

CITY OF MOBILE
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Minutes of the Meeting
September 27, 2004

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Chair Cindy Klotz at 3:03 p.m.

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

Members Present: Douglas Kearley, David Tharp, Bunky Ralph, Harris Oswalt, Cindy Klotz, Joe Sackett, Tilmon Brown.

Members Absent: Lynda Burkett, Michael Mayberry, Robert Brown, Cameron Pfeiffer.

Staff Members Present: Ed Hooker, Anne Crutcher, Wanda Cochran

<u>In Attendance</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Item Number</u>
David Wilkins	P.O. Box 1406, Mobile, AL 36633	091-03/04-CA
N.H. Holmes, Jr.	P.O. Box 864, Mobile, AL 36601	092-03/04-CA
Margaret Pappas	Urban Development Department	091-03/04-CA

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:

Tilmon Brown moved to approve the minutes as mailed. The motion was seconded by Douglas Kearley and unanimously 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 Bunky Ralph and unanimously approved.

MID MONTH APPROVALS

1. Applicant's Name: Summer's Roofing and Construction Co., Inc.
Property Address: 359 Chatham Street
Date of Approval: 8/10/04 asc
Work Approved: Re-roof building with 25 year 3-tab fiberglass shingles, shadow gray in color.
2. Applicant's Name: Fred South
Property Address: 1318 Chamberlain Avenue
Date of Approval: 8/11/04 weh
Work Approved: Repair or replace rotten wood with materials matching existing in material, profile and dimension. Paint new materials to match existing.
3. Applicant's Name: Kiker Corporation
Property Address: 1111 Government Street
Date of Approval: 8/11/04 asc
Work Approved: Re-roof flat roof with materials to match existing.
4. Applicant's Name: Kiker Corporation
Property Address: 209 North Washington Street

- Date of Approval: 8/11/04 asc
 Work Approved: Re-roof flat roof with materials to match existing.
5. Applicant's Name: John Moore
 Property Address: 310 Charles Street
 Date of Approval: 8/12/04 weh
 Work Approved: Repaint house in American Tradition color scheme:
 Body: Molear Vaquero Red
 Trim: white
 Replace existing columns with new box columns in stock design provided by MHDC staff – new columns to total 4, as original design.
6. Applicant's Name: Sand Dollar Properties
 Property Address: 110 South Dearborn Street
 Date of Approval: 8/13/04 asc
 Work Approved: Replace roof decking as necessary; install new charcoal shingles to match existing.
7. Applicant's Name: Bill Zasiris
 Property Address: 20 South Reed Street
 Date of Approval: 8/16/04 weh
 Work Approved: Re-roof house with 3 tab fiberglass shingles, charcoal in color.
8. Applicant's Name: Charles Alfred Cowley Jr.
 Property Address: 955 Palmetto Street
 Date of Approval: 8/16/04 asc
 Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary to match existing in material and profile and dimension. Repaint house in existing color scheme.
9. Applicant's Name: Donald's Roofing
 Property Address: 110 S. Bayou Street
 Date of Approval: 8/16/04 asc
 Work Approved: Re-roof building with materials matching existing.
10. Applicant's Name: Hero's Sports Bar
 Property Address: 273 Dauphin Street
 Date of Approval: 8/16/04 weh
 Work Approved: Stain deck the following colors:
 Deck/skirtboard – Linen
 Railings – Oak Brown
 Pergola – Terra
 Canopy Framing – Dark Brown
11. Applicant's Name: Cooner Roofing Inc.
 Property Address: 1457 Brown Street
 Date of Approval: 8/18/04 weh

- Work Approved: Re-roof house with 3 tab fiberglass shingles, charcoal black in color.
12. Applicant's Name: Contractors of Today/Gary Soutullo
Property Address: 206 Roper Street
Date of Approval: 8/18/04 weh
Work Approved: Remove existing concrete steps and replace with new wood steps with handrails matching existing porch rail. Paint to match existing.
13. Applicant's Name: Bernhardt Roofing Company
Property Address: 258 Dexter Street
Date of Approval: 8/25/04 asc
Work Approved: Re-roof with 3-tab fiberglass shingles, black in color.
14. Applicant's Name: Conrad Construction
Property Address: 253 St. Anthony Street
Date of Approval: 8/25/04 asc
Work Approved: Replace glass as necessary; repair/replace wood siding as necessary with new wood siding to match existing in profile and dimension; prime and paint new materials.
15. Applicant's Name: Larry and Cathy Burdette
Property Address: 1561 Luling Street
Date of Approval: 8/26/04 weh
Work Approved: Repaint house in the following colors:
Body – Lettuce Alone B68-3
Trim – Bistro White 7006-4
16. Applicant's Name: Mark and Denise Burks
Property Address: 1559 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 8/26/04 weh
Work Approved: Construct 3 car garage as per submitted plans. Design is modified MHDC stock plan utilizing building elements found on main residence. Building to measure 38' x 24' and is to be located at the rear of the property behind existing guest house. Siding to be hardiplank painted to match main house, hipped roof with timberline shingles matching that of the main residence.
17. Applicant's Name: Leland Moore Jr.
Property Address: 12 North Reed Avenue
Date of Approval: 8/26/04 weh
Work Approved: Repaint house in existing color scheme.
Repair existing flat roof – install 5-v crimp galvalume roofing over flat roof surface and flash into existing asbestos tile as necessary. Repair rotten soffit & fascia with materials matching in profile & dimension.
18. Applicant's Name: DNC of Mobile
Property Address: 113 South Dearborn Street

- Date of Approval: 8/26/04 asc
 Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary with new materials matching existing in material, profile and dimension. Prime new materials. Paint colors to be submitted at a later date.
19. Applicant's Name: Barbara and Fred South
 Property Address: 1112 Dauphin Street
 Date of Approval: 8/26/04 asc
 Work Approved: Replace rotten wood with materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension.
 Repaint house in the following Sherwin Williams color scheme:
 Body: SW6325
 Trim: Cream
 Base: SW 6328
 Cedar Shakes: SW6326
20. Applicant's Name: Goldengate Properties/E. Bradford Ladd
 Property Address: 2301 DeLeon Ave.
 Date of Approval: 8/26/04 asc
 Work Approved: Minor wood repair with new wood to match existing in dimension and profile.
 Paint in the following Benjamin Moore colors: body-Rockport Gray; trim-Titanium, window sashes - white.
21. Applicant's Name: Thomas Roofing/Robert Ramsey
 Property Address: 311 West Street
 Date of Approval: 8/26/04 asc
 Work Approved: Install new charcoal 3 tab shingle roof on pitched roof and modified flat roof system on flat roof sections.
22. Applicant's Name: O. C. Wiggins
 Property Address: 1005 Augusta Street
 Date of Approval: 8/26/04 jss
 Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Re-roof house in timberline shingles heather in color to match existing.

OLD BUSINESS:

1. **020-03/04-CA** 165-67 State Street
 Applicant: Devereaux Bemis
 Nature of Project: Retain prototype fence constructed at the Board's request.

APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. Certified Record Attached.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. **090/03/04/CA** 20 North Reed Avenue
Applicant: Ryan Freisen
Nature of Project: Install 6' privacy fence around perimeter of property as per submitted plans.

APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. Certified Record attached.

2. **091-03/04-CA** 203 Church Street
Applicant: The McMillan Family Trust of 2002
Nature of Project: Retain 43' cell tower installed without proper federal permits, without zoning clearance, without a building permit, and without ARB approval.

TABLED. Certified Record attached.

3. **092-03/04-CA** 304 Government Street
Applicant: Centre for the Living Arts/ Holmes & Holmes, Architects
Nature of Project: Rehabilitate existing and abandoned former Mobile Press Register offices into space for Mobile County Probate Court functions.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

4. **093-03/04-CA** 114 North Lafayette Street
Applicant: Mike Clark
Nature of Project: Remove existing inoperable and damaged steel casement windows and replace with vinyl clad double hung one-over-one sash as per submitted information.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

OTHER BUSINESS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Discussion with the Board by Steve Walker
Item withdrawn from agenda
2. Federal Courthouse Review by Staff
Ed Hooker reported that the review is ongoing. Any comments from the Board should be given to staff to incorporate in the report.
3. Bunky Ralph announced that there will be a meeting of the Rules and Regulations Committee on Tuesday September 28th at 3:00 p.m. in Wanda Cochran's office, 9th floor, Government Plaza.

There being no further business, Harris Oswalt moved that the meeting be adjourned. The motion was seconded by Douglas Kearley and approved. The meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

020-03/04 – CA 165-67 State Street
Applicant: Devereaux Bemis
Received: 8/23/04 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 11/07/04 1) 11/10/03 2) 9/13/04 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: DeTonti Square Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-B, Residential Business
Additional Permits Required: (1) Building
Conflicts of Interest: Tilmon Brown recused himself from discussion and voting on the application.
Nature of Project: Construct 8’ high wood and Hardiplank fence as per submitted design. Stain fence dark brown.

Fence to be constructed of 4’ x 8’ panels of Hardiplank mounted between 6”x 6” treated wood posts. Panels to have ½” x 4” evenly spaced applied batten strips. Fence to be stained.

History of the Project:

At the November 10, 2003 meeting, the Board had questions concerning the use of Hardiplank for fencing in the historic district. It also had questions concerning the structural integrity of the fence as designed. The Board noted it would be willing to review a full scale mock up of the fence.

The fence has been erected as presented, and Board Members are encouraged to visit the site and examine the fence.

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	Fences, Walls and Gates	Construct wood and hardiplank fence

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

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 existing structure is solid masonry.
 2. The building materials are compatible for use in the district.
 3. The building materials have been approved for use in the district.
 4. The Board encourages the use of new materials when appropriate.
 5. New construction should be easily distinguished from old meeting Park Service guidelines.
 6. Solid fencing of other types has been approved in the district.
 7. A continuous cap adds a finished edge to the fence.
 8. Typically the Design Guidelines limit fences to 6’ in height.
 9. The applicant is requesting to construct the fence on the sidewalk which is allowed in RB zoning where the setback is 0’ or 5’.

Staff has no recommendation for this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

There was no one to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application.
There were no comments from the public or city departments to enter into the record.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There were questions regarding whether the fence would be painted and if there would be a gate. It was stated by Bunky Ralph that the gate has been constructed and continues the design of the remaining portion of the fence.

There was concern that the approval of a fence out of non-traditional materials would set a precedent. Douglas Kearley offered that the fence design was inappropriate to the neighborhood although its placement next to the sidewalk was a standard solution.

There was discussion that a base or snake board would improve the design of the fence.

FINDING OF FACT

Bunky Ralph moved to find the facts in the staff report with the addition of facts 5 through 9. The motion was seconded by David Tharp and approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Harris Oswald moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness conditioned upon the fence being painted a single color and the applicant taking into consideration the addition of a base/snake board. The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph and approved. Douglas Kearley opposed the motion.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 09/27/05.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

090-03/04 – CA 20 North Reed Avenue
Applicant: Ryan Friesen
Received: 8/27/04 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 10/11/04 1) 9/13/04 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single family residential
Additional Permits Required: (1) Fence
Nature of Project: Install 6’ high wood privacy fence as per submitted plans.

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	Fences, Walls & Gates	Install wood privacy fence

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 along with their relationship to the Historic District.”
 - 1. The main structure is a one story frame structure.
 - 2. The residence is located on the northwest corner of North Reed Avenue and New Hamilton Streets.
 - 3. Typically, the Design Guidelines limit fences to 6’ in height.
 - 4. Typical side yard setbacks for fences is 12’ for standard (60’ or wider) corner lots.
 - 5. The subject lot is 50’ in width at the front, so due to the substandard lot size, a setback of 9.8’ is allowed.
 - 6. The applicant is requesting to construct the fence on the sidewalk.
 - 7. A common alley separates the houses facing North Reed Avenue from North Monterey Street.
 - 8. The house that faces North Monterey Street directly behind the subject property has a wood privacy fence with brick columns located directly on the sidewalk.
 - 9. As this is a corner property, the applicant will have to apply for a zoning variance to allow the fence to be closer to the sidewalk.
 - 10. The fence will be a standard dog eared fence left natural to weather.

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.
There were no comments from the public or city departments to enter into the record.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed that a setback variance will be required but that adjacent properties had similar kinds of fences. Staff clarified that the fence would be a standard dog eared privacy fence left natural to weather.

FINDING OF FACT

David Tharp moved to find the facts in the staff report added fact 10. The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph and approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness based upon the facts and discussion at the meeting conditioned upon a zoning variance being approved. The motion was seconded by David Tharp and approved. A COA will be issued once the variance has been obtained.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 09/27/05.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

091-03/04 – CA 203 Church Street
Applicant: The McMillan Trust of 2002, David D. Wilkins, representative
Received: 8/31/04 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 10/12/04 1) 9/13/04 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East Historic District
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-4, General Business
Additional Permits Required: (1) Fence; Planning Approval
Nature of Project: Retain 43’ cell tower installed without proper federal permits,
without zoning clearance, without a building permit, and without ARB approval.

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	Fences, Walls & Gates	Install iron fence

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

The current Design Review Guidelines do not directly address structures such as cell towers, satellite dishes, antennas, etc. However, Section 9 under Standard of Review addresses the appropriateness and the impact of elements within the context of historic districts. A list of facts is enumerated for the Board’s consideration of this request.

1. The tower is located in the Central Parking lot due south of Government Plaza, between Church Street and Interstate 10.
2. The parking lot is directly adjacent to the historic Chandler House, and is within the view shed of the Christ Episcopal Church, The Museum of Mobile and the Fort Conde Welcome Center.
3. The tower is 43’ tall, and tapers from 20” in diameter at the base to 15” at the top.
4. The plan notes that the tower is to match existing light poles. However, the one existing light pole is approximately 25’ high, and much smaller in diameter.
5. The plan notes that the tower will provide additional illumination for the parking lot, at an elevation of approximately 20’ above grade. However, the light is placed on the tower at a height approximately 30’ above grade and is pointed directly down at the existing building.

6. Plans call for the placement of a radio base station at the base of the tower and an antenna at the apex.
7. Typically, towers of this nature have up to 2 co-locations for cell phone use, requiring additional buildings to house equipment. The plans provided show no additional buildings.
8. The Applicant has agreed to paint the pole black or dark green or any other color as directed by the Board.
9. The Applicants will be required to submit information to the Alabama Historical Commission for Section 106 Review to mitigate any negative impact on the Church Street East Historic District.

Staff was unable to reach a consensus on whether or not the tower impaired the historic integrity of the Church Street East Historic District. Staff suggests the Board visit the site and determine an appropriate decision.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Applicant David Wilkins explained that the light pole/cell tower was being proposed by T-Mobile in order to provide phone reception in the tunnels. Using the roof of the Ramada Inn for the antenna was not feasible. David Buchanan with Central Parking agreed to the installation of a pole in the parking lot since it was advantageous for the parking facility to have more lighting. An electrical permit was obtained for the light pole. If the pole becomes a tower, it will be a micro cell tower. For this tower type a small rectangular box serving as the antennae will be attached to the pole.

Margaret Pappas from the Urban Development Department reported that Planning Approval will be required for the installation of the tower. There will need to be certification of the foundation and certification of the electrical work. Even if the pole remains a light pole, these certifications will be required. November is the earliest that the Planning Commission would hear the request.

Wanda Cochran added that there are no height restrictions in B-4. There will also be a 106 Review required to assess the tower's impact on historic resources.

Tilmon Brown questioned whether the tower could be leased to others since zoning is pro-co-location. Mr. Wilkins reported that micro cell co-locations would be possible and of the same size as the proposed antennae. Support equipment for the tower would be the approximate size of a water cooler.

There was discussion concerning whether engineers had determined that 43 ft. high pole was required to provide the best reception. Mr. Wilkins did not know if those calculations were available.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed whether enough information was submitted to render a decision. It was the feeling of the Board that the Planning Approval process and 106 Review be completed prior to the ARB making a decision on the application. Engineering studies concerning the optimum height of the pole must be submitted when the application is brought back for re-consideration.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

David Tharp moved to table the application until the Planning Approval and 106 Review Process were completed at which time there could be a resubmission to the Board. Part of the resubmission must contain engineering studies justifying the height of the pole/tower. The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph and passed.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

092-03/04 – CA 304 Government Street
Applicant: Centre for the Living Arts/ Holmes & Holmes, Architects
Received: 9/21/04 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 11/3/04 1) 9/27/04 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4, General Business
Additional Permits Required: (1) Building
Conflicts of Interest: Douglas Kearley recused himself from discussion and voting on the application.
Nature of Project: Rehabilitate existing and abandoned former Mobile Press Register offices into space for Mobile County Probate Court functions.

Alterations to the exterior include:
 South Elevation – removal of infilled bay at extreme east side of building to install emergency fire doors as per submitted plans.
 West Elevation – removal of existing metal door and replacement with new fire-rated door in new fire stair.
 - infill of existing garage bay with new anodized aluminum storefront as per submitted plans.

Building History: The building was designed by C. L. Hutchisson Sr. and constructed in 1921 (MHDC File date) for the Adams Motor Company. The Mobile Press Register acquired the property in 1941, and replaced storefront windows with glass block infill.

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		reconfigure exterior egress

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 a three story masonry commercial building, with parapet and concealed roof.
 - 2. The existing fenestration is brick bays with glass block and panel infill.
 - 3. This glass block and panel infill was a later alteration to the original building.

4. The proposed infill for the south elevation calls for the removal of panel & glass block infill in the extreme east bay and the installation of a single exit door (controlled access) with obscure laminated impact-resistant glass, and insulated panel side light.
5. The proposed infill for the west elevation occurs at the location of a truck bay towards the north end of the original building.
6. The proposed infill for the west elevation consists of a pair of recessed anodized aluminum doors with laminated impact-resistant glass, and anodized aluminum storefront with laminated impact-resistant glass.
7. At the extreme north edge of the bay is proposed a single fixed window, anodized aluminum with laminated impact-resistant glass.
8. An existing flush metal exit door at the extreme northern end of the west elevation is to be changed to a fire rated exit door (controlled access).

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Nicholas H. Holmes, Jr., architect on the project, appeared before the Board. He explained that there was currently no legal means of egress from the building. Proposed alterations will satisfy this life/safety issue. This work would have to be completed in order to occupy the building. He explained that the insulated panel will be metal in a beige color. Glazing will be clear. The storefront system will be mill finish to match existing materials.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Tilmon Brown suggested that glass block might be a good material for glazing since there was a great deal of glass block already on the building. Mr. Holmes explained that there was a desire to give the offices an open, rather than closed, feeling.

FINDING OF FACT

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

David Tharp moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness based on the facts and the testimony provided at the meeting. The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph and approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 09/27/05.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

093-03/04 – CA 114 North Lafayette
Applicant: Mike Clark
Received: 9/23/04 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 11/5/04 1) 9/27/04 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way Historic District
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Additional Permits Required: (1) Building
Nature of Project: Remove existing inoperable and damaged steel casement windows and replace with vinyl clad double hung one-over-one sash as per submitted information.

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	Windows	Remove & replace existing windows

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 a one story brick veneer ranch house, slab on grade, with a monolithic hipped roof.
 2. The existing windows are the original single glazed, single pane steel casement.
 3. The existing window glass suffered damage from pressure build-up during Hurricane Ivan.
 4. The existing windows are rusted and inoperable.
 5. The proposed new windows are vinyl clad wood, one-over-one double hung.

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.
There were no comments from the public or city departments to enter into the record.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no discussion by the Board.

FINDING OF FACT

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness based upon the facts in the staff report and information provided at the meeting that the house is non-contributing to the district. The motion was seconded by Douglas Kearley and approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 09/27/05.