

CITY OF MOBILE
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

Minutes of the Meeting
June 14, 2004

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Acting Chair Bunky Ralph at 3:05 p.m.

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

Members Present: Douglas Kearley, Michael Mayberry, David Tharp, Bunky Ralph, Harris Oswald. Joe Sackett, Tilmon Brown.

Members Absent: Lynda Burkett, Cindy Klotz Robert Brown.

| <u>In Attendance</u> | <u>Address</u> | <u>Item Number</u> |
|----------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| Dora Finley | 204 S. Lawrence St. | 067-03/04-CA |
| Linda La | 61 S. Ann St. | 068-03/04-CA |
| Jerry Arnold | 558 Conti St. | 070-03/04-CA |
| David Lindsey | 1257 Springhill Ave. | 070-03/04-CA |

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Douglas Kearley moved to approve the minutes as mailed. The motion was seconded by Joe Sackett and approved.

APPROVAL OF THE MID-MONTH CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS;

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

MID-MONTH APPROVALS

1. Applicant's Name: Tony Woods
Property Address: 908 Palmetto
Date of Approval: 5/11/04 weh
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary with materials matching existing in profile and dimension.
Paint house in the following color scheme:
Body: Fresh Lemonade, Richards (Gleem)
Trim: White (Richards)
2. Applicant's Name: McDade Contracting
Property Address: 110 S. Claiborne
Date of Approval: 5/12/04 asc
Work Approved: Repaint in the following Benjamin Moore color scheme to match existing:
Body: BM 8C58 Chippendale Rose Tone
Trim White
Shutters: Bellingrath Green
Ironwork: Black
3. Applicant's Name: Ralph Reynolds Roofing
Property Address: 9 Semmes Avenue
Date of Approval: 5/12/04 weh
Work Approved: Re-roof with Stratford shingles, Graystone Blend in color.

4. Applicant's Name: Warren Riley
Property Address: 1719 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 5/7/04 jdb
Work Approved: Install black fiberglass 20 year 3 tab shingles to match existing.

5. Applicant's Name: Phillip Holley
Property Address: 1214 Selma Street
Date of Approval: 5/17/04 asc
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Paint new materials to match existing color scheme.

6. Applicant's Name: Danny McAleer
Property Address: 1557 Bruister St.
Date of Approval: 5/17/04 asc
Work Approved: Paint exterior in the following Sherwin-Williams colors:
Body- Morris Room Gray
Trim- Classical White
Door-Roycroft Copper Red
Porch deck-battleship gray
Unpainted brick to remain unpainted.
Install approximately 50 ft. 6 ft. dog eared privacy fencing on east side to match existing fencing.

7. Applicant's Name: H. E. Rummel
Property Address: 1002 Charleston
Date of Approval: 5/17/04 asc
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary with new materials to match existing in profile and dimension. Repaint house in the existing color scheme.

8. Applicant's Name: H. E. Rummel
Property Address: 1004 Charleston
Date of Approval: 5/17/04 asc
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary with new materials to match existing in profile and dimension. Repaint house in the existing color scheme.

9. Applicant's Name: John Gwin
Property Address: 224 S. Lawrence Street
Date of Approval: 5/19/04 asc
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood with new materials as necessary to match existing in profile and dimension. Repaint house in existing color scheme: Body: Dauphin Gray, Trim: White

10. Applicant's Name: Ashton Brock
Property Address: 1708 Laurel Street

- Date of Approval: 5/19/04 asc
 Work Approved: Repair to rotten wood with new wood to match existing in dimension and profile;
 Paint exterior in the existing color scheme: body-gray; trim-white; porch deck-gray.
11. Applicant's Name: Vance McCown Construction, Inc.
 Property Address: 1507 Dauphin Street
 Date of Approval: 5/20/04 asc
 Work Approved: Repaint building in the existing color scheme.
12. Applicant's Name: Janet Rich Pittman
 Property Address: 210 South Georgia Avenue
 Date of Approval: 5/20/04 weh
 Work Approved: Install storm windows as per submitted design.
 Touch up paint in existing color scheme.
13. Applicant's Name: Ellen Lizotte
 Property Address: 310 Charles Street
 Date of Approval: 5/20/04 asc
 Work Approved: Repairs to roof with materials to match existing. Minor wood repair with new wood to match existing in dimension and profile; paint new wood in existing color scheme.
14. Applicant's Name: Dianne Caylor
 Property Address: 1308 Brown Street
 Date of Approval: 5/20/04 weh
 Work Approved: Install concrete driveway as per submitted site plan. Drive to be placed in location of existing dirt drive, measuring 52' long by 9 ½' wide.
15. Applicant's Name: Vance McCown Construction, Inc.
 Property Address: 1507 Dauphin Street
 Date of Approval: 5/20/04 weh
 Work Approved: Repaint building in the existing color scheme.
16. Applicant's Name: MDM LLC
 Property Address: 126 Government Street
 Date of Approval: 5/24/04 asc
 Work Approved: Replace rotten wood with new materials as necessary on windows to match existing in profile and dimension. Caulk windows and repaint in existing color scheme.
17. Applicant's Name: Harold Allen
 Property Address: 203 Charles Street
 Date of Approval: 5/24/04 weh
 Work Approved: Replace rotten wood with new materials as necessary match existing in profile and dimension. Repaint in existing color scheme.

18. Applicant's Name: Jean Buckner
Property Address: 1221 Elmira Street
Date of Approval: 5/24/04 asc
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary on foundation with new materials matching existing in profile and dimension. Rebuild brick piers using existing materials. Match piers to existing.
19. Applicant's Name: D B Technon Services
Property Address: 505 Church Street
Date of Approval: 5/24/04 asc
Work Approved: Repaint house. (Paint colors to be submitted prior to start)
20. Applicant's Name: Mr. and Mrs. Jerry Bramlett/Lipford Construction
Property Address: 151 Levert Avenue
Date of Approval: 5/25/04 asc
Work Approved: Repair/replace rotten wood on main house with new wood to match existing in profile and dimension; paint new materials in existing color scheme.
Replace metal door on garage with new fiberglass door to match existing in design.
21. Applicant's Name: Tim Wells
Property Address: 1751 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 5/26/04 weh
Work Approved: Construct 6' shadowbox fence along alley as required by the Board of Zoning Adjustment. Install landscape timbers and pea gravel to create permeable parking surface at rear of property as per submitted plan. As per a requirement of BZA.
22. Applicant's Name: Jason C. and Kim G. Smith
Property Address: 1558 Luling Street
Date of Approval: 5/25/04 jdb
Work Approved: Install 6' wood dog-eared privacy fence as per submitted plans.
23. Applicant's Name: Margaret Rushing
Property Address: 1106 Selma Street
Date of Approval: 5/27/04 asc
Work Approved: Install 3' picket fence in front yard per submitted plan. Pickets to be gothic or pointed, fence to be painted dark green.

OLD BUSINESS

1. 1275 Springhill Avenue

Ed Hooker asked the Board to consider a change in the approved design of this gas station/convenience store. Staff explained that the Review Board had approved an elevation showing 5 bays of storefront with a horizontal band replicating a water table. Applicants had already ordered tempered glass with no horizontal member to fill the openings that cannot be returned. David Lindsey appeared on behalf of the applicant with a mock up of a section of storefront. This model showed a

horizontal muntin both in front of and behind the glass that simulated the horizontal band approved in the original application.

The Board was asked its informal opinion on the use of this technique to replicate the previously approved design. It was the consensus of the Board that this would be an acceptable substitute.

NEW BUSINESS

1. **065-03/04-CA:** 101 Herndon Avenue
Applicant: Mark Ramey
Nature of Request: Remove existing concrete front steps & slab porch and construct new wood porch with columns, porch rail & wood steps as per submitted plan.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.
2. **066-03/04-CA:** 251 Chatham Street
Applicant: Bill and Leslie Cutts
Nature of Request: Rebuild front porch to match original using old photographs as a guide. Add rear porch. Remove north entrance door and install window to match existing. Repaint color to be selected by owner.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.
3. **067-03/04-CA:** 501 Monroe Street
Applicant: Dora Finley
Nature of Request: Construct 8' stucco wall to run 30' along southwest property line, continuing the line of an existing wall supporting a pool enclosure at adjacent property. Add black louvered shutters to windows. Add 4 white fluted square 10" columns to support front balcony, all as per submitted plans.

APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. Certified Record attached.
4. **068-03/04-CA:** 1275 Spring Hill Avenue
Applicant: Kwan Bui
Nature of Request: Install signage as per submitted plans.

APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. Certified Record attached.
5. **069-03/04-CA:** 278 Dauphin Street
Applicant: David Rasp/Hero's Sports Bar
Nature of Request: Stain wood deck with penetrating stain as per submitted sample.

DENIED. Certified Record attached.
6. **070-03/04-CA:** 558 Conti Street
Applicant: Jerry Arnold
Nature of Request: Construct rear addition as per submitted plans.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

OTHER BUSINESS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS:

1. Report from the Rules and Regulations Committee

Bunky Ralph reported that the committee has not met. Bunky Ralph, Tilmon Brown, Harris Oswald and David Tharp will meet at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, June 22, 2004 in the MHDC offices.

2. Discussion of the proposed GSA Federal Courthouse

Based upon a review of photographs of the proposed courthouse model, Ed Hooker will provide a summary of remarks made at the meeting. These remarks will be emailed to Board members for review prior to sending comments to the architects.

3. Plans for NAPC Conference in Indianapolis

Ed reported that arrangements for air travel and hotel have been finalized for those attending the conference. A packet will be mailed to Board members soon.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

- B. The Guidelines state that “The form and shape of the porch and its roof should maintain their historic appearance. Materials should blend with the style of the building.”
 - 1. The proposed porch is 3 bays wide and spans the width of the front of the residence.
 - 2. A set of wood steps is proposed to be located at the north side of the porch and serve two entrances to the foyer.
 - 3. 12” square wood box columns will support a balustraded deck. Stock box column design provided by MHDC staff.

- C. The Guidelines state that “The balustrade of the stairs should match the design and materials of the porch.”
 - 1. Proposed porch balustrade and step rail is MHDC stock design #1, utilizing square pickets, and top and bottom rail.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

There was no one to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was discussion concerning the side entrance stair that will give access to two front entrances. Removing the north entrance was suggested, however, staff reported that the two doors appear to be original since they open into the same space.

FINDING OF FACTS

David Tharp moved to find the facts in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Mike Mayberry and passed.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Harris Oswalt moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. The motion was seconded by Tilmon Brown passed.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 6/14/05

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

There was no one present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no discussion on the application.

FINDING OF FACTS

Tilmon Brown moved to find the facts in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswalt and approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Tilmon Brown moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswalt and approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 6/14/05

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

Work Item 1, Front Porch Alteration

- 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.”
1. The main structure is a two story minimal traditional brick veneer residence.
 2. The existing cantilevered balcony has aluminum railing and is centered over the front door and covers 3 bays of the 5 bay façade.
 3. The proposed changes include the addition of 4 aluminum fluted columns, 8” square.

Work Item 2, Addition of Pediment over Rear Entry

- B. 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.”
1. The main structure is a two story minimal traditional brick veneer residence.
 2. Currently there is a deteriorated fabric awning covering the rear entry door.
 3. The proposed changes include the addition of 2 fluted pilasters 8” wide that support a horizontal beam with faux keystone. Material is polypropylene copolymer.

Work Item 3, Addition of Decorative Shutters

- C. The Guidelines state that “Operable units, hung with appropriate hinges are encouraged. Where blinds and shutters must be fixed, they should be hung in the window casing in a manner to replicate those that are operable. Decorative shutters are appropriate on some 20th century buildings. Evidence must be presented of their original use when requested.”
1. Currently there are no shutters on the residence.
 2. The proposed shutters are only for decorative purposes.

Work Item 4, Continuation of Stucco-Covered Masonry Wall

- D. The Guidelines state that Fences “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 main structure is a two story brick veneer residence.
 2. The proposed stucco-covered masonry wall will be a continuation of the one constructed as part of a pool enclosure.
 3. Typically, the Design Guidelines limit privacy fences to 6’ in height.
 4. The Design Guidelines do allow 8’ high separations where residential property adjoins commercial property.
 5. The property adjacent to the west property line is a duplex apartment.

Staff recommends the following conditions should the Board find that the proposed changes will not materially impair the historic character of the District:

1. Front Porch Alterations:

The columns proposed for the front cantilevered balcony are out of scale with the balcony. With a shallow depth, the columns would be less than 4' from the main façade. Staff recommends eliminating the columns. Installing decorative brackets similar to mid-19th century cantilevered balconies would create a more decorative façade, and be as successful as the addition of columns.

2. Rear Door Surround:

Traditionally rear doors are considered secondary entrances. The proposed surround increases the importance of the rear door without providing a functional purpose, such as a stoop or porch. Staff recommends either simplifying the design or constructing an alternate structure.

3. Shutter Installation:

Typically, the Board requires the use of heavier, more substantial shutters. Should the Board determine that the installation of shutters in this case is appropriate, staff recommends that the applicant be required to submit a shutter constructed of an approved material.

4. Stucco-Covered Masonry Wall

Staff recommends approval of the wall as submitted. The proposed new wall section is a continuation of an existing wall constructed to support a pool enclosure. While the property to the west is a duplex, no adjacent properties are commercially zoned. Typically, the Board only approves 8' walls where residentially zoned properties adjoin commercially zoned properties.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Dora Finley was present to explain her application. She lives next door to the property under consideration by the Board. The 8 ft. wall is being requested for security reasons since there is foot traffic from Lawrence Street. The wall will be stuccoed masonry with a brick cap. The wall will jog around an existing oak tree and will, in essence, be u-shaped.

Columns are being requested on the front facade since the existing balcony brackets will not support weight. Ed Hooker pointed out that the existing balcony was probably always decorative in nature. Shutters are for decorative appeal, are wood grained and will be 18" wide to appear operable on the building's 36" wide windows.

The rear door surround will enhance the elevation once the awning is removed. It will not have sidelights.

The applicant also asked to install gutters.

There were no additional comments in favor of or in opposition to the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Douglas Kearley asked if there was a slab to receive front columns. Staff responded in the affirmative. There was discussion concerning the appropriateness of the columns proposed. They were overscaled for the balcony and the material appears inconsistent with the existing iron balcony. Douglas Kearley suggested a pipe support column with decorative cap as an alternate solution. This was agreed to by the applicant.

Board members pointed out that the rear door surround would provide no protection for the door and that the door might soon require replacement.

FINDING OF FACTS

Douglas Kearley moved to find the facts in the staff report. The motion was seconded by David Tharp and approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mike Mayberry moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness on condition that the columns be 4" pipe columns with cap and base and that a landscape professional be consulted about wall footings in order not to damage the tree's root system during construction of the wall. The motion was seconded by Tilmon Brown and approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 6/14/05

D Materials
E Lighting

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...

A. Mounting and Placement:

1. The proposed building signage is to be mounted on the 2 ½’ sign band below the roof.
2. The proposed canopy signage is to be mounted on the canopy valance.
 - (a) The Sign Design Guidelines state that “No portion of a sign shall extend above the cornice line at the top of the building face.”
 - (b) The 3’ square diagonal logo extends past the sign band at the top and bottom by approximately .87”
3. The proposed monument sign is to be placed at the northwest corner of the property.

B. Design:

1. The proposed design for the sign band signage is channel lettering, in a simple block font, painted red.
2. The proposed design for the logo sign is a 3’ square with a white background. Two symmetrical red diamonds placed in an up/down position are the backdrop for a green number 1 on which the letters “STOP” are applied in yellow.

C. Size:

1. The Zoning Ordinance of the City of Mobile, Section 64-008, as amended, states the following:
4.3 Authority. The Review Board shall have the authority to adopt such rules and regulations consistent with law to carry out the duties under this Chapter. In exercising this authority, the Review Board shall consider:
 - (a) The location of the signs (site plan), including size, mounting, placement, height, materials and illumination;
 - (b) The impact of the sign in relation to the building;
 - (c) The overall relationship of the sign to the district in which it is located or to be located.

5.0 Permissible Signs in Historic Districts

The maximum allowable sign area for all signs...shall not exceed 1.5 square feet per linear foot of the primary building wall, not to exceed 64 square feet per tenant.

2. The Guidelines state that “The total maximum allowable sign area for all signs is one and one half square feet per linear front foot of the principal building, not to exceed 64 square feet. A multi-tenant building is also limited to a maximum of 64 square feet.”

1. The linear front footage of the building is 108 feet.
2. The allowable signage based on the formula is 162 square feet.
3. There are three tenants proposed for the site:

| | | |
|--|--------------------------------|--|
| Five Points Tobacco and Liquor | Linear Front Footage = 20 feet | Signage Permitted = 30 sf |
| | | Signage Proposed = 24.5 sf |
| First Stop Deli/Mart | Linear Front Footage = 68 feet | Signage Permitted = 104 sf > 64 sf, so 64 sf |
| | | Signage Proposed = 16 sf |
| Springhill Flowers & Gifts | Linear Front Footage = 20 feet | Signage Permitted = 30 sf |
| (Identical signage facing Springhill Ave. & Ann St.) | | Signage Proposed = 30 sf |

4. There are two additional signs proposed for the site:

| | | |
|---------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| Monument Sign | Signage Permitted | = max allowable 50 sf |
| | Signage Proposed | = 50 square feet |
| Canopy Sign | 3' square on a diagonal | = 9 sf |
5. The proposed signage totals 129.5 square feet.

D. Materials:

1. The Guidelines state that “Wood, metal, stucco, stone or brick is allowed. Plastic, vinyl or similar materials are prohibited. Neon, resin to give the appearance of wood, and fabric may be used as appropriate.”
2. The signage material proposed for the sign band is aluminum channel, painted red.
3. The signage material for the logo signs is aluminum with an applied vinyl face.
4. The signage material for the monument sign is aluminum with an applied vinyl face.

E. Lighting:

1. Information provided by the applicant/owner states that the signage on the sign band is to be reverse channel backlit; information obtained from the sign contractor indicates the signs are to be non-illuminated, lit with flood lighting.
2. No lighting plan was provided for this source of lighting.
3. Information provided by the applicant/owner states that the signage on the fuel canopy is metal with vinyl face; information obtained from the sign contractor indicates that the sign is to be internally lit plastic.
4. The monument sign is to be lit with flood lights, which will be an integral part of the landscaping around the monument sign.

Staff recommends approval of the application with the following conditions:

1. That all sign band signage be aluminum, reverse channel backlit.
2. That the logo sign on the canopy not be internally lit plastic. It may be either metal with vinyl face, lit with floodlights, or another sign type permitted under the guidelines.
3. That the applicant be made aware of the following:
 - (a) **Section 7 of Section 64-008, Signs Exempt from Regulations Under the Ordinance**
7.2 Any sign inside a building, not attached to a window or door that is not legible from a distance of more than 3' beyond the lot line of the building site or parcel on which such sign is located.
 (This section is intended to cover such signage as branding logos, neon product names, etc.)

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

The applicant made no additions to the record.
 There was no testimony in favor of or in opposition to the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The applicant will not require a variance since the sign ordinance allows a maximum of 64 square feet of signage per tenant.

FINDING OF FACTS

David Tharp moved to find the facts in the staff report. The motion was second by Douglas Kearley and approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Douglas Kearley moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness conditional upon those items enumerated in the staff report.

1. That all sign band signage be aluminum, reverse channel backlit.
2. That the logo sign on the canopy not be internally lit plastic. It may be either metal with vinyl face, lit with floodlights, or another sign type permitted under the guidelines.
3. That the applicant be made aware of the following:
 - (b) **Section 7 of Section 64-008, Signs Exempt from Regulations Under the Ordinance**
7.3 Any sign inside a building, not attached to a window or door that is not legible from a distance of more than 3' beyond the lot line of the building site or parcel on which such sign is located.

(This section is intended to cover such signage as branding logos, neon product names, etc.)

The motion was seconded by David Tharp and approved. Tilmon Brown abstained from voting.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 6/14/05.

APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS - STAFF COMMENTS

070-03/04 – CA 278 Dauphin Street
Applicant: David Rasp/Hero’s Sports Bar
Received: 6/2/04 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 7/17/04 1) 6/14/04 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4, General Business
Additional Permits Required: (1) Paint
Conflicts of Interest: Douglas Kearley recused himself from discussion on the application.
Nature of Project: Stain wood deck with submitted sample.

At the November 18, 2003 meeting of the Architectural Review Board, approval was granted to construct a wooden deck in the city right-of-way to promote outside dining. The Board requested that the deck be either painted or stained, and requested the applicant submit color samples for Board consideration.

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 | Exterior Materials & Finishes | Stain wood deck |

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. There are currently no applicable guidelines for this type of structure. Therefore, the design is reviewed in terms of compatibility and the structure’s impact on the historic district.
2. At the meeting where this structure was approved, the Board requested the applicant return with color samples.
3. The applicant is requesting to stain the deck with a transparent stain by Sherwin Williams, color Mountain Ash.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

The applicant did not appear.
There was no one to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was discussion concerning the original intent of the Board when it requested to see the finish treatment of the deck. After some discussion, it was concluded that the proposed finish yielded the appearance of a raw wood deck. A more formal, finished look would be preferred. This could be

achieved using a stain. More than one stain color was suggested--a darker stain for the flooring with a lighter stain for the railing and pickets.

FINDING OF FACTS

The Board found no facts.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mike Mayberry moved to approve the application as submitted. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswald. The motion failed.

Mike Mayberry moved to approve staining on condition that more than one color be used (a darker deck color contrasted to a lighter color for the railing) and that staff work with Main Street Mobile on an appropriate solution. The motion was seconded by Tilmon Brown and passed.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

071-03/04 – CA 558 Conti Street
Applicant: Jerry Arnold
Received: 6/2/04 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 6/25/04 1) 7/17/04 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street Historic District

Classification: Contributing

Zoning: R-1 Single Family Residential

Additional Permits Required: (1) Building

Nature of Project: Construct a 21’-4” x 14’ – 9” addition to rear as per submitted plans. New construction to be brick veneer, painted to match existing, with flush board siding under rear porch. Porch details to match those of front porch. Louvered blinds to fill 1 bay of the 3 bay rear porch, concealing structure and interior space behind. Hipped roof to match existing in pitch and shingles.

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 | Additions | Construct Family Room Addition |

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

- A. The Guidelines state that “The appropriateness of additions shall be measured by the guidelines applicable to new construction. The addition should compliment the design and scale of the main building.”
1. The main structure is one story load-bearing masonry late Victorian residence, with a hipped roof.
 - a. The existing structure is painted brick, and has six-over-six wood windows, and decorative brick cornice frieze.
 - b. Currently there is a brick addition to the rear that will be incorporated into the proposed design.
 - c. The proposed addition is a one story brick veneer, with brick painted to match existing, decorative cornice detail to match existing, and wood frame porch with details copied from the front porch.
 2. The proposed addition repeats the design of the existing residence by utilizing the following elements:
 - a. Brick bond, color, and decorative cornice matching that on the main residence;
 - b. Wood windows matching those in the main residence, and the introduction of diamond windows, a traditional historic design element;
 - c. Roof pitch matching that of the existing;
 - d. Porch elements matching that of the front porch.
 3. No trees will be removed to construct the addition.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

The applicant appeared but added no testimony.

There was no additional public comment in favor of or in opposition to the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACTS AND DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Douglas Kearley moved to find the facts in the staff report and to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. The motion was seconded by Mike Mayberry and approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 6/14/05.

