

**MOBILE HISTORIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION  
CITY OF MOBILE  
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD  
Minutes of the Meeting  
August 11, 2003**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Cindy Klotz called the Architectural Review Board Meeting to order at 3:03 p.m.

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

Present: Bunky Ralph, Cindy Klotz, Nick Holmes, III, Karen Carr, Bill Christian, Robert Brown,  
Alternates David Barr and Harris Oswalt

Absent:, Dan McCleave, Douglas Kearley, Dennis Carlisle, and Jackie McCracken

A quorum was declared after the roll was called.

In Attendance	Address	Item Number
Clifton Sons	200 Marine Street	1
Tom Stout	215 South Warren Street	4
JoBeth Murphree	203 South Dearborn Street	2
Alex Jones	214 South Cedar Street	4
Alver Carlson	1653 Dauphin Street	5

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:** July 28, 2003 Meeting

Bunky Ralph moved to approve the minutes as mailed. Bill Christian seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

**APPROVAL OF THE MID-MONTH CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS:**

Bunky Ralph moved to approve the mid-month certificates as mailed. Karen Carr seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

**MID MONTH APPROVALS**

1. Applicant's Name: Wanda Cochran  
Property Address: 255 North Conception Street  
Date of Approval: 7/11/03 weh  
Work Approved: Repair existing wood windows. Repaint all windows and trim to match existing.
  
2. Applicant's Name: Ann Luce et al  
Property Address: 202 Government Street  
Date of Approval: 7/11/03 weh  
Work Approved: Replace all broken glass in windows on both levels, remove all shutters and nails. Replace window sills where necessary. Rework all plywood where necessary, cut to fit inside openings.
  
3. Applicant's Name: Jason Robinson  
Property Address: 1365 Government Street  
Date of Approval: 7/14/03 weh  
Work Approved: Erect temporary banner at the above address. Banner may be displayed for 30 days from date of installation.

4. Applicant's Name: Anna Habeeb  
Property Address: 1752 Government Street  
Date of Approval: 7/15/03 jss  
Work Approved: Reroof garage with 20 year shingles, same as existing color. Replace any rotten decking and fascia board. Replace any rotten exterior wood to match existing in dimension and profile.
  
5. Applicant's Name: Taco Bell  
Property Address: 1115 Government Street  
Date of Approval: 7/15/03 weh  
Work Approved: Alter soffit & fascia design to eliminate built-in guttering. Repair damaged stucco with materials matching existing in profile and dimension.
  
6. Applicant's Name: Glenda Dixon  
Property Address: 73 South Ann Street  
Date of Approval: 7/10/03 weh  
Work Approved: Repaint west, north & south side of residence to match existing. Install metal roof on first floor front porch to match the material on the rear porch.
  
7. Applicant's Name: John Moore  
Property Address: 1050 Dauphin Street  
Date of Approval: 7/15/03 weh  
Work Approved: Install existing sign on new metal pole as per submitted design.
  
8. Applicant's Name: Jerry Graham  
Property Address: 907 Dauphin Street  
Date of Approval: 7/16/03 weh  
Work Approved: Re-roof section on west side of structure. Materials to match existing in color, profile and dimension.
  
9. Applicant's Name: Ben Cummings  
Property Address: 1011 Augusta Street  
Date of Approval: 7/16/03 asc  
Work Approved: Repair exterior dormers using new wood to match existing; install new wood windows to match existing; paint new materials to match house paint scheme.
  
10. Applicant's Name: Charles Bowen  
Property Address: 1414 Brown Street  
Date of Approval: 7/17/03 weh  
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood on front porch with new matching existing in profile and dimension. Repaint to match existing color scheme.
  
11. Applicant's Name: Larry Posner  
Property Address: 165 St. Emanuel Street  
Date of Approval: 7/17/03 jss  
Work Approved: Secure porch columns. Board open windows and paint. Repair chain link gate. Repair broken windows in dependency.

12. Applicant's Name: MDM LLC  
Property Address: 126 Government Street  
Date of Approval: 7/17/03 jss  
Work Approved: Repair openings and repoint as necessary on east elevation where damaged. Use brick to match.
13. Applicant's Name: Larry Posner  
Property Address: 113 Monroe Street  
Date of Approval: 7/17/03 jss  
Work Approved: Repair balcony roof. Patch roof and board up windows. Paint boards in windows.
14. Applicant's Name: Jeb Schrenk  
Property Address: 157 Houston Street  
Date of Approval: 7/17/03 weh  
Work Approved: Replace existing deteriorated wood privacy fence with new wood privacy fence matching original.
15. Applicant's Name: Alan Gustin  
Property Address: 259 North Jackson Street  
Date of Approval: 7/18/03 weh  
Work Approved: Re-roof with modified bitumen roof. Repoint brick as necessary. Secure all first floor window and door openings.
16. Applicant's Name: Jackie Carr  
Property Address: 10 Common Street  
Date of Approval: 7/18/03 weh  
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood on porches, windows and siding to match existing in profile and dimension. Paint house in existing color scheme, white.
17. Applicant's Name: Marjorie Bell  
Property Address: 1315 Springhill Avenue  
Date of Approval: 7/18/03 jss  
Work Approved: Repairs to roof to match existing in profile and dimension.
18. Applicant's Name: Roberta Fulton  
Property Address: 1255 Texas Street  
Date of Approval: 7/18/03 weh  
Work Approved: Complete back yard fencing as per submitted site plan. Install 6' wood dog eared privacy fence along north property line. Install wood gates, finished good side facing public view, on northeast and northwest corners of residence.
19. Applicant's Name: Martha Searcy  
Property Address: 1059 Augusta Street  
Date of Approval: 7/18/03 weh  
Work Approved: Face steps with split brick. Install brick pavers on concrete sidewalk.

20. Applicant's Name: Clifton Sons  
Property Address: 200 Marine Street  
Date of Approval: 7/18/03 weh  
Work Approved: Re-roof house to match existing 3 tab shingles. Replace rotten wood with new wood matching existing in profile and dimension.
21. Applicant's Name: Doright Construction  
Property Address: 114 St. Emanuel Street  
Date of Approval: 7/21/03 asc  
Work Approved: Repaint windows and cornice as necessary. Replace rotten wood as necessary with new matching existing in profile and dimension.
22. Applicant's Name: Reynolds Roofing Company  
Property Address: 300 Dauphin Street  
Date of Approval: 7/21/03 asc  
Work Approved: Repair painted metal cornice to match existing in profile and dimension. Paint to match existing.
23. Applicant's Name: Devereaux Bemis  
Property Address: 167 State Street  
Date of Approval: 7/22/03 asc  
Work Approved: Repair roof matching existing flat torched down roof. Paint doors and doorways  
Valspar Mahogany or equivalent.
24. Applicant's Name: M & B Incorporated  
Property Address: 102 Bradford Avenue  
Date of Approval: 7/22/03 asc  
Work Approved: Repair or replace burned wood as necessary to match existing in profile and dimension. Paint to match existing.
25. Applicant's Name: Jenny Jurjevich  
Property Address: 17 N. Julia  
Date of Approval: 7/22/03 asc  
Work Approved: Repaint house in the following color scheme:  
Body: Benjamin Moore, Butter (yellow)  
Trim: DeTonti Square Off-White  
Accent: Bellingrath Green
26. Applicant's Name: Dean Holley, Owner, Liberty Roofing Co., Contractor  
Property Address: 21 Macy Place  
Date of Approval: 7/23/03 weh  
Work Approved: Re-roof with GAF slate blend 3 tab shingles.

**New Business:**

1. 077-02/03-CA 200 Marine Street  
Applicant: Clifton Sons  
Nature of Project: Enclosed existing recessed side porch as per submitted plans.

APPROVED as submitted. Certified Record Attached

2. 078-02/03-CA 203 South Dearborn Street  
Applicant: JoBeth Murphree  
Nature of Project: Construct side addition as per submitted plans.

APPROVED as submitted. Certified Record Attached

3. 079-02/03-CA 215 South Warren Street  
Applicant: Tom Stout  
Nature of Project: Retain existing 8' high painted concrete block wall. Construct new 8' high wall with brick cap to support pool enclosure as per submitted plans.

DENIED as submitted. Certified Record Attached

4. 080-02/03-CA 750 Government Street  
Applicant: Don Puig/Popeye's Restaurant  
Nature of Project: Remove existing deteriorated wood-framed windows and replace with bronze anodized aluminum storefront windows as per submitted drawing.

APPROVED as submitted. Certified Record Attached

5. 081-02/03-CA 1651 Dauphin Street  
Applicant: Carl Thomas  
Nature of Project: Enclose rear porch as per submitted plans.

APPROVED as submitted. Certified Record Attached.

**Other Business and Announcements:**

The Board was reminded that Friday, August 15 was the date for the C.A.M.P. conference.

Staff announced that Review Board Member Buffy Donlon resigned from the Board. David Thomas, Sr. and Harris Oswalt have been submitted to Councilman Clinton Johnson for consideration to fill this vacancy.

There being no other business before the Review Board, Bunky Ralph moved to adjourn the meeting. Harris Oswalt seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote. The meeting adjourned at 4:12 p.m.

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
CERTIFIED RECORD**

077-02/03 – CA                      200 Marine Street  
**Applicant:**                              Clifton Sons  
**Received:**                                7/25/03                                      **Meeting Date (s):**  
**Submission Date + 45 Days:**    9/08/03 1                                ) 8/11/03                                2)    3)

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:**                      Oakleigh Garden Historic District  
**Classification:**                        Contributing  
**Zoning:**                                    R-1, Single Family Residential  
**Additional Permits Required:** (1) Building,  
**Nature of Project:**                    Enclose existing inset porch as per submitted drawings. Existing porch measures 7’ deep by 16’ long. Existing wood window to be relocated to the new exterior wall; new wood diamond-shaped window to be installed in the new exterior wall as shown on plan. Existing shingle siding to be removed and reinstalled on new exterior wall, feathered in to match existing.

**Additional Information:**  
The applicants were granted a Certificate of Appropriateness on 7/18/03 for minor exterior repairs to the structure, including re-roofing the house to match existing 3 tab shingles and replacing rotten wood with new wood matching existing in profile and dimension.  
Acting on a complaint that work was being done exceeded the scope of the permit, Urban Development issued a Stop Work Order.

**Current Condition:**                    The inset porch located on the north side of the asbestos shingle-covered house has for some time been screened. The screening was attached to 2x4 framing, painted white. After 7/18/03 this system was removed, the porch cornice was leveled, and 2x6 framing was installed. The SWO was issued at this point. Attached photographs depict the current condition as of 7/25/03.

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

<b><u>Sections</u></b>	<b><u>Topic</u></b>	<b><u>Description of Work</u></b>
3	Porches and Canopies	Infill recessed side porch

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “ The Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed change:... Will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the historic district...”

**STAFF REPORT**

A. The Guidelines state that “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 existing porch has no architectural features. A simple cornice spans the inset area. No columns, porch railing or details exist.
  2. The previous infill at the exterior wall was 2x4 framing with insect screen.
  3. The proposed infill is recycled exterior sheathing, reused window sash, and new wood window sash.
  4. The proposed infill will be highly visible from public view.
- B. Exterior Materials: The Guidelines state that “Replacement...must match the original in profile, dimension and material.”
1. The existing exterior sheathing is painted asbestos shingle.
  2. The existing painted asbestos shingle will be removed and relocated to the new exterior wall, feathered in to match existing.
- C. The Guidelines state that “Original window openings should be retained as well as original window sashes and glazing.”
1. Proposed plans call for the existing wood window to be removed and reused in the new façade.
  2. A new wood diamond-shaped window is proposed for the new exterior wall, located to the right of the relocated wood window.

Staff recommends approval as submitted.

#### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Support: Mr. Clifton Sons, applicant, appeared before the Review Board to answer questions. There was no one else present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board had no further questions of Mr. Sons regarding his application.

#### **FINDINGS OF FACT**

Bunky Ralph moved to find Staff Comments A, B, and C acceptable as Findings of Fact. Karen Carr seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

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

Karen Carr moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. Bill Christian seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 8/11/04





## 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...”

### 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	General	
3	Piers, Foundations and Foundation Infill	Construct addition
3	Exterior Materials and Finishes	
3	Doors and Doorways	
3	Windows	
3	Porches and Canopies	
3	Roof	
3	Accessory Structures	Construct Pergola

## STAFF REPORT

### General

- A. The Guidelines state that “The standards listed and shown... illustrate elements that contribute to the architectural character of the buildings in Mobile’s historic districts. These define the architectural style of the buildings and establish a repetition of forms and details which create harmony and character of the historic districts.
  - 1. The form of the proposed addition replicates the massing of a traditional L-shaped Victorian cottage.
  - 2. This plan is typically characterized by 2-3 rooms long, adjoining 2-3 rooms across the rear.
  - 3. Typically, the rear portion of the “ell” has a simple façade with windows in the same plane.
  - 4. The proposed design is for a 2’-6” x 7’-0” bump-out with false windows topped by a transom.
  - 5. This design element is not compatible, in terms of proportions and window openings, with any other design element found on this historic structure.

### Work Item 1 –Side Addition

- A. Piers, Foundations and Foundation Infill: The Guidelines state that “foundation screening should be recessed from the front of the foundation piers.”
  - 1. The existing foundation is brick pier with lattice infill.
  - 2. The proposed addition is brick pier with framed lattice infill, matching existing.
- B. Exterior Materials: The Guidelines state that “ Replacement... must match the original in profile and dimension and material.”
  - 1. The existing exterior sheathing is wood lap siding.
  - 2. The proposed exterior sheathing for the addition is wood lap siding.
- C. The Guidelines state that “ Original doors and door openings should be retained along with any mouldings, sidelights and transoms.”
  - 1. Proposed plans call for the existing rear door to re-hung to swing out.
  - 2. Proposed plans call for the installation of a pair of new wood French doors on the east elevation.

- D. The Guidelines state that “Original window openings should be retained as well as original window sashes and glazing.”
1. Proposed plans call for the side window, where the addition is to be constructed, to be removed and reused in the front portion of the side hall.
- E. The Guidelines state that “The size and placement of new windows for additions or alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.”
1. Windows in the historic residence are wood 4-over-4 double hung.
  2. Windows in the main area of the addition are proposed to match the existing in profile, light configuration, and dimension.
  3. Windows in the bath area/extension of the front elevation are blind windows covered with fixed louvered blinds and transom above.
  4. Windows in the bath area/extension of the front elevation, side elevations are 1’-8” wide x 5’ high wood, double hung with transom above.
- F. The Guidelines state that “...historic roof forms, as well as the original pitch of the roof, should be maintained.”
1. The existing roof form is as follows:  
Front – end gable over entry connecting to main hipped roof  
Rear – end gable
  2. Proposed roof form for the addition is end gable for the side addition.
  3. The existing roof pitch is 8 and 12.
  4. The roof pitch for the side addition is 8 and 12.

### **Work Item 2 – Sunroom Enlargement**

- A. Exterior Materials: The Guidelines state that “ Replacement...must match the original in profile and dimension and material.”
1. The existing sunroom occupies the space of the original back porch.
  2. The sunroom is comprised of chamfered porch columns, partial solid balustrade of wood siding, partial balustrade, and fixed wood louvered blinds. Insulated glazing in wood frames encloses the space.
  3. Proposed plans call for the reuse of existing porch columns, infilled with a two-part system of framed insulated glass in two sections, and reused fixed wood louvered blinds at the top.
- B. The Guidelines state that “...historic roof forms, as well as the original pitch of the roof, should be maintained.”
1. The existing roof form at the rear is an end gable.
  2. The proposed roof for the sunroom is a hipped roof.
  3. A shallow-pitched area of flat roof will be created by the additions but will not be visible from the street.

### **Work Item 3 – Pergola and Deck**

- A. The Guidelines state that “The appropriateness of accessory structures shall be measured by the guidelines applicable to new construction. The structure should compliment the design and scale of the main building.”
1. The existing rear porch columns are 6x6 wood chamfered posts.
  2. The proposed pergola supports are 6x6 wood chamfered posts.
  3. Proposed pergola infill is framed lattice panels 6’ in height, constructed on a new wood deck.
  4. Existing wood steps are wood stringers with wood treads.
  5. Proposed new steps are wood stringers with wood treads.
  6. Existing porch balustrade design is square pickets with 2x4 top and bottom rails, and chamfered 2x4 cap.

7. Proposed new wood balustrade matches the existing design.

Staff recommends approval with the following conditions :

That the main elevation of the side addition be flush with a single 4-over-4 wood double hung window as originally proposed. Staff Report –General A, 1-5, validates this condition.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Support: Ms. JoBeth Murphree, applicant, appeared before the Review Board to answer questions. There was no one present in opposition to the application.

Ms. Murphree explained to the Board that the reason for the extension of the front was to allow more room in the bath area.

Ms. Murphree also inquired about alternative decking materials such as brick or stone. Chair Cindy Klotz noted that staff would be able to accept and approve revisions given the appropriateness of the material.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board compared the drawings submitted and approved in 2001 to the current submission.

### **FINDINGS OF FACT**

Under Staff Report, General, A, Nick Holmes, III noted that there was a bump-out with a small window on the left side, a similar element to the proposed addition element. He further noted that the gable echoed the existing gable over the entry.

Holmes stated that the Guidelines do not require proposed design elements for additions to be present on existing historic structures.

Nick Holmes, III moved to find Staff Comments A, General, 1-4 as Findings of Fact, and to exclude Item 5. Bill Christian seconded this motion, which was approved by a 7-1 vote. Bunky Ralph voted against the motion.

Karen Carr moved to find Staff Comments, Work Items 1-3, acceptable as Findings of Fact. Robert Brown seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

### **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Bill Christian moved to issue of Certificate of Appropriateness. David Barr seconded the motion, which was approved by a 7-1 vote. Bunky Ralph voted against the motion.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 8/11/04

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
CERTIFIED RECORD**

079-02/03 – CA            215 South Warren Street  
Applicant:            Tom Stout  
Received:            7/25/03                            Meeting Date (s):  
Submission Date + 45 Days:    9/08/03                            1) 8/11/03            2)                            3)

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District:       Church Street East Historic District  
Classification:       Contributing  
Zoning:                R-1, Single Family Residential  
Additional Permits Required: (1) Building,  
Nature of Project:    Retain existing 8’-4” painted concrete block wall, and stucco inside of wall.  
Continue wall at line of existing driveway to enclose rear yard.

**Additional Information:**

The applicant was issued a Notice of Violation after the Action Center received a complaint about the wall being constructed without a Certificate of Appropriateness or a building permit. Urban Development issued a Notice of Violation, citing that the owners did not receive a Certificate of Appropriateness or a Building Permit prior to the wall’s construction.

The owner has stated to staff that he intends to install a pool and pool enclosure behind the existing and proposed concrete block wall. However, this is not part of the application before the Board.

As part of the application, the applicant cited 15 examples of concrete block walls within a 1 block radius of his residence. As a point of clarification, 507 and 509 Monroe Street are part of the same property; 601 Cedar Street is not in the district. Therefore, only 14 examples were considered for staff review.

Of these examples, 8 are new construction either in the new section of Church Street East or on the perimeter of the historic section as infill construction.

**Historic Structures:**

- 211 South Cedar Street: Existing 6’ high stucco-covered concrete block wall was not approved by the ARB
- 164 South Cedar Street: 6’ stucco-covered masonry wall approved in 1994
- 554 Eslava Street: 6’ wood privacy fence approved in 1988 – no CoA for masonry wall
- 556 Eslava Street: 7’ masonry-covered stucco wall approved 1999 (approval followed construction with condition that it be stuccoed – current condition is painted block with vegetation)
- 156 South Lawrence Street: 4’ metal fence approved; no CoA in file for masonry fence
- 501 Church Street: no CoA in file for concrete block wall.

**New Construction:**

- 255 South Cedar Street: new construction – unapproved 8’ unstuccoed masonry wall forfeited earnest money paid to the Mobile Housing Board – constructed along rear property line adjoining interior alley

- 257 South Cedar Street: new construction – unapproved 8’ unstuccoed masonry wall forfeited earnest money paid to the Mobile Housing Board – constructed along rear property line adjoining interior alley
- 511 Eslava Street: 6’ brick and masonry-covered stucco wall approved as part of new construction in 1995
- 509 Eslava Street: stucco-covered block wall approved as part of garage addition
- 601 Eslava Street: 8’ stucco-covered wall approved as part of new construction
- 204 South Lawrence Street: 8’ stucco-covered block wall approved as part of pool enclosure – applicant did not stucco rear side of wall – current condition of side facing neighbors is bare concrete block
- 507-509 Monroe Street: masonry veneer wall constructed as part of new construction (ca. 1980s)

A letter from the neighbor, Marjorie Allen Jones, directly to the east at 214 South Cedar Street is included as Exhibit B. This letter opposes the wall because of the height and inappropriate finish.

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

<b><u>Sections</u></b>	<b><u>Topic</u></b>	<b><u>Description of Work</u></b>
3	Fences, Walls and Gates	Retain existing concrete block wall and continue construction to enclose yard

**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 fences should “...compliment the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered with their relationship to the historic district.”
  - 1. The subject property is a 1 story wood frame Victorian residence with wood lap siding.
  - 2. The properties adjacent to the subject property are also one story wood frame residences.
  
- B. The Guidelines state that “The height of solid fences in historic districts is generally restricted to six feet; however, if a commercial property or multi-family housing adjoins the subject property, an eight foot fence may be considered.”
  - 1. The proposed fencing is an 8’ – 4.
  - 2. No other wall in the district is 8’-4”
  - 3. Of masonry walls cited by the applicant, only two were reviewed and approved by the ARB:

164 South Cedar Street: 6' stucco-covered masonry wall approved in 1994  
556 Eslava Street: 7' masonry-covered stucco wall approved 1999 (approval followed construction with condition that it be stuccoed – current condition is painted block with vegetation)

- C The Guidelines state that “The finished side of the fence should face toward public view”.
1. The wall is unfinished painted concrete block.
  2. Unstuccoed concrete block is listed as an inappropriate material.

Staff recommends that the wall be approved with the following conditions:  
The wall be lowered to 6' in height, capped, and stuccoed on both sides.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Support: Mr. Tom Stout, applicant, appeared before the Review Board to answer questions. Alex Jones, of 214 South Cedar Street, was present to speak in opposition to the application.

Mr. Stout noted that he attached his wall to an existing 8' wall located at 556 Eslava Street. Stout also asked that he be treated as others in his neighborhood had been in the past with regard to not having to finish both sides of the wall.

Mr. Jones stated that originally the wall was to be constructed of brick at a height of 6'. Jones also stated that the neighbors to the north have constructed an 8' wood privacy fence to conceal the unfinished concrete block wall.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board noted that the walls referenced in the application were either not approved or not constructed as approved. Furthermore, the Board explained that they are a decision-making body, not an enforcement body therefore complaints regarding the existing unapproved walls should be directed through the City's Action Center.

Nick Holmes, III noted that the Board may wish to consider this wall as part of a pool enclosure, or structure, as opposed to an 8' wall. He recommended either holding over for further information or withdrawing and resubmitting with additional information, including a site plan, design for the pool enclosure, and proposals for the treatment of both sides of the wall.

The Board noted that where the proposed pool enclosure did not intersect with the 8' wall, that area would be considered not part of the structural system and therefore should be lowered to 6' in height to meet the Guidelines.

### **FINDINGS OF FACT**

Bunky Ralph moved to accept Staff Comments A, 1-2 as Findings of Fact. Nick Holmes, III seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Bunky Ralph moved to accept Staff Comments B, 1-3 as Findings of Fact as amended. Staff Comment 2, was amended to read that no other wall in the district had been approved a height of 8'-4". And, also Staff Comment 3 should reflect that the wall at 556 Eslava Street was not altered as per the ARB requirements.

A fourth fact was added. This fact was that an 8' wall was approved as part of a pool enclosure at 204 South Lawrence, a non-contributing structure within the district.

Karen Carr moved to accept Staff Comments C, 1-2, as Findings of Fact. David Barr seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

## **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Nick Holmes, III moved to Deny the application as submitted. Bill Christian seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

The applicant was encouraged to resubmit his proposal for a pool enclosure with the existing wall as part of that structural system.





**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

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

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

Chair Cindy Klotz asked staff if there were any conditions imposed on the construction of this building in the historic district. Staff was unaware of any such conditions.

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

Nick Holmes, III moved to accept Staff Comments A, 1-4, as Findings of Fact. Bunky Ralph seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Bunky Ralph moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. Nick Holmes, III seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 8/11/04



3. The proposed infill is designed using the proportions and heights of traditional porch elements. The fixed glazing 32” high replicates the proportion of porch railing, and the transom above the entry door replicates the effect of a spindle frieze.
4. The porch is located on the interior of the lot and will be minimally visible from public view.

Staff recommends approval as submitted.

#### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

No one appeared before the Board to represent this Application.  
Alver Carlson, of 1653 Dauphin Street, was present to observe the Review Board Process.  
There was no one present in opposition to the application.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board had no further questions regarding the application.

#### **FINDINGS OF FACT**

Karen Carr moved to accept Staff Comments A, 1-4, as Findings of Fact. Bill Christian seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

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

Bunky Ralph moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. Bill Christian seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 8/11/02