

**CITY OF MOBILE**  
**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD**

Minutes of the Meeting  
June 12, 2006

**CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 3:01 p.m. by Chair, Bunky Ralph.

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

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

**Members Absent:** Robert Brown, Michael Mayberry, Jim Wagoner, 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>
Jaimie Brown	13 N. Dearborn St.	001-05/06-CA
Don Williams	6300 Piccadilly Sq. Dr. 36609	069-05/06-CA
Mrs. Shivers	350 West St.	069-05/06-CA
Nick Holmes, III	257 N. Conception	future business

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

Tilmon Brown 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: Chris Holmes/ Bayside Remodelers  
Property Address: 1804 New Hamilton Street  
Date of Approval: 5/10/06 weh  
Work Approved: Replace deteriorated siding in east and west end gables with materials matching existing in materials profile and dimension. Prep to paint.
2. Applicant's Name: O.C. Wiggins  
Property Address: 33 South Lafayette  
Date of Approval: 5/12/06 jss  
Work Approved: Repair storm damage. Reset and repair awnings. Re-flash chimney and front porch. Replace columns as per existing and make minor siding repairs to match existing in profile and dimension. Replace damaged roofing on rear of house to match existing.
3. Applicant's Name: Scott Markle  
Property Address: 108 South Georgia Avenue  
Date of Approval: 5/12/06 asc  
Work Approved: Hurricane repairs to include: replacement of wood siding as necessary to match existing, pressure wash, repair gutters.

4. Applicant's Name: William Gadd  
Property Address: 957 Palmetto Street  
Date of Approval: 5/15/06 asc  
Work Approved: Repair to rotten wood with new wood to match existing in profile and dimension; paint exterior white with dark trim, dark green sashes, green shutters and grey deck. Install new working wood shutters. Install 3' white picket fence in front yard to tie into house on sides; gate of same design across driveway and front walk.
5. Applicant's Name: Ben and Maria Payne  
Property Address: 952 Charleston Street  
Date of Approval: 5/15/06 weh  
Work Approved: Install new 30 year GAF 3 tab fiberglass shingles, slate in color.
6. Applicant's Name: Ida Thomas  
Property Address: 960 Selma Street  
Date of Approval: 5/15/06 asc  
Work Approved: Install new 3 tab fiberglass shingles, black in color.
7. Applicant's Name: Andrea and Parks Moore  
Property Address: 166 South Georgia Avenue  
Date of Approval: 5/17/06 weh  
Work Approved: Replace plywood exterior siding on rear porch with lap siding to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Infill 6' section of rear porch to match remaining porch infill in materials, profile and dimension. Paint to match existing.
8. Applicant's Name: Caroline P. Hawkins  
Property Address: 909 Government Street  
Date of Approval: 5/18/06 asc  
Work Approved: Repaint building in the following Devoe Color Scheme:  
Body - Haze Green  
Trim – Celestial Glow (off white)  
Shutters & Railing - Black
9. Applicant's Name: Building and Maintenance Company  
Property Address: 79 South Ann Street  
Date of Approval: 5/19/06 weh  
Work Approved: Paint building in original color scheme:  
Body – Light Grey  
Trim – White  
Porch - Black
10. Applicant's Name: Building and Maintenance Company  
Property Address: 309 South Monterey Street  
Date of Approval: 5/19/06 weh  
Work Approved: Paint building in original color scheme:  
Body – Light Gray  
Trim – White

Porch – Black  
Door – Red

11. Applicant's Name: Redeemer Community Church  
Property Address: 1416 Church Street  
Date of Approval: 5/22/06 asc  
Work Approved: Demolish non-contributing structure as per approval by ARB March 18, 2002 (This CoA replaces CoA dated 4/18/02).
12. Applicant's Name: Mary Lousteau  
Property Address: 33 South Lafayette Street  
Date of Approval: 5/23/06 weh  
Work Approved: Restore front porch to original configuration based on photographic evidence in MHDC file.
13. Applicant's Name: J. Anders and Leslie Westerberg  
Property Address: 1553 Monterey Place  
Date of Approval: 5/23/06 weh  
Work Approved: Replace existing concrete strip driveway with concrete slab driveway. Replace concrete patio slab in rear with new concrete.
14. Applicant's Name: Liberty Roofing  
Property Address: 1569 Bruister Place  
Date of Approval: 5/23/06 weh  
Work Approved: Install new 30 year GAF 3 tab fiberglass architectural shingles, charcoal black in color.
15. Applicant's Name: Tessa Benstrom  
Property Address: 313 North Jackson Street  
Date of Approval: 5/23/06 jdb  
Work Approved: Prep to paint. Paint house in the following BLP color scheme: Body – Suez Rio – 2649D, Trim – Cream Silk – 2146-60, Porch and Shutters to remain existing colors.
16. Applicant's Name: Chris Bowen  
Property Address: 15 North Ann Street  
Date of Approval: 5/23/06 asc  
Work Approved: Install new dumpster pad at rear of property, 8' away from all property and fence lines as per submitted site plan.
17. Applicant's Name: Michael Rod Deal  
Property Address: 1154 Dauphin Street  
Date of Approval: 5/24/06 weh  
Work Approved: Replace rotten or damaged wood as necessary with materials to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Prep house for painting. Paint house in the following BLP color scheme:  
Body – Flo Claire Crocus Yellow  
Trim, Columns & Accents – DeTonti Square Off

White  
Porch Ceiling – Robin’s Egg Blue

18. Applicant’s Name: Fremin’s Roofing  
Property Address: 15 Blacklawn  
Date of Approval: 5/25/06 asc  
Work Approved: Install new 20 year 3 tab fiberglass shingles, autumn brown in color.
19. Applicant’s Name: Noah Brice Whetstone  
Property Address: 167 South Georgia Avenue  
Date of Approval: 5/25/06 asc  
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary with new materials matching existing in profile, dimension and material. Repaint house with the existing Benjamin Moore color scheme:  
Body – Tyler Taupe HC-43  
Trim and Accent – Navajo White  
Doors and Shutters - Black
20. Applicant’s Name: Cunningham, Bounds, Crowder, Brown and Breedlove  
Property Address: 1601 Dauphin Street  
Date of Approval: 5/26/06 weh  
Work Approved: Install generator as per submitted plans.
21. Applicant’s Name: Roof Design Center  
Property Address: 1559 Blair Avenue  
Date of Approval: 5/26/06 weh  
Work Approved: Install new standing seam galvanized metal roof.

**NOTICES OF VIOLATION and MUNICIPAL OFFENSE TICKETS:**

No NoVs or MoTs were written during this time period.

**OLD BUSINESS:**

1. **001-5/6-CA** 412 Dauphin Street  
Applicant: Real Source Holdings, Inc.  
Nature of Request: Phase 2 of main project. Convert rear building into 3 residential units. Redesign front and west elevation doors and windows.

**APPROVED.** Certified Record attached.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

1. **066-05/06-CA** 1211 Selma Street  
Applicant: Brent and Sally Ericson  
Nature of Request: Install glass behind existing rear porch columns as per submitted plans.

**APPROVED.** Certified Record attached.

2. **067-05/06-CA** 111 South Royal Street  
 Applicant: Museum Board, Inc.  
 Nature of Request: Install 160 sf banner on south elevation as per submitted plans. Install 6 banners totaling 384 sf. along front elevation as per submitted plans.
- DENIED** South elevation banner. **APPROVED** pole banners on west elevation. Certified Record attached.
3. **068-05/06-CA** 959 Augusta Street  
 Applicant: Robert and Sheri Allen  
 Nature of Request: Addition to rear of existing residence as per submitted plans.
- APPROVED.** Certified Record attached.
4. **069-05/06-CA** 350 West Street  
 Applicant: Mr. and Mrs. Steven Shivers/Don Williams Engineering  
 Nature of Request: Construct two story addition on north and south elevations as per submitted plans.
- TABLED.** Certified Record attached.
5. **070-05/06-CA** 100 South Monterey Street  
 Applicant: Lucinda Gardner  
 Nature of Request: Install fencing in yard as per submitted information.
- APPROVED.** Certified Record attached.

**OTHER BUSINESS and ANNOUNCEMENTS:**

1. **Nick Holmes III** was present to discuss the use of pvc/fiberglass shutters on an undisclosed historic building. The Board moved and voted to hear Nicholas Homes III although he was not on the agenda but noted that there was no application and there will be no official ruling. The Board considered that the submitted shutter mimicked wood shutters and that covering an asbestos shingle surface could be an acceptable application. No existing wood shutters on the building would be replaced with pvc shutters.
2. **Discussion of brick sidewalks in the Historic Districts**  
 Mayor Sam Jones has written a letter to the ARB feeling that there should be a provision for sidewalks in the historic districts that are other than concrete. The Board was unanimous in its opinion that it will review requests for brick sidewalks on a case by case basis. The ARB is in the process of rewriting its guidelines and a section will be created dealing with sidewalks.
3. **Update on Dauphin Street circular drive.**  
 Staff reported that the owners had gone to Right of Way to obtain a permit. A ROW clerk overrode the historic tag in the Tidemark permitting system and issued a permit for two curb cuts and a circular drive. It was the feeling of Staff that the owners should not be ticketed when they had a valid permit. The permit could have been revoked, however, the permit was issued on a Thursday and the drive went in on Friday. The ability of a clerk to override the system has been removed.

The Board could do nothing or demand that the owner come into compliance. If the owner is asked to apply for the circular drive after the fact and the Board denies it, City Council will override the Board based on the fact that numerous circular drives already exist on Dauphin Street in the historic district and the owner had a permit to construct the drive.

Board counsel stated that it is not good to ticket when a permit has been obtained. Not every violation is prosecuted.

Staff will write a note to the file that the permit was issued in error.

**There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.**

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
CERTIFIED RECORD**

**001-05/06 – CA**            412 Dauphin Street  
**Applicant:**            Joseph Cleveland Architects/Real Source Holdings, Inc.  
**Received:**            5/08/06                            **Meeting Date (s):**  
Submission Date + 45 Days:    6/27/06                            1) 10/17/05    2) 5/22/06    3) 6/12/06

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:**        Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District  
**Classification:**        Contributing  
**Zoning:**                B-4, General Business  
**Conflicts of Interest:**    Tilmon Brown recused himself from discussion and voting on the application. David  
Tharp and Cindy Klotz disclosed that they had worked on the project but no longer had  
any financial interest in it.  
**Nature of the Project:**    Phase 2 of main project. Convert rear building into 3  
residential units. Redesign front and west elevation  
doors and windows.

**STAFF REPORT**

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.…”

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff’s judgment, the proposed work is in compliance with the *Design Review Guidelines* and the *Lower Dauphin Street Commercial District Design Guidelines*.

**Part 1 – Convert Rear Building into 3 residential units.**

- A. FAÇADE ALTERATIONS – Windows** - The *Design Review Guidelines* state that “The type, size, and dividing lights of windows and their location and configuration (rhythm) on the building help establish the historic character of a building. Original window openings should be retained as well as original window sashes and glazing.
1. This area was originally constructed as a storage and warehouse facility for the main building. Currently there are 2 windows and one door on the south elevation and one garage door opening on the west elevation. The north and east elevations are solid brick.
  2. Plans call for the installation of double hung windows and doors.
- B. FAÇADE ALTERATIONS – Doors** – The *Design Review Guidelines* state that “Original doors and openings should be retained along with any mouldings, transoms, and sidelights. Replacements should respect the age and style of the building.”
1. The existing building’s primary façade faces west onto Hamilton Street.
  2. The proposed design respects the age and style of the building.
- C. ROOF ALTERATIONS – Parapet Wall and Sloped Roof** – The *Design Review 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 of the roof should be maintained.”
1. The existing roof is flat concealed behind a horizontal brick parapet.

2. The proposed roof has sloped end parapets and a steeply pitched shingled roof.

Staff recommends approval of this portion of the application as submitted.

## **Part 2 – Redesign Front and West Elevation Windows**

### **Project Background:**

The ARB approved plans for this project in October 2005. At that time, 10' wood and glass doors with tall transoms above were proposed for the Dauphin Street elevation. During the course of construction, a large steel beam supporting the masonry above the first floor was discovered. This beam limits the height of the first floor doors and does not allow for a transom. The contractor installed 8' wood multi-light doors with narrow transoms above. The scale was determined inappropriate for the building and presented a material impairment to the structure and the district.

The applicants are now requesting permission to install 10' wood and glass doors with stucco panels above. Ironwork from the previous application will remain the same. The proposed design emphasizes the verticality of the original building elements, which is a significant character-defining feature of the building.

### **Staff Recommendation:**

Due to Staff's involvement with the applicants on this issue, Staff has no comment or recommendation, other than to defer to the Board for the determination of appropriateness.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Jaimie Brown and Joseph Cleveland were 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.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

There was no Board discussion.

### **FINDING OF FACT**

David Tharp moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswald and passed on a vote of 5 to 1 with Cindy Klotz voting in opposition.

### **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 Oswald and approved on a 5 to 1 vote with Cindy Klotz voting in opposition.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 06/12/07.**



**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
CERTIFIED RECORD**

**066-05/06-CA**                      1211 Selma Street  
**Applicant:**                      Brent and Sally Ericson  
**Received:**                        5/22 /06                              Meeting Dates:  
**Submission Date + 45 Days:**                      7/06/06                              1) 6/12/06                      2)                      3)

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:**                      Oakleigh Garden Historic District  
**Classification:**                      Contributing  
**Zoning:**                                R-1, Single Family Residential  
**Conflicts of Interest:**                      Douglas Kearley recused himself from discussion and voting on the application. Tilmon Brown disclosed that he constructed the addition on the house several years ago but has no financial interest in the current project.  
**Nature of Project:**                      Install glass behind existing porch columns as per submitted plans.

**STAFF REPORT**

**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 ANALYSIS**

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

- A. The Guidelines state that “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture. Historic porches should be maintained and repaired to reflect their period. Particular attention should be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions and decorative details... Where rear or 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. 1908 Van Antwerp house is a two story wood frame residence.
  2.        The subject structure is a contributing element within the Oakleigh Garden Historic District.
  3.        The applicants are proposing to enclose the existing rear porch with a wood frame and glass system.
  4.        The existing open rear porch measures approximately 23’-6” wide by approximately 12’ deep.
  5.        There are four existing wood Doric columns supporting the second floor above.
  6.        The existing three bays created by the columns will be infilled with wood window units with fixed insulated glass, with awning windows at the bulkhead level below and a fixed insulated glass panel in a rabbeted frame above.

7. Exterior sheathing will be 1x wood installed over plywood.
8. The center bay is proposed to be the new location of an existing pair of 5' wood French doors with single panes of glass.
9. This door will be moved from its current location on the rear elevation under the porch to the new location between the middle columns.
10. New materials will be painted to match existing color scheme.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

#### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Neither the applicant nor his representative was 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 whether the existing rear door would be reused. Staff responded that the door would be moved forward and that the existing rear door would remain a cased opening.

#### **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 finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion was seconded by David Tharp 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 structure or the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by David Tharp and unanimously approved.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 06/12/07.**

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
CERTIFIED RECORD**

**067-05/06-CA**                    111 South Royal Street  
**Applicant:**                    Museum of Mobile/ Museum Board, Inc.  
**Received:**                    5/30 /06                                    Meeting Dates:  
**Submission Date + 45 Days:**                    7/14/06                    1) 6/12/06                    2)                    3)

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:**                    Church Street East Historic District  
**Classification:**                    Contributing  
**Zoning:**                                    B-4, General Business  
**Nature of Project:**                    Install banners as per submitted plans.

**STAFF REPORT**

**APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT**  
*Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts and the Government Street Corridor*

**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 ANALYSIS**

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff's judgment, the signage requested does not comply with the Sign Design Guidelines in terms of square footage of signage. A variance will be necessary to allow the additional signage, however the proposed signage will not impair the historic integrity of the structure and the district.

1. The ca. 1857 Old City Market is a two story masonry structure adorned with decorative wrought and cast iron work.
2. This structure is designated a National Historic Landmark.
3. The present signage measures 64 square feet, which is the maximum allowable by Mobile City Code.
4. The linear front footage facing South Royal Street is 182.75'.
5. The Museum of Mobile takes up the majority of the block bounded by Water Street to the east, Church Street to the south, Royal Street to the west and Government Street to the north.
6. The proposed signage is to be placed along the west and south elevations.
7. The proposed signage is to be in interchangeable banner form.
8. The design for proposed signage for the west elevation is a series of six banners hung from poles mounted on the face of the building.
9. These double-sided banners will measure 13' long by 2.5' wide, or 65 sf each.
10. Colors will vary depending on the exhibit.
11. The proposed signage for the south elevation is in the form of a horizontal banner measuring 32' long by 5' high, or 160 sf.

12. The proposed banner will be mounted on the wall between the first and second floor levels.
13. The color of the sign is to be black with white lettering.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted with the condition that a variance is obtained from the Board of Zoning Adjustment.

#### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Neither the applicant nor his representative was 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.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board questioned the appropriateness of the banner on the south elevation and considered that more permanent signage should be used in this location.

#### **FINDING OF FACT**

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion was seconded by Douglas Kearley and unanimously approved.

#### **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the banners on the west elevation do not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines and should be approved and that the horizontal banner on the south elevation does impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines and should be denied. The motion was seconded by Cameron Pfeiffer and unanimously approved. A Certificate of Appropriateness will be issued for the banners on the west elevation once a variance is obtained from the Board of Zoning Adjustment.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
CERTIFIED RECORD**

**068-05/06-CA**                      959 Augusta Street  
**Applicant:**                      Bob and Sheri Allen  
**Received:**                      5/26 /06                      Meeting Dates:  
**Submission Date + 45 Days:**                      7/10/06                      1) 6/12/06                      2)                      3)

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:**                      Oakleigh Garden Historic District  
**Classification:**                      Contributing  
**Zoning:**                      R-1, Single Family Residential  
**Nature of Project:**                      Construct rear addition as per submitted plans.

**STAFF REPORT**

**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 ANALYSIS**

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. 1940 Hunter house is a one story wood frame bungalow with Classical Revival detailing.
2.        The subject structure is a contributing element within the Oakleigh Garden Historic District.
3.        The subject property lot is “L”-shaped and measures 50’ at the front and 75’ at the rear, by 172’ long.
4.        The applicants are proposing to construct a rear addition measuring 27’ x 27’-11 ½”.
5.        The proposed addition will continue the line of the existing house back 15’ by the width of the house, then will indent to the east to create a sunroom measuring 15’ -1 ½” x 12’.
6.        The roof line at the rear of the existing structure will be altered to incorporate a side gable to accommodate the addition. Overhang will match existing.
7.        Foundation for the addition will be continuous brick construction to match existing.
8.        Siding will be wood lap siding to match existing, painted to match.
9.        Windows will be wood true divided lite, three-over-one.
10.      Glazing for the sunroom will be fixed glass panels in wood frame above operable awning windows at the bulkhead level.
11.      Single door will be wood with a single glass panel.
12.      There are no setback or lot coverage issues associated with this project.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Bob Allen was 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.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

There was no additional Board discussion.

### **FINDING OF FACT**

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

### **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Douglas Kearley 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 David Tharp and unanimously approved.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 06/12/07.**

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
CERTIFIED RECORD**

**069-05/06-CA**                      350 West Street  
**Applicant:**                      Mr. and Mrs. Steven Shivers/Don Williams Engineering  
**Received:**                      5/31 /06                                      Meeting Dates:  
**Submission Date + 45 Days:**                      7/15/06                      1) 6/12/06                      2)                      3)

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:**                      Leinkauf Historic District  
**Classification:**                      Contributing  
**Zoning:**                                      R-1, Single Family Residential  
**Nature of Project:**                      Construct side additions as per submitted plans.

**STAFF REPORT**

**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 ANALYSIS**

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.

1. The ca. 1922 Quina house is a one story wood frame bungalow with a pop-up second floor in the middle of the roof.
2. The subject structure is a contributing element within the Leinkauf Historic District.
3. The subject property lot measures 60' x 120'.
4. The applicants are proposing to construct additions on both the north and south elevations.
5. The addition to the south elevation is proposed to be constructed over an existing bump-out. This addition measures 12'-3" x 14' – 11" at the second floor level.
6. This addition occurs at a distance of 54' from the street.
7. There are no setback issues concerning this elevation, which establishes a side yard setback of 2'-6".
8. This addition would not exceed the perimeter of the footprint of the existing bump-out.
9. The addition to the north elevation is proposed to elongate a bump-out, to measure 26' – 7" by 14' – 0".
10. This addition occurs at a distance of 55' from the street.
11. A porte cochere is proposed for the first level of the north addition with a bedroom above at the second level.
12. The proposed addition will come within 2'-6" of the north property line.
13. The Historic District Overlay Ordinance would be applicable to this situation.
14. Siding material for both additions is wood lap siding to match existing.
15. Roof material and pitch for both additions is to match existing.

16. Windows are proposed to be wood double hung, true divided lite, six-over-six.
17. Windows on the first floor of the existing house are a variety of styles, but are predominately wood nine-over-one true divided lite.
18. Windows in the pop-up appear to be wood one-over-one.
19. Columns supporting the porte cochere are proposed to match those on the front porch, with brick plinths supporting three wood columns.
20. Chamfered brackets on the front porch will also be replicated on the porte cochere.

Staff recommends approval of the addition to the south elevation as submitted. Due to the small massing and scale, this addition should not pose an adverse affect to the historic structure.

Staff recommends denial of the addition to the north elevation as submitted. Due to the massing and scale, this addition would be highly visible from the street and would negatively impact the historic integrity of the structure.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Mrs. Shivers and Don Williams were present to discuss the application. Mr. Williams explained that the focus of the project was to expand living space for the owners by expanding the second floor. The only way to expand is from the side. The car shelter is an afterthought. The addition will be 2 ft. 6” from the north property line and 2’6” from the south side. There is a power line at the rear which makes expansion to the rear difficult and would require a major change in the way the house is used.

The Board questioned the applicant regarding the relationship of windows to siding—there appeared to be too much siding and the windows as drawn seemed small. The Board questioned why existing window types on the existing house had not been used in the addition.

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 historic significance of the building. Staff responded that the house is a contributing house in the district, but that expanding the footprint and creating a two story house would alter that designation. As to the pop-up, Staff felt that it was a common Bungalow feature and was original. Staff questioned the roof pitch used on the drawing, commenting that an incorrect pitch might have affected the look of the drawing.

Board members suggested pulling back the second floor, but Mr. Williams said that would sacrifice the space required by the owners.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

There was no additional Board discussion.

### **FINDING OF FACT**

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report noting that indications of north and south should be reversed. The motion was seconded by David Tharp and unanimously approved.

### **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

David Tharp moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application be tabled and that the applicant meet with Staff to discuss design options. The motion was seconded by Douglas Kearley and unanimously approved.



**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
CERTIFIED RECORD**

**070-05/06-CA**                      100 South Monterey Street  
**Applicant:**                      Lucinda Gardner  
**Received:**                      5/30 /06                              Meeting Dates:  
**Submission Date + 45 Days:**                      7/14/06                      1) 6/12/06                      2)                      3)

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:**                      Old Dauphin Way Historic District  
**Classification:**                      Contributing  
**Zoning:**                              R-1, Single Family Residential  
**Nature of Project:**                      Install fencing in yard as per submitted plans.

**STAFF REPORT**

**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 ANALYSIS**

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 wood frame bungalow designed by C.L. Hutchisson and built by the Mobile Shipbuilding Company as worker housing.
2. The subject lot is on the southwest corner of South Monterey and Conti Streets.
3. The subject lot measures 40' x 180'. □ □
4. The proposed fence for the side yard along Conti Street measures 3'- 4" high, picket fence painted white.
5. The proposed fence for the inside and rear property line measures 5' high, picket fence painted white.
6. Both fences will be picket using a rounded picket.
7. All fencing will be installed inside existing perimeter plantings.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Neither the applicant nor his representative was 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.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

There was no Board discussion.

## **FINDING OF FACT**

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion was seconded by Douglas Kearley 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 Tilmon Brown and unanimously approved.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 06/12/07.**