. Repaint in the following Glidden color scheme:
Body – Fossil Gray
Trim – Kitten White
Shutters - Fauna
2. Applicant's Name: Stambaugh Roofing/Regions Bank
Property Address: 106 St. Francis Street
Date of Approval: 3/3/06 asc
Work Approved: Install new EPDM roof on 8,5 and 2 story buildings.
3. Applicant's Name: Willie Martin/L & N Construction
Property Address: 315 North Joachim Street
Date of Approval: 3/6/06 asc
Work Approved: Install new 30 year architectural shingle roof, black in color.
4. Applicant's Name: Cliff Inge/Stamley Roofing
Property Address: 204 Lanier Avenue
Date of Approval: 3/6/06 asc

- Work Approved: Repair roof over front porch with particular attention to the flashing. Roof to match existing in materials and color.
5. Applicant's Name: Liberty Roofing
 Property Address: 105 Ryan Avenue
 Date of Approval: 3/6/06 weh
 Work Approved: Re-roof with 3 tab shingles, charcoal blend in color.
 6. Applicant's Name: Elsie Hall
 Property Address: 1510 Eslava Street
 Date of Approval: 3/7/06 asc
 Work Approved: Install new roof using timberline shingles. Roof to be brown in color to match existing. Replace fascia as needed with new wood to match existing in dimension and profile.
 7. Applicant's Name: Fred South Construction
 Property Address: 300 Oakleigh Place
 Date of Approval: 3/7/06 weh
 Work Approved: Repair decorative elements under window sills with materials matching existing in material, profile and dimension. Repaint to match existing.
 8. Applicant's Name: Daniels Sheet Metal
 Property Address: 251 Government Street
 Date of Approval: 3/7/06 weh
 Work Approved: Replace existing rain gutters with new rain gutters over north and west entrances to match existing in materials, profile and dimension.
 9. Applicant's Name: Joe Basenberg
 Property Address: 207 Rapier Avenue
 Date of Approval: 3/7/06 weh
 Work Approved: Repair or replace rotten or damaged wood with materials matching existing in material, profile and dimension. Repaint to match existing color scheme.
 10. Applicant's Name: Hectall
 Property Address: 166 Government Street
 Date of Approval: 3/8/06 weh
 Work Approved: Repaint to match existing color scheme.
 11. Applicant's Name: Ellen Sheffield
 Property Address: 58 Lee Street
 Date of Approval: 3/9/06 asc
 Work Approved: Paint exterior to match existing. Install wood steps and railing per MHDC design.
 12. Applicant's Name: Coastal Construction, LLC
 Property Address: 1510 Dauphin Street
 Date of Approval: 3/13/06 asc
 Work Approved: Install new three tab charcoal roof.

13. Applicant's Name: Brian McGowan
Property Address: 29 Hannon Avenue
Date of Approval: 3/14/06 asc
Work Approved: Install new roof using architectural shingles, Estate Gray in color.
14. Applicant's Name: David F. Werschkul
Property Address: 1220 Texas Street
Date of Approval: 3/14/06 weh
Work Approved: Construct storage building measuring 10' x 20' as per MHDC stock plans. Exterior siding to match main house, painted to match existing. Hipped roof to match existing in pitch & roofing material.
15. Applicant's Name: Jane Daugherty
Property Address: 1555 Blair Avenue
Date of Approval: 3/14/06 asc
Work Approved: Install new roof with 3 tab fiberglass shingles, gray in color.
16. Applicant's Name: Jarrod White
Property Address: 1200 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 3/14/06 asc
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood with new materials to match existing in profile, material and dimension. Repaint house in the following color scheme:
Body – Canyon View BCC20-1
Trim – Ranch Acres ECC20-2
Wooden shingles – Hickory Grove ECC20-3
Accent on windows – Red Pines ECC27-1
Porch Floor – Laurel Oak ECC41-3

OLD BUSINESS:

1. **043-04/05-CA** Southeast Corner of Cedar and Dauphin Streets
500 Block of Dauphin Street between Lawrence and Cedar
Applicant: Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund
Nature of Request: Alter previously-approved plans to construct one two-story Federal-style townhouse and three 1 ½ story Creole-style cottages. Applicants are requesting to construct three Federal-style townhouses and one 1 ½ story Creole-style cottage as per submitted plans.

APPROVED WITH RECOMMENDATIONS. Certified Record attached.

NEW BUSINESS:

2. **046-05/06-CA** 601 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Wintzell's Restaurant
Nature of Request: Construct a wood framed, hipped roof orangerie on existing patio with an 8' addition to the west.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

3. **047-05/06-CA** 208 Dauphin Street
Applicant: JSMM LLC, Clark Geer Latham & Associates, architects
Nature of Request: Renovation of existing building destroyed by fire.
Proposed new building to be an independent theater on the first floor and lofts on the second and third floors, as per submitted plans.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

3. **048-05/06-CA** 1559 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Mark and Denise Burks
Nature of Request: Construct a deck measuring 17' x 26'-6" as per submitted plans. Construct free-standing exterior fireplace as per submitted plans.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

OTHER BUSINESS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. National Alliance of Preservation Commissions Trip to Baltimore

July 27-30, 2006

Staff reported that no information on the conference has been posted to date on the NAPC web site.

2. Enforcement Issues

Since less than half of the Board members were present, discussion regarding enforcement will take place at another time. Staff did inform the Board members that Jeanelle Cala at 1553 Fearnway will be ticketed for being out of compliance with the Board and that the project at 412 Dauphin Street will come back before the Board since it is impossible to construct the plan as approved.

Nick Madeloni, a Dauphin Street property owner, asked about the property at 501 Dauphin Street and whether that property had been inspected for compliance with the Board. Staff reported that the approved plan called for opening up the original window openings on the front elevation. However, the contractor had a letter from a structural engineer stating that the windows could not be opened up unless the entire wall was rebuilt. Staff also reported that no inspections through the City's Tidemark program had been performed.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

043-04/05-CA Southeast corner of Cedar and Dauphin Streets
(515 and 517 Dauphin Street)
Applicant: Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund/ Douglas Kearley Architect
Received: 3/16/06 Meeting Dates:
Submission Date + 45 Days: 4/30/06 1) 4/25/05 2) 3/27/06 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District
Classification: Non-Contributing (new construction)
Zoning: B-4, General Business
Conflicts of Interest: Douglas Kearley recused himself from discussion and voting on the application.
Nature of Project: Alter previously-approved plans to construct one two-story Federal-style townhouse and three 1 ½ story Creole-style cottages. Applicants are requesting to construct three Federal-style townhouses and one 1 ½ story Creole-style cottage as per submitted plans.

The building site is located on the south side of Dauphin Street between Cedar and Lawrence Streets, behind Barton Academy.

The buildings face north towards Dauphin Street, and the front building line is on the sidewalk. The corner unit and the two easternmost units are to be constructed out of Carolina brick. Foundation is floating slab. The ground plan is rectangular in design. All roofs are gabled with parapet ends and party walls. Doors are wood.

The end/corner unit, and the third and fourth units have a battered recessed entry, a full two story brick façade and a cantilevered iron porch on the second floor.

Each unit has a rear courtyard and one parking space accessed off an alley in the middle of the block.

The following are proposed building materials:

- a. foundation – floating concrete slab
- b. façade – Carolina Brick veneer
- c. doors – wood with glazing, wood with panels
- d. windows –six-over-six and nine-over-nine wood sash
- e. wood blinds, batten and louvered
- f. roof –side gable with parapet walls

History of the Project:

The Review Board originally approved this project in April 2005. The original approval covered construction of one two story Federal-style townhouse and three one and one-half story Creole-style cottages. Construction began first on the Federal-style townhouse and one of the Creole-style cottages. These almost immediately went under contract. The applicant has stated that their organization, the Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund, has been approached by potential buyers requesting to

purchase the two story Federal-style townhouses. For that reason, because the market is more favorable for the townhouse, the applicants are requesting to alter their previous approval.

All four structures are currently under construction. Staff has informed both the owners and the contractor that they are proceeding with construction at their own risk. A revised building permit will be necessary.

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 townhouses
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	

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “ In the case of a proposed new building, that such building will not, in itself, or by reason of its location on the site, materially impair the architectural or historical value of the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity and that such building will not be injurious to the general visual character of the Historic District in which it is to be located.”

STAFF REPORT

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. Buildings in the Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District are mainly commercial in nature and are predominantly built at the sidewalk.
 - B. The proposed setback is approximately zero feet based on the plans.

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 a few remaining examples of residential structures right at the sidewalk, including the Chighizola House (ca. 1852) and the Elkus House (ca. 1854) in the Church Street East Historic District. There are several in the Lower Dauphin Street Historic District and the DeTonti Square Historic District.
 - 2. The proposed buildings are 2 story brick veneer structures.
 - B. The guidelines state that new buildings should have foundations similar in height to those of nearby historic buildings.
 - 1. Most modern commercial structures adjacent to this site have slab-on-grade foundations. However, most historic structures have similar finished floor levels as those proposed.
 - 2. The proposed foundation is a floating concrete slab.
 - 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 roof shapes exist in the Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District, but the most common are flat roofs behind a parapet and end gables with parapets.

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 wood doors, wood windows with louvered blinds, rooftop dormers and cantilevered cast iron balconies replicate the previously-approved designs.

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.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted. Staff further recommends that details of the ironwork and color samples should be submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

David Newell, representing the owner, was present to answer Board questions.

Staff presented the application and explained that, according to the owner, there is a preference among buyers for 2 story residences. As a result, the owners are asking to alter previously approved 1 ½ story cottages to 2 story buildings. The buildings will be constructed of Carolina brick to match the corner building and the rear of the buildings will be stuccoed. The Revolving Fund informed Staff about the change several weeks ago.

One Board member expressed concern about the massing of the project since the entire row of buildings would now be two story with a 1 ½ story cottage wedged between.

Another Board member felt that there should be more individuality between the buildings in order that they be perceived as separate buildings and not a modern complex. This could be achieved by changing iron work patterns, changing the door surrounds, varying the doors themselves, or using varying paint schemes to differentiate them. Staff responded that it is not unusual to have row houses that are identical in a city street scape.

Another member inquired why a stop work order had not been issued since work was progressing that was not in accordance with the ARB CoA. Staff stated that the owners were put on notice that they were proceeding at their own risk if they continued without Review Board approval. However, Staff would be reluctant to place a stop work on a project where a change will be submitted to the Board.

A Dauphin Street property owner in the audience, Nick Madeloni, asked about the stairs at 515-17 Dauphin that extended into the right of way. He stated that his business required full use of the sidewalk and any similar projection into the right of way adjacent to his business would prevent him from doing business as usual. Staff informed him that the steps received a Right of Way permit and that only the 1 ½ story Creole cottage will encroach onto the sidewalk. The remaining buildings have recessed entrances.

In response to Board concerns, Mr. Newell stated that the materials had been ordered and that changing the buildings would not be cost effective. There could possibly be some slight variations created by changing the door surrounds or the doors themselves. The Revolving Fund will do what it can to create variety between the buildings.

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

There was no additional Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

Harris Oswalt 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 Jim Wagoner and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Harris Oswalt moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued with the recommendation that some distinction be made between units (balcony, door surround, doors, or other method.) The motion was seconded by Jim Wagoner and approved with Bunky Ralph and David Tharp voting in opposition.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 03-27-07.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

046-05/06-CA 601 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Wintzell’s Restaurant
Received: 3/13/06 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 4/26/06 1) 3/27/06 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4, General Business
Conflicts of Interest: Douglas Kearley recused himself from discussion and voting on the application.
Nature of Project: Construct a wood framed, hipped roof orangerie on existing patio with an 8’ addition to the west.

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.

1. The Peters Building, ca. 1891, is a contributing two story frame structure within the Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District.
2. The subject lot measures approximately 209’ x approximately 150’.
3. The applicants are requesting to construct additional restaurant space on an existing concrete patio.
4. The current concrete patio measures 28’ x 18” and is bordered by wood planters with boxwoods.
5. The proposed addition measures 36’ x 18”.
6. The proposed south or parking lot elevation features four pairs of wood casement windows with wood panels below and transoms above.
7. An overhang over the two center doors replicates the overhang on the front elevation.
8. The proposed east elevation features two pair of wood casement windows with wood panels below and transoms above.
9. The proposed west elevation features two pair of wood doors with transoms above.
10. The proposed west elevation also features a shed overhang over the northernmost door.
11. Siding material is to be painted wood lap siding to match that on the original building.
12. Roofing material is to be 3 tab shingles, black in color, matching existing.

Staff recommends approval of the application 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 questioned the current use of the area designated for the construction. Staff explained that the area was currently designated for open patio seating. The Board also questioned the roof plan and its potential for leaking. Staff responded that a cricket had been included for that purpose

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no additional Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

Harris Oswalt 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 Cameron Pfeiffer 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 historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswalt and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 03/27/07.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

047-05/06-CA 208 Dauphin Street
Applicant: JSMM LLC/Clark Geer Latham & Associates architects
Received: 3/13/06 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 4/26/06 1) 3/27/06 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4, General Business
Nature of Project: Renovation of existing building destroyed by fire.
Proposed new building to be an independent theater on the first floor and lofts on the second and third floors, 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. Prior to the fire, the building is a contributing two story masonry structure within the Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District.
2. The subject lot measures approximately 120’ x approximately 27.88’.
3. Currently the building only contains two floors.
4. The applicants are requesting to construct a third floor to accommodate an extra loft unit.
5. Adjacent buildings, along with adjacent buildings, originally had ceiling heights of 12’ on each floor.
6. The proposed alterations include the first floor with a 20’ ceiling height; a second floor with a 15’ ceiling height; and a third floor with a 12’ ceiling height.
7. While the proportions appear to be appropriate for the subject structure, they may not be appropriate when viewed with adjacent properties.
8. The first floor storefront of the subject structure was destroyed by the fire, and is currently boarded up with plywood.
9. The second floor of the structure has been previously altered and is a monolithic wall with two small lookout windows.
10. The proposed first floor elevation features a pair of showcase-style windows on either side of a double-leaf entry.
11. Four cast iron columns create three bays.

12. The proposed second floor elevation features an 8' cantilevered balcony with decorative railing.
13. Three arched windows and one operable wood door are proposed to be placed in the second floor façade.
14. The subject structure appears on the 1925 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map and depicts a balcony.
15. A stucco finish is proposed for the second floor elevation.
16. The proposed third floor elevation features a pair of wood French doors flanked by single four-lite arched wood windows.
17. The proposed third floor elevation features an 8' cantilevered balcony with decorative railing.
18. The proposed third floor is set back from the front building line 8'.
19. The proposed balcony begins at the front building line.
20. A stucco finish is proposed for the third floor elevation.
21. A simple cornice is proposed to cap the elevation.

Staff has the following recommendations:

1. That the ground floor elevation be re-designed to be more in keeping with a true storefront system – bulkhead, storefront and transom.
2. That the applicant submit details of the arches and window casings.
3. That the applicant submit details of the ironwork.
4. That the applicant submit information on signage.
5. That the applicant submit information on lighting.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Max Morey and Linda Snapp were present to answer Board questions. They explained that the proposed theatre would have 180 -200 seats. Linda Snapp also presented a revised column base design that she described as being both narrower and smaller and having better detail. The color board was circulated among Board members.

After presenting the application Staff explained that, in a conference call with architect Linda Snapp, revisions had been made to the plan that satisfied conditions 1, 2 and 3 of the staff recommendations. Staff also explained that as a result of the fire, while the building had been considered contributing in the district NR nomination, it will no longer be considered contributing since most of its original fabric had been destroyed.

The Board questioned the use of multi-lighted French doors on the third floor and the solid panel in the railing. It was stated that the panel represented an old parapet seen in historic photographs and the multi-lighted door was inserted in the design for variety.

The Board wanted clarification on the materials to be used in the doors and windows. Ms. Snapp explained that the first floor would have aluminum framing and the remainder of the windows and doors would be of wood.

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no additional Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

Harris Oswalt moved that fact 22 be added: “Supplemental information has been submitted that meets the first three staff recommendations.” The motion was seconded by Cameron Pfeiffer and unanimously approved.

Harris Oswalt 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 in addition to supplemental fact 22 stated above. The motion was seconded by Cameron Pfeiffer and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

David Tharp moved that, based upon the facts adopted by the Board, that the application does impair the historic district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued conditioned on the third floor doors being single light rather than multi-light. The motion was seconded by Douglas Kearley and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 03/27/07.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

048-05/06-CA 1559 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Mark and Denise Burks
Received: 3/17/06 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 4/30/06 1) 3/27/06 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Nature of Project: Construct wood deck measuring 17' x 26'-6" as per submitted plans.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
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 property is a ca. 1900 two story wood frame vernacular residence with a curved front porch.
2. The proposed rear deck measures 17' deep by 26'-6" wide.
3. The height of the proposed deck is 28" above grade.
4. The handrail for the proposed deck is to match that on the front porch.
5. A free-standing exterior fireplace is proposed to be constructed on the west side of the deck.
6. The fireplace will be constructed out of bricks resembling Old Mobile brick to match those on the main house and the piers for the deck.
7. The proposed deck and fireplace will not be visible from public view.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Neither the owner nor a 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. In response to a Board question, staff explained the deck railing spindles would match those on the front porch railing.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no additional Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

Douglas Kearley moved that, based upon the information presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board adopt the facts in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswalt and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 03/27/07.