

**CITY OF MOBILE**  
**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD**  
Minutes of the Meeting  
September 11, 2006

**CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m. by Chair, Bunky Ralph.

Devereaux Bemis, MHDC Director, called the roll as follows:

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

**Members Absent:** Robert Brown, Michael Mayberry, Joe Sackett.

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

<u>In Attendance</u>	<u>Mailing Address</u>	<u>Item Number</u>
Andrea & Suzanne Gherzi	152 Charles Street	090-05/06-CA
Hiep Bui	61 S. Ann Street	095-05/06-CA
Eddie Cornell	1751 Old Shell Road	088-05/06-CA
David Moore	506 Eslava Street	092-05/06-CA
Arthur Smith	1751 Old Shell Rd.	088-05/06-CA
John Dendy	501 Government St.	089-05/06-CA
Tuan Titlestaad	155 Marine Street	087-05/06-CA
Ben Cummings	114 Providence St.	091-05/06-CA

Harris Oswalt moved to approve the minutes of the last meeting as emailed with the following change: the Certified Record of 1659 Government Street should reflect that the first two motions were defeated. 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 Certificates of Appropriateness:**

- Applicant's Name:** Golden Gate Properties/Tuan Titlestaad  
**Property Address:** 155 Marine Street  
**Date of Approval:** August 14, 2006

Remove unfinished rear addition approved and begun in 2000. The original house is not to be disturbed.

- Applicant's Name:** Hilton Construction  
**Property Address:** 1551 Eslava Street  
**Date of Approval:** August 15, 2006

Repair to rear porch deck—replace with 1 x 4 tongue and groove decking and paint new materials to match existing color scheme;  
Repair roof over front porch to match existing.

3. **Applicant's Name:** M.R. Kopf Contracting  
**Property Address:** 225 Dauphin Street  
**Date of Approval:** August 15, 2006

Perform exterior work to include: repaint exterior to match existing color scheme; replace balcony decking to match existing; repair roof as necessary to match existing.

4. **Applicant's Name:** Rhonda W. Smith  
**Property Address:** 361 Regina Avenue  
**Date of Approval:** August 16, 2006

Repair windows to match existing: replace glass as necessary; repair sashes and wood casing as necessary. Storm shutters to be added on interior.

5. **Applicant's Name:** Walker Brothers  
**Property Address:** 550-56 Dauphin Street  
**Date of Approval:** August 17, 2006

Repaint building in existing color scheme.

6. **Applicant's Name:** Walker Brothers  
**Property Address:** 661 Dauphin Street  
**Date of Approval:** August 17, 2006

Repaint building in existing color scheme.

7. **Applicant's Name:** Coulson Roofing  
**Property Address:** 1359 Dauphin Street  
**Date of Approval:** August 17, 2006

Install new architectural shingle roof, charcoal in color.

8. **Applicant's Name:** Briley Shirah  
**Property Address:** 915 Palmetto Street  
**Date of Approval:** August 18 2006

Construct smooth stucco fence to match stucco finish on house. Fence is to be 6ft tall with brick cap and brick piers. To run along the north property line from the front corner of the house to the back corner of the house. Set back from the street is to be determined by the owner in consultation with the Urban Development Department.

9. **Applicant's Name:** Ken Palmertree  
**Property Address:** 1111 Old Shell Road  
**Date of Approval:** August 22, 2006

Remove infill from original front porch area for investigative purposes. Applicant to return with column and rail design.

10. **Applicant's Name:** Diana Allen  
**Property Address:** 310 Regina Avenue  
**Date of Approval:** August 24, 2006

Paint building in the following color scheme: (unpainted brick to remain unpainted)

body-tan or taupe; accent: darkest green; eaves-off-white or taupe. Install 4 new aluminum windows on front of building to replace existing aluminum windows.

11. **Applicant's Name:** Henry Callaway  
**Property Address:** 205 S. Georgia Avenue  
**Date of Approval:** August 24, 2006

Install wood shutters as per submitted plans.

12. **Applicant's Name:** Joe Pierce  
**Property Address:** 121 N. Lafayette Street  
**Date of Approval:** August 25, 2006

Repaint house white.

13. **Applicant's Name:** Michael Smith  
**Property Address:** 1000 Dauphin Street  
**Date of Approval:** August 25, 2006

Repair rotten wood as necked to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Paint repair and peeling areas to match the existing paint scheme.

14. **Applicant's Name:** Ray Lamb  
**Property Address:** 1551 Monterey Place  
**Date of Approval:** August 25, 2006

Repaint house in the following Sherwin-Williams color scheme:  
Body-Bird's Eye Maple;  
Trim-Weathered Shingle;  
Accent:-Roycroft Vellum and Polished Mahogany.

15. **Applicant's Name:** Damon Lett Roofing Company  
**Property Address:** 10 Oakland Terrace  
**Date of Approval:** August 28, 2006

Install new 20 year GAF 3 tab shingles, slate in color.

16. **Applicant's Name:** Jo Beth Murphree and Marie Dyson  
**Property Address:** 103 S. Dearborn Street  
**Date of Approval:** August 28, 2006

Widen sidewalk and drive2way as per submitted plans. Remove asphalt and install aggregate.

17. **Applicant's Name:** Ranita Smith  
**Property Address:** 910 Charleston Street  
**Date of Approval:** August 28, 2006

Install new roof shingles to match existing profile and color.

**Old Business:**

1.     **087-05/06-CA**                   155 Marine Street  
Applicant:                   Tuan Titlestaad/Douglas Kearley, architect  
Nature of Application:       Renovate existing building per the submitted plans.  
Recent rear addition to be rebuilt to match existing;  
install new section of privacy fence and repair existing  
portions of fencing.  
  
  **APPROVED.** Certified Record attached.
  
2.     **089-05/06-CA**                   308 St. Louis Street  
Applicant:                   Renaissance Development Company, LLC/ John Dendy, architect  
Nature of Request:          Development of Mobile Fixture warehouse building into 21 residential  
condominiums with indoor parking garage.  
  
  **APPROVED.** Certified Record attached.

**New Business:**

1.     **088-05/06-CA**                   1751-1759 Old Shell Road  
Applicant:                   Cornell Family Properties  
Nature of Request:          Request to install parking behind 1757 and 1759 Old Shell Road  
  
  **APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.** Certified Record attached.
  
2.     **090-05/06-CA**                   152 Charles Street  
Applicant:                   Andrea and Suzanne Ghersi  
Nature of Request:          Request to install 7 ft. stuccoed masonry fence on south property line.  
  
  **APPROVED AS AMENDED.** Certified Record attached.
  
3.     **091-05/06-CA**                   114 Providence Street  
Applicant:                   Archdiocese of Mobile/Ben Cummings, architect  
Nature of Request:          Construct wood handicap ramp on north side of house at rear.  
  
  **APPROVED.** Certified Record attached.
  
4.     **092-05/06-CA**                   506 Eslava Street  
Applicant:                   David M. Moore  
Nature of Request:          Construct 38 ft. bedroom addition with adjoining covered deck.  
  
  **APPROVED AS AMENDED.** Certified Record attached.
  
5.     **093-05/06-CA**                   307 West Street  
Applicant:                   Kim and Chris Husting  
Nature of Request:          Remove elevator shaft at rear and square off area for downstairs utility  
room and upstairs bathroom.  
  
  **APPROVED.** Certified Record attached.
  
6.     **094-05/06-CA**                   110 Ryan Avenue  
Applicant:                   Norman and Victoria Wood  
Nature of Request:          Construct wood frame garage and asphalt or concrete drive.



**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
CERTIFIED RECORD**

**087-05/06 – CA**            155 Marine Street  
**Applicant:**            Tuan Titlestaad/Douglas Kearley, architect  
**Received:**            8/14/06                            **Meeting Date (s):**  
**Submission Date + 45 Days:**    9/28/06                            1) 8/28/06    2)    9/11/06 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. Cameron Pfeiffer, David Tharp, Bunky Ralph and Jim Wagoner disclosed that they had received emails about the project.  
**Nature of the Project:** Renovate existing building per the submitted plans. Recent rear addition to be rebuilt to match existing; install new section of privacy fence and repair existing portions of fencing.

**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 Guideline*.

1. The one story frame residential structure dates from 1892.
2. Only a few turned posts remain on the front porch and the railing is missing.
3. Dormer to be installed on south side and a skylight to be installed on the north slope of the roof.
4. Chain link fence to be removed and a wood privacy fence to be installed on north side.
5. Existing wood fencing to be repaired.
6. New Victorian details to be added per existing photographs.
7. Porch to be added on rear elevation.
8. Paint colors to be submitted at a later date.

The architect has submitted a written letter of clarification for those items in the application that were questioned by the Board. A copy of his comments are included:  
Dear Ann and fellow ARB board members

I hope this email will serve to clarify the questions raised by the Board at the last ARB meeting concerning the above property. I have not received a copy of the minutes, nor was I able to find them on the web site, so here goes:

1. Dormer on the East elevation, North side was supposed to be erased after we decided to substitute skylights. I was in a hurry and forgot to do it. I will bring white out to the meeting.
2. There is a variety of windows currently on the job- 6 over 6, 2 over 2, etc. The building seems to date from several different periods and the decision was made to leave the window to reflect the buildings history, rather than make them all the same and create a "false history"
3. When preparing drawings of existing structure, I like to hatch or draw in new materials and leave existing material blank. An example would be that clapboards are drawn as horizontal lines on an addition, but an existing wall would not have the horizontal lines. I believe that is the case here. If the reproductions in the members packet had been copied at a slightly larger scale, I believe the notes to this effect would have been evident!!!!!! (Hint, hint)

Please let me know if this is not sufficient.

Douglas B. Kearley, AIA, NCARB

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

#### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Tuan Titlestaad was present to discuss the application. He explained that there will be one dormer, incorporated in the project. The dormer is drawn to scale and the window in the dormer will be approximately 5' x 5'. There will also be one skylight, which will not be visible. However, after some discussion, the owner agreed to make it low profiled. The same building footprint will be maintained but the rear addition will be taken down and rebuilt to code.

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**

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 Harris Oswalt and unanimously approved.

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

Tilmon Brown 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 approved with Cameron Pfeiffer voting in opposition believing the dormer to be over scaled.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 09/11/07.**

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
CERTIFIED RECORD**

**089-05/06 – CA**            308 St. Louis Street  
**Applicant:**                Renaissance Development Company, LLC/ John Dendy & Associates, Architects  
**Received:**                 8/10/06                                **Meeting Date (s):**  
**Submission Date + 45 Days:**    9/24/06                                1) 8/28/06        2) 9/11/06        3)

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:**        DeTonti Square Historic District  
**Classification:**        Noncontributing  
**Zoning:**                    B-4  
**Nature of the Project:** Renovate buildings on the block into 21 residential condominiums. Also create indoor parking. Only a single lot is in the historic district, but following precedent set by other projects, the entire project will be reviewed by the ARB.

**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*. This project respects the individual character of each building unit and concentrates on revealing their matter of fact industrial features.

This is the second hearing for this project. Board members had difficulty reading the drawings and objected to dimensions not being indicated on the drawings. The Board requested separate demolition drawings and elevations. There were also concerns about the windows and doors and how they would be treated. A design for the fence was requested. Staff gave the applicant a mid-month approval for roof work.

1. Six separate buildings on the block will be combined in this project.
2. The existing massing of all buildings will be retained.
3. Many sealed window and door openings on all elevations will be reinstated as part of the project.
4. Bldg A, the former Mobile fixture building, will retain its window openings on the second floor on both the north and west elevations.
5. Bldg A will retain 3 bay first floor openings with the upper panel demolished and new glass and door infill .
6. Bldg A openings will be reinstated on the west elevation and new windows will be installed with awnings placed over the windows.
7. A garage door will be installed on the west elevation.



- 8. New roof with new cap and flashing to be installed on all buildings as well as gutters and downspouts.
- 9. All masonry walls to be repaired to match existing.
- 10. All existing windows to be repaired and reglazed.
- 11. Install iron fence on east elevation.

**NEW INFORMATION**

- 13. Windows will be single hung, double sash, General Aluminum, Series 1900.
- 14. There will be two sizes of transoms, also General Aluminum.
- 15. Windows will be double glazed with internal mullions in a bronze finish.
- 16. The new storefront will be bronze anodized aluminum.
- 17. Fencing will surround the court yard area adjacent to Jackson Street per the site plan provided.
- 18. Fencing will be prefinished aluminum 48 inches high.
- 19. Fence will be white in color.
- 20. Enclosed windows will be opened per sheets A-2.1 and X-2.1
- 21. Panels above and below the new windows to be EIFS in a smooth sand finish, Amber Leaf in color.
- 22. EIFS was chosen to allow movement in the wall and are not structural.
- 23. Various areas of concrete block will be covered in EIFS (units 109-113 and 116 & 117).
- 24. New garage door by Cookson Roll Up Doors to match the existing doors and painted to match wall.
- 25. Awnings to be used according to the submitted plan.
- 26. Colors are as follows:

Walls	Behr color “Amber Leaf”
Garage door	Same
Doors & Trim	Behr “Autumn Hills”
Awning	Sunbrella “Gaston Jewell” Stripe
Fence	White

**Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.**

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Architect John Dendy was present to discuss the application. He explained that the rezoning had passed so that the entire property was zoned B-4. New skylights will be added but they will not be visible behind the parapet wall. Existing windows remain behind sealed openings. They are single hung double sash aluminum with a bronze finish. EFIS will be used on the north side where there are two brick sections with concrete block between. EFIS will only be used on the concrete block section and will have the effect of smooth plaster. Parking will be off Claiborne and the existing entrance will be pushed back slightly in order to allow cars to pull off the street. The proposed roll up door will be slatted metal and painted to match the wall color.

Board members questioned Staff on the use of EIFS in the historic districts. Staff explained that it has been used occasionally in the districts. For example, in certain instances, it has been approved for cornice treatments. It was noted that the portion of the building to receive the EIFS is not the portion located in the DeTonti Square District and that it would not be used structurally except around the infilled windows. 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 Cameron Pfeiffer and unanimously approved.

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

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

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 09/11/07.**



The Board can consider only the request and not the use of the property. Currently application has been made to the Planning Commission for resubdivision and rezoning, but it has not been scheduled. If the ARB approves the present request, it must be contingent upon review by the Planning Commission. However, at this stage it appears the application is not complete: pictures of buildings to be demolished; materials; landscaping; fencing and lighting. Staff is attempting to get these materials in time for the meeting. If the information can not be obtained, staff recommends denial due to lack of information and that the applicant resubmits with a complete package. Staff also recommends the Board consider internal landscaping in the back parking lot, and that the fence be constructed with the finished side to the neighbors and have a cap.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Arthur Smith, Eddie Cornell and a representative from the Frank Dagley firm were present to discuss the application. Mr. Cornell explained that there are 3,000 sq. feet of unoccupied space in his commercial building for which parking will be needed. Off-site parking is not feasible, nor is designated street parking. This additional parking will solve any future parking requirements. The applicant explained that one frontage tree less than required is indicated on the landscaping plan. The parking lot material would be concrete to match the adjacent parking lot. Lighting for the new parking area will be provided by bollards placed around the perimeter. The privacy fence will be continued along the rear to match the existing fence. Board members asked the owner if he would be willing to turn the good side of the fence outward and include a fence cap. The owner answered in the affirmative.

In response to questions about the historic houses, the owner replied that they will be used for rental purposes. He stated that there is no vehicle access to the rear of either house.

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, but reminded the Board that it has no control over use or subdivision.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

There was no Board discussion.

### **FINDING OF FACT**

Cameron Pfeiffer 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 as amended:

11. The tree calculation is incorrect—there should be one additional frontage tree;
14. The fence will match the privacy fence in the photograph provided;
15. The 2 buildings to be demolished have been identified and are non-contributing.
16. Lighting will be provided by bollards; and
17. The parking lot material will be concrete.

The motion was seconded by Harris Oswalt 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 conditioned upon approval of the subdivision application by the Planning Commission and turning the good side of the fence outward and placing a cap on the fence. The motion was seconded by Douglas Kearley and approved with Bunky Ralph voting in opposition.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 09/11/07.**

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
CERTIFIED RECORD**

**090-05/05-CA – CA**    152 Charles Street  
**Applicant:**            Andrea and Suzanne Gherzi  
**Received:**            8/28/06                    **Meeting Date (s):**  
Submission Date + 45 Days:    10/12/06            1) 9/11/06            2)            3)

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:**        Oakleigh Garden Historic District  
**Classification:**        Contributing  
**Zoning:**                 R-1, Residential  
**Additional Permits Required:** (1) Fence;  
**Nature of Project:**     Remove existing wood privacy fence (50 feet) and replace it with a 7 foot tall concrete cinderblock wall which will begin at the back of the property and extend forward (toward the street) 50 feet.

**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 & Gates	Install concrete block wall

**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. . .

The Design Review 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 Districts.”

**STAFF REPORT**

1.        The house is a 1930 wood bungalow with masonry porch and battered piers typical of the style and date.
2.        There is a porte-cochere on the right side of the house with a ribbon drive.
3.        Plans call for the removal of an existing 8 foot wood privacy fence.
4.        The new fence will be located in the same place as the existing fence.
5.        There is an apartment building adjacent to the property where the fence is proposed.
6.        The concrete block wall will have piers located along its length.
7.        The wall will be capped and stuccoed.

Since the property is located alongside an apartment complex, it qualifies for an exception to the six foot restriction on fences. Concrete walls are allowed in the districts if finished and capped as stated in the analysis. Staff recommends approval provided the applicants agree to the design of the piers and caps as shown in the illustration or present an acceptable. Also, the distance between the piers and color of the wall should be determined.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Mr. and Mrs. Ghersi were present to discuss the application. Due to the limited amount of space in the side yard, they amended the application so that the fence would have a cap but no piers. They presented a photograph of the fence they wished to copy. They explained that the wall would run adjacent to their bedroom and their daughter's bedroom for a distance of 50 ft. from the rear of the property. A portion of the existing wood fence would remain toward the front of the property.

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 David Tharp and unanimously approved.

### **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Tilmon Brown 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 Jim Wagoner and unanimously approved.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 09/11/07.**

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
CERTIFIED RECORD**

**091-05/06 – CA**            114 Providence Street  
**Applicant:**            Catholic Archdiocese of Mobile/Ben Cummings, Architect  
**Received:**            8/25/06                            **Meeting Date (s):**  
**Submission Date + 45 Days:**    10/09/06                        1) 9/11/06            2)                            3)

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:**        Old Dauphin Way Historic District  
**Classification:**        Contributing  
**Zoning:**                R-1, residential  
**Nature of the Project:** Install wood handicap ramp on the north side at the rear.

**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*.

1. This building dates from c. 1930 and is a contributing Bungalow in the district.
2. The building will be used to supplement St. Mary’s classroom space.
3. The handicap ramp will be a permanent fixture until the building is no longer functioning as part of St. Mary’s.
4. The handicap ramp will be placed on the north side at the rear.
5. The handicap ramp slopes from the drive to a platform; from the platform there is a right angled slope to the rear porch of the house.
6. The ramp will be 3 ft. in height and be simply detailed with a 3 part handrail.
7. The ramp will be hidden from view by an existing 6 ft. wood privacy fence.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Architect Ben Cummings was present to discuss the application. He explained that the ramp would be located behind the privacy gate and fence already in place on the site. It would lead to the rear porch. He had already obtained a CoA to remove the plywood enclosure from the porch. 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**

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 David Tharp 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 Jim Wagoner and unanimously approved.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 09/11/07.**



**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
CERTIFIED RECORD**

**092-05/06-CA**                      506 Eslava Street  
**Applicant:**                      David M. Moore  
**Received:**                      8/24/06                      **Meeting Date (s):**  
Submission Date + 45 Days:      10/8/06                      1) 9/11/06

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:**              Church Street East  
**Classification:**              Contributing  
**Zoning:**                      R-1, Single family residential  
**Additional Permits Required:** Applicant should check with UDD for site coverage and setback requirements;  
building permits  
**Nature of Project:**              Add a 38' bedroom addition with adjoining covered deck; replace existing fence.

**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..."

The Design Review 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 Districts."

**STAFF REPORT**

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

1. 506 Church is a highly unusual house, extremely narrow but long.
2. The file suggests the original house was constructed about 1855 with alterations about 1910.
3. It is a one story, frame house with a later dormer.
4. The proposed addition to the house is in line with the current house.
5. A porch is proposed for the east side of the lot (called a covered deck).
6. The proposed addition will be built of Hardiboard.
7. The Board does not allow the use of Hardiboard on additions to historic houses.
8. The materials for the porch deck are not called out.
9. The additions windows are 4/4.

10. The house windows are 6/6.
11. The porch has a very classical Corinthian type column.
12. The house will be painted: BLP Fort Gaines Blue.
13. The piers are to be brick.
14. There is no information on the fence to be erected.

Staff recommends approval of the proposed work on the house with the following conditions: the material be wood to match the existing siding in dimensions and material (wood); windows should be 6/6 wood, true divided light or 1/1 wood; a new design for the post should be submitted; and the applicant provide the materials to be used for the porch decking. It should be noted that this porch will be a living space with an outside bar area and hot tub. The request for the fence should be denied for lack of information and a new submission be made at a later date.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

David Moore was present to discuss the application. He explained that a popcorn tree would be removed from the back yard. The addition will extend the length of the house by 38 ft. and a covered deck will be placed at right angles to the addition. Mr. Moore brought modified plans to the meeting that showed corrections/alterations to the following: windows would be 6/6 wood to match the existing historic windows; rather than the Corinthian column shown on the submitted drawing, the column will match the design of the front porch columns; the addition will be constructed of wood rather than Hardiboard. He also explained that he will not be removing the existing fencing, he will be replacing rotten boards. The fence will remain unpainted in order to weather.

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 as amended:

6. The proposed addition will be built of wood to match the existing siding.
8. The material of the porch is wood.
9. Windows on the addition will be 6/6 to match existing windows.
11. The rear porch column will match the front porch column design.
15. Black asphalt shingles will be used on the addition to match the existing shingles.

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. Site coverage and setbacks will be determined by the Urban Development Department.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 09/11/07.**

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
CERTIFIED RECORD**

**093-05/06 – CA**            307 West Street  
**Applicant:**                Kim and Chris Husting  
**Received:**                 8/22/06                            **Meeting Date (s):**  
**Submission Date + 45 Days:**    10/06/06                        1) 9/11/06    2)                            3)

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:**        Leinkauf Historic District  
**Classification:**         Contributing  
**Zoning:**                    R-1, residential  
**Nature of the Project:** Remove elevator shaft and square off rear corner of house per the submitted drawings.

**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 Guideline*.

1. The residence is a c. 1926 American Foursquare with offset gabled porch.
2. The building is frame with a hipped roof and projecting profiled rafters.
3. The rear of the building has a partial width one story porch and a two story elevator shaft.
4. The plan calls for removing the elevator shaft and squaring off the rear of the house to provide for a laundry room on the first floor and a bathroom on the second floor.
5. The new addition will be covered by an intersecting hip roof with projecting rafters and roofing material to match the existing structure.
6. All materials and features will match the existing structure

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**

The Board commented on the fact that the proposed windows do not match those on the building.

### **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 amended as follows:

6. All materials and features to match the existing structure including 6/6 windows.

The motion was seconded by Tilmon Brown and unanimously approved.

### **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

David Tharp moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued conditioned on the windows being 6/6. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswalt and unanimously approved.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 09/11/07.**

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
CERTIFIED RECORD**

**094-05/06 – CA**            110 Ryan Avenue  
**Applicant:**                Norman and Victoria Wood/Douglas Kearley, architect  
**Received:**                 8/27/06                        **Meeting Date (s):**  
**Submission Date + 45 Days:**    10/11/06                      1) 9/11/06            2)                            3)

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:**        Ashland Place Historic District  
**Classification:**         Contributing  
**Zoning:**                     R-1, Single family residential  
**Nature of the Project:** Construct 2 story garage with dormers on front slope; entrance stair to be located at north side. Install new driveway of asphalt or concrete.

**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 Guideline*.

1. The residence dates from 1928 and is an example of the English Revival style.
2. The garage will be two story with dormers on the front slope.
3. A pair of simulated true lite clad wood windows will be placed on the north side.
4. There will be a pair of clad casement windows with simulated true divided light and half round transom on the north side.
5. There will be an automatic embossed metal garage door, Renaissance series.
6. There will two 6 panel metal man doors on the building.
7. The building will be constructed of wood siding or hardiplank.
8. Dutch lap siding will mimic the main house.
9. Architectural shingles will be used.
10. The building will be set back 5 ft. from the side property line and 10 ft. from the rear property line.
11. Concrete driveways are permitted under the guidelines while asphalt drives are prohibited.

Staff recommends approval of the garage as submitted and the installation of a concrete driveway.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Victoria Wood was present to discuss the application. Mrs. Wood explained that wood siding and asphalt architectural shingles would be used on the garage and that it would be painted to match the house. The

driveway would be concrete. The alley behind had been vacated so the garage will be placed on the abandoned alleyway.

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**

Cameron Pfeiffer 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 as amended:

9. Asphalt architectural shingles will be used.

12. The driveway will be concrete.

13. The building will be painted to match the house.

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. David Tharp seconded the motion which was unanimously approved.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 09/11/07.**

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
CERTIFIED RECORD**

**095-05/06-CA**            1255 Springhill Avenue  
**Applicant:**            F. S. Land Co., LLC  
**Received:**              8/23/06                      **Meeting Date (s):**  
Submission Date + 45 Days: 9/18/06                      1) 9/11/06    2)                      3)

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:**        Old Dauphin Way Historic District  
**Classification:**        Non-Contributing  
**Zoning:**                    B-3, Business  
**Additional Permits Required:** (1) Fence; Variance for dumpster pad.  
**Nature of Project:**       Increase run of fence on the east side matching the existing dog eared fence.  
Place gates across both drives. Install dumpster pad at SE corner of the lot.  
Install second gate on east side, toward front, near the building.

**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..."

The Design Review 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 Districts."

**STAFF REPORT**

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff's judgment, parts of the proposed work complies with the Design Review Guidelines and will not impair the historic integrity of the structure and the district, provided staff has correctly interpreted the submission.

1. The subject structure is a late 20<sup>th</sup> century brick doctor's office.
2. The subject structure is a non-contributing element within the Old Dauphin Way Historic District.
3. The proposed extension of the fence will run along the east side of the property line, but the exact location is difficult to determine from the site plan.

4. The proposed wood fence will be 6 ft. high wood dog eared.
5. There will be gates on the east and west side, set back from the sidewalk a distance greater than 25 ft and connecting with the building and fences on either side, respectively.
6. The proposed fence will be left natural to weather.
7. There is a third gate listed on the plans at the front of the property.
8. Staff cannot determine the exact location of the gates, but the distance of two from Springhill Avenue should be acceptable, while the front east gate placement is difficult to determine.
9. There will be an 8x10 concrete dumpster pad in the SE (rear) corner of the property.

Staff recommends approval of the fence once its exact location is determined. Staff also recommends approval of the east and west gates toward the middle of the property, upon clarification of the sites and the design. Staff recommends approval of the dumpster pad, but notes there may need to be a variance from Urban Development. Staff recommends denial of the front east gate due to lack of information.

#### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

The applicant was present to discuss the application. He clarified where the fence would be installed, the location of the dumpster pad and gates across the driveway.  
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 felt there were some discrepancies in the application that could be clarified with a site plan.

#### **FINDING OF FACT**

There was no finding of fact.

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

David Tharp moved that, contingent upon the submittal of a final site plan, Staff can handle the application on a mid-month basis. The motion was seconded by Cameron Pfeiffer and unanimously approved.



**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
CERTIFIED RECORD**

**096-05/06 – CA**            312 N. Conception Street  
**Applicant:**                Helene Shatto  
**Received:**                 8/25/06                            **Meeting Date (s):**  
Submission Date + 45 Days:    10/09/06                        1) 9/11/06    2)                            3)

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:**        DeTonti Square Historic District  
**Classification:**         Contributing  
**Zoning:**                    RB, Residential-Business  
**Nature of the Project:** Construct 14' x 16' outbuilding in rear yard.

**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 Guideline*.

1. The Bolling House was constructed in 1852 and has had changes over time.
2. The building will have traditional construction on brick piers.
3. The proposed building will be constructed of hardiplank.
4. The outbuilding will be placed in the rear corner of the yard, 5 ft. from the rear and south property lines.
5. The outbuilding will have square classical columns on its full width porch.
6. The building is accented with a cupola.
7. The roof will have cedar shakes.
8. Window openings will be permanently shuttered.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Helene Shatto was present to discuss the application. She explained that she had begun to construct the proposed outbuilding and received a Stop Work order. The outbuilding will be placed in the southeast corner of the lot and painted to match the house. She was unsure about adding the cupola. 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. As amended adding fact 9. The building will be painted to match the house.

The motion was seconded by David Tharp and unanimously approved.

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Tilmon Brown 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 Jim Wagoner and unanimously approved.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 09/11/07.**