

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES

April 19, 2023 – 3:00 P.M.

Auditorium, Government Plaza
205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The acting Chair, Ms. Karrie Maurin, called the meeting to order at 3:00 pm. Christine Dawson, Historic Development staff, called the roll as follows.

Members Present: Bob Allen, Abby Davis, Karrie Maurin, Andre Rathle, Joseph Rodrigues, and Gypsie Van Antwerp

Members Absent: Janelle Adams (alternate), Cart Blackwell (alternate), Catarina Echols, Kimberly Harden, Kathleen Huffman (alternate), Craig Roberts, and Jim Wagoner

Staff Members Present: Annie Allen, Christine Dawson, Dana Foster, Chris Kern, Marion McElroy, and Kim Thomas

2. Mr. Rodrigues moved to approve the minutes from the April 5, 2023 meeting. The motion was seconded by Ms. Van Antwerp and approved unanimously.
3. Mr. Rodrigues moved to approve the Mid-Month COAs granted by Staff. The motion was seconded by Ms. Davis and approved unanimously.

B. MID-MONTH APPROVALS

- APPROVED

1. Applicant: Jerry Jackson

- a. Property Address: 1212 New St Francis Street
- b. Date of Approval: 03/29/2023
- c. Project: 1. Repaint exterior in the following colors: Body - Alabaster (Sherwin Williams SW7008); Trim, windows & porches - Anew Gray (Sherwin Williams SW7030)
2. Landscaping: Azaleas & yaupon holly will be installed in the front yard near the façade.

2. Applicant: Lorraine Nalley

- a. Property Address: 23 Blacklawn
- b. Date of Approval: 03/31/2023
- c. Project: 1. Replace existing wood fence gate located across driveway in-kind.
2. Replace in-kind wood gate located south of the house.
3. Replace wood fencing which runs down north property line in-kind.

3. Applicant: Global South Holdings

- a. Property Address: 109 South Lafayette Street
- b. Date of Approval: 04/04/2023
- c. Project: Install a single-faced 1'-6"x1'-6" freestanding sign mounted on a steel sign pole. "109. The Nest"

4. Applicant: Global South Holdings

- a. Property Address: 1420 Government Street
- b. Date of Approval: 04/04/2023
- c. Project: Install a 4'x4' double-sided vinyl-wrapped plywood sign suspended sign on an existing hanging blade. "1420. The Nestor"

5. Applicant: Robert Impson

- a. Property Address: 329 McDonald Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 04/05/2023
- c. Project: Reroof in-kind in Tamko Titan XT. Color: Oxford Grey

6. Applicant: City of Mobile

- a. Property Address: 702 Government Street
- b. Date of Approval: 04/06/2023
- c. Project: Remove asbestos roofing from garage. Reroof garage and annex buildings with shingles in Weathered Wood color.

7. Applicant: City of Mobile

- a. Property Address: 700 Government Street
- b. Date of Approval: 04/06/2023
- c. Project: Reroof library administration building with shingles in Weathered Wood color.

8. Applicant: All American Fence Builders, LLC

- a. Property Address: 309 S. Ann Street
- b. Date of Approval: 04/06/2023
- c. Project: Remove existing 72" wood fence and replace with 72" aluminum fence behind front building plane.

9. Applicant: Edward Meztista

- a. Property Address: 25 McPhillips Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 04/06/2023
- c. Project: Replace damaged tongue and groove boards on front porch to match existing.

10. Applicant: Crane Contractors, LLC

- a. Property Address: 758 St Michael Street
- b. Date of Approval: 04/10/2023
- c. Project: Reroof in-kind

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2023-01-CA: 157 Dauphin Street

- a. Applicant: Carlos Gant on behalf of Tracy Roberts
- b. Project: Changes to façade

APPROVED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

2. 2023-22-CA: 221 S. Dearborn Street

- a. Applicant: Tony Jones
- b. Project: Install 75"-inch tall wall/fence at southeast corner of property

APPROVED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

3. 2023-23-CA: 17 Macy Place

- a. Applicant: Edward "Paul" Jones
- b. Project: Demolish one-story single-family residence; construct one-story single-family residence

DEFERRED AT APPLICANT'S REQUEST

D. OTHER BUSINESS

- 1. The next ARB meeting is scheduled for May 3, 2023.

Public comment regarding items on this agenda will be accepted via e-mail (mhdc@cityofmobile.org) or USPS (Mobile Historic Development Commission, P.O. Box 1827, Mobile, AL 36633) until 5PM on Tuesday, April 18, 2023. Please include your name, home address, and the item number about which you are writing.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

ADDRESS	157 Dauphin Street	APPLICATION NO.	2023-01-CA
SUMMARY OF REQUEST	Changes to north façade		
APPLICANT	Carlos Gant	OWNER, IF OTHER	Tracy Roberts

HISTORIC DISTRICT	Lower Dauphin Street Commercial	MEETING DATE	4/19/2023
CLASSIFICATION	Contributing	REVIEWER	A. Allen

DISTRICT/PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District was initially listed in the National Register in 1979 under Criteria A (historic significance) and C (architectural significance) for its local significance in the areas of commerce and architecture. The district is significant for its unique character stemming from the high concentration of closely spaced two- and three-story brick buildings and as Mobile’s nineteenth century commercial thoroughfare. The district boundaries were expanded in 1982, 1995, 1998, and 2019.

157 Dauphin Street is a two-story contributing commercial building located in the Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District. It is a brick building with a masonry façade. Currently the storefront entry is boarded up. According to the MHDC vertical files, this building was constructed c. 1860 and was associated with a Thomas Byrnes. Historic photographs show that the building’s original façade was brick and consisted of four large second story windows set above a suspended metal awning over the storefront. A heavy ornamented cornice was accentuated with a centered arched molding which echoed the shape of decorative hoods over the four windows. The property’s façade underwent an art deco remodel by J.N Stafford around 1937. At this time, the four windows were covered on the second story by a masonry veneer which included a large, recessed stucco panel centered on the second story. On the ground floor, a glass storefront was installed with deep recesses leading to an entry door. Although this historic storefront is no longer extant, the rest of this façade remains intact.

This property appeared previously before the Architectural Review Board (ARB) in January 2023, when the same application was presented. The Board requested that the applicant make some changes to the proposed design of the storefront and provide more information regarding materials.

SCOPE OF WORK (per submitted application and plans and correspondence)

1. Install new storefront and signage on first story of façade.
 - a. The proposed new storefront would measure 21’-7” wide by 10’-7” high.
 - b. The storefront would include a centered opening measuring 8’-0” wide by 7’-10” high. The opening would be topped with a 1’-10” aluminum frame transom which would be painted white.
 - c. The centered opening would be flanked by two 1’-0” wide stucco pilasters which would extend the full 10’-7” height of the storefront and be painted white. An aluminum framed glazed folding wall system (also in white), consisting of two (2) panels each, would sit on the outside of the columns on either side of the opening. These wall systems would each measure 5’-5 ½” wide by 8’-11 ½” high, with a transom spanning the width of each system measuring 1’-9” high. Each folding wall system would sit above a proposed new white painted wood panel bulkhead which would span the width of the openings and measure 1’-8” high.

2. Install a fixed glazed window on the second story of façade.
 - a. The proposed window would be centered on the façade and set within a 1” recess which would measure 5’-2” wide by 10’-9” high.
 - b. The proposed window would be wood clad in fiberglass.
 - c. The proposed window would measure 4’-2” wide by 6’-2” high, and be topped by a stucco panel measuring 4’2” wide by 2’-5” high.
3. Repairs and repainting to existing façade.
 - a. The existing masonry façade, including the recessed stucco panel, would be re-skimmed and painted in Copper Red.
4. Installation of new signage.
 - a. The proposed wall sign for the north façade would be set in a panel which would be formed above the storefront.
 - b. The proposed sign would consist of individual back-lit channel letters that would read “SPORTY T’S STEAKHOUSE.”
 - c. The proposed sign would comprise approximately 13.1 square feet.
5. Install new lighting.
 - a. New 12 Volt LED strip lighting is proposed to run along the second story recess and above the signage panel on the north façade.

STAFF REPORT

A. Applicable standards from the *Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts (Guidelines)*:

1. **7.1** Preserve the key character-defining features of a historic commercial façade.
2. **7.2** Repair an altered storefront to its original design.
 - Use historic photographs when determining the original character of a storefront design.
 - Where evidence does not exist, use a contemporary interpretation of a traditional storefront. Consider retaining a non-original storefront where it has achieved historic importance as an option.
 - Do not remove a façade veneer if it may cause serious damage to the original historic materials underneath (i.e., historic brick).
3. **7.3** Retain an original bulkhead as a decorative panel.
 - Retain the bulkhead below the display window.
 - If the original bulkhead is covered with another material, consider exposing the original design.
 - If the original bulkhead is missing, develop a sympathetic replacement design that is similar in profile, texture and durability to the original.
4. **7.5** Retain the original shape of the transom in a historic storefront.
 - Preserve the historic transom shape and configuration.
 - Add new glass if the original glass is missing.
 - Do not remove or enclose a transom.
5. **7.6** Replace a historic storefront to be consistent with the historic location.
 - Locate a new storefront in the same plane as it was historically.
 - Do not recess or project a replacement storefront from the front façade.
6. **7.7** Preserve and repair original materials on a historic commercial building whenever possible.
 - Strive to preserve materials on the sides and rear of a historic commercial building where possible.
 - Brick is the most common façade material, but in some cases stucco has been applied to an original brick façade.
 - If brick repair is required, match the mortar color, consistency and strike to the original as

- closely as possible.
7. **7.11** If necessary, replace a door in a fashion that is sensitive to the historic commercial character of the building.
 - Use doors with high proportions of transparent glass.
 - Do not use a residential door for a commercial building.
 8. **7.16** Preserve and repair an original detail or ornamentation on a historic commercial building.
 - Maintain an original detail and ornamentation on a historic façade. Prioritize the front façade.
 - Maintain the established spatial relationships and scale of existing details.
 - Preserve and maintain a significant original detail or ornamentation element, including a pilaster, window frame, or molded wood, terra cotta or brick.
 - Do not remove later historic fabric to recreate missing elements without proof of the original.
 9. **7.18** Preserve and repair an original detail or ornamentation on a historic commercial building.
 - Maintain the original space patterns and location of windows. Most display windows have a bulkhead below and a transom above.
 - Preserve the size and shape of an upper story window.
 - Consider maintaining a Carrara glass or glass block storefront if it has attained historic significance as an alteration.
 10. **7.19** If required, replace original historic windows to be compatible with the windows on the original historic building.
 - Use large panes of glass that fit the original opening for a display window. Where a display window is no longer required, the ARB will consider an alternative design.
 - Do not use opaque treatments for a window, including black plexiglass. Do not paint a window.
 - Do not use reflective mirror glass for a window.
 - Unless evidence exists from existing buildings or historic photographs, do not use a multi-pane design that divides the storefront window into smaller components.
 - Use a tempered glass window if required by the building code.
 - Reopen an upper story window if it is blocked.
 - If reopening an upper story window is not feasible, use a fixed shutter to define the original proportion of the window opening.
 11. **7.23** Minimize the visual impact of metal bars or grills on a historic building.
 - Use security features that are sized properly to fit the opening.
 - Use security features that are simple and do not include decorative detailing.
 - If roll-down security grills are used on storefronts, use an open weave pattern that permits visibility to display items.
 - Use a roll-down security grill that is located on the interior of a window or doorway.
 12. **10.9** Design lighting that is in character with the setting.
 - Use a fixture that is compatible with architectural and site design elements.
 - When adding a new fixture, use one that is simple in character.
 - Mount a new light fixture on a porch ceiling or an adjacent entrance.
 - Mount a light fixture such that it will not interfere with the opening and closing of a door or shutter.
 - Design lighting to be contained within a site and to not spill over to a neighboring property.
 - Use incandescent lighting or a source that appears similar in character. Use a fluorescent or LED source provided the color is similar to that of an incandescent light. For residential projects, use an exterior light source that is in a color range at 3000 Kelvin temperature or below.
 - Limit the amount of landscape lighting used on a site to the amount necessary for its purpose for safety or the illumination of important site features. Landscape lighting includes concealed low wattage landscape lighting, uplights for trees or shrubbery or

- bollard lighting. Use low bollard lighting to illuminate a walkway or a drive aisle.
- Softly illuminate an important architectural feature if desired.
- For commercial properties, minimize stand-alone lighting. Instead, use the ambient light from a storefront as a light source.
- Do not use an imitation historic fixture that may convey a false sense of history.
- Do not use a light source that creates a harsh glare or color.
- Do not use a blinking light.

ACCEPTABLE LIGHTING SOURCES

Lighting sources that produce a light similar in tone and brightness to original lighting used for historic properties in the district are acceptable. These often include:

- Incandescent (low wattage)
- LED lighting that appears similar to an incandescent light
- Mercury vapor
- Moon lighting
- Dark Sky (downward facing)

UNACCEPTABLE LIGHTING SOURCES

Lighting sources that produce a light incompatible in tone and brightness that is discordant with properties in the district are unacceptable. These often include:

- Low sodium
- Metal halide

13. **11.3** Design a new sign to be compatible with the character of a building and the district.
14. **11.4** When installing a new sign on a historic building, avoid damaging or obscuring the key architectural features.
 - Minimize the number of sign anchor points.
 - Use an existing sign bracket if possible.
 - Design a sign to integrate with the architectural features of the historic building.
 - Avoid penetrating brick when attaching a sign to a masonry building.
15. **11.5** New signs are restricted to a maximum of 64 square feet.
16. **11.6** Place a sign to be compatible with those in the district.
 - When placing a new sign on a historic building, locate a sign to emphasize design elements of the historic building façade.
 - Mount a sign to fit within existing architectural features.
17. **11.7** Use a sign material that is compatible with the materials of the building on which it is placed and the district. New materials that achieve the effect of traditional materials and lighting solutions will be considered on a case by case basis.
 - Do not use highly reflective materials for a sign. All plastic faced box signs are not allowed.
 - Design a sign to be subordinate to the building façade.
18. **11.8** Where necessary, use a compatible, shielded light source to illuminate a sign.
 - Consider direct lighting toward a sign from an external, shielded lamp when possible.
 - Use a warm colored light to illuminate a sign when possible.
 - If halo lighting is used to accentuate a sign or building, locate the light source so that it is not visible.
 - If a back-lit sign is used, illuminate each individual letter or element separately.

ACCEPTABLE SIGN MATERIALS Sign materials that are similar in character, permanence, and durability to historic commercial signage in the district are acceptable.

These often include:

- Painted or carved wood
- Individual wood or cast metal letters or symbols
- Stone, such as slate, marble or sandstone

- Painted, gilded or sandblasted glass
 - Metal, provided it is appropriate to the architectural character of the building
- UNACCEPTABLE SIGN MATERIALS Sign materials that are not similar in character, permanence and durability to historic commercial signage in the district are unacceptable. These often include:
- Whole plastic face
 - Metal inappropriate for the architectural character of the building

B. Staff Analysis

As stated above, this application came before the ARB previously in January 2023, when the Board asked the applicant to redesign certain elements of the storefront, and to provide more detailed drawings and information regarding materials. Also included in this return application are the finalized design proposals regarding lighting and signage.

The *Design Review Guidelines* call for original and key character defining features of a historic commercial façade to be preserved, that original materials be repaired, and an altered storefront be restored to its original design. The current façade at 157 Dauphin is not original to the building. However, it is a historic one as it has been extant for over ninety years and has attained historic significance as an alteration. The proposed repairs to the historic masonry and stucco and the plan to repaint the façade respect these aforementioned *Guidelines* (A.1, 2, 6, 9). The proposed new storefront design reflects the character of the c. 1937 storefront in its placement, in the design of the windows and transoms, and in the retention of the original bulkhead (A.3-5). The proposed perforated roll-down security door follows the *Guidelines* call for minimal visual impact to the façade (A. 11).

The installation of a new window on the second story of the historic façade is not specifically addressed in the *Guidelines*. The *Guidelines* do state, however, that if a window must be replaced, the replacement be compatible with the windows on the original historic building (A.10). A few arguments come into play here which support the proposed installation of a new window. First, MHDC records show that there were originally four windows across the second story façade, creating a precedent for windows on the second story of the façade. Second, the proposed design and repurposing of this building has a demonstrated need for a better light source to the interior. A window at this location is required to bring in additional light. Further, the proposed style, profile and positioning of this new window complements the character of the historic façade. Therefore, an argument can be made that this proposed new window would not impair the character of the historic façade.

The proposed wall sign for the north façade would consist of individual back-lit letters and would fall within the maximum square footage allowed by the *Guidelines*. It would be comprised of materials which are compatible with the character, permanence, and durability of those of historic commercial signage in the district. Further, the sign would be placed on the façade of the building in alignment with signs on nearby buildings, would sit within a formed panel which is compatible to the building, and would incorporate an appropriate profile and color scheme (A. 13-18). Likewise, the LED strip lighting proposed to run along the recess of the second story would comply with the *Guidelines*' call for new lighting on a historic structure to be compatible with its design elements, to be similar in character to an incandescent light, and to softly illuminate a historic feature (A.12).

C. Summary of Analysis

- The proposed repairs and alterations to the existing façade, including the newly presented changes to the storefront design, are in compliance with the *Guidelines*.
- The proposed signage and lighting are appropriate to the building and comply with the *Guidelines*.

- The proposed installation of a window on the second story of the façade is an alteration which can be supported due to a precedent for windows in this location, the need for a better light source, and the compatibility of the proposed window's design.
- The proposed roll-down security door is also compliant.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on Section B above, Staff believes that the proposed repairs and alterations to the north façade at 157 Dauphin Street would not impair the architectural or historic character of the existing historic structure or the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Joseph Rodrigues recused himself from consideration of the application due to his employer's involvement in the project.

Mr. Carlos Gant was present to discuss the application. He stated that he agreed with the Staff's report.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Allen asked if the bulkheads would remain in place. Mr. Gant replied that there are no extant bulkheads; that new bulkheads would be constructed.

Mr. Allen asked if the proposed security door would come down over the proposed windows. Mr. Gant stated that the security door will be located on the backside of the columns.

Mr. Allen confirmed that past the storefront, there will be no bulkhead along the recessed entry area. Mr. Gant replied that this is correct as the design is for a courtyard area.

Ms. Davis asked what material is in the recess surrounding the second story window. Mr. Gant replied that the entire façade is stucco.

Ms. Maurin asked if the light source on the second story of the façade would be visible. Mr. Gant stated that the light would be a recessed track lighting system which would be flush with the stucco to avoid retaining water.

FINDING FACTS

Ms. Davis moved that, based on the evidence presented in the application, the Board finds the facts in the Staff's report.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Allen and approved unanimously.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Ms. Davis moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, the changes to the north façade at 157 Dauphin Street would not impair the architectural and historic character of the property or the district, and a Certificate of Appropriateness should be granted.

Ms. Van Antwerp seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

ADDRESS	221 S Dearborn Street	APPLICATION NO.	2023-22-CA
SUMMARY OF REQUEST	Install 75” tall wall/fence at southeast corner of property		
APPLICANT	Tony Jones	OWNER, IF OTHER	

HISTORIC DISTRICT	Church Street East	MEETING DATE	4/19/2023
CLASSIFICATION	Non-contributing	REVIEWER	A. Allen

DISTRICT/PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

Church Street East Historic District was initially listed in the National Register in 1971 under Criteria A (historic significance) and C (architectural significance) for its local significance in the areas of architecture, education, and urban planning. The district is significant for its concentration of multiple 19th century architectural styles and because it encompasses the site of Mobile in the early 1700s. The district boundaries were expanded in 1984 and 2005.

The current structure at 221 S Dearborn Street was constructed in 1998. Prior to its construction the lot had been vacant. The property appears on the 1891 Sanborn map comprising 561 and 559 Eslava Street and 408 Canal Street. A one and one-half frame structure sits on the western portion of the current property and is labeled as a grocery. To the east of the grocery is a long narrow frame structure which faces Eslava Street and is denoted at a “shanty”. The subsequent 1904 Sanborn survey shows that the grocery has been replaced with a frame double shotgun style structure with a porch spanning the façade. The street numbers have changed to 251 and 253 S Dearborn Street. The shanty structure is still extant but has been incorporated into its own lot denoted on the map as “J Eslava Street”. By the time of the 1955 overlay, 251 and 253 S Dearborn are still extant but the shanty facing Eslava Street has been demolished and the land incorporated into a lot to the east. According to aerial photography, the double house remained extant until 1967 but the lots appear vacant in the subsequent aerial photo from 1980 and remain vacant until the current property’s construction in 1998 on the present 221 S Dearborn.

According the MHDC vertical files, this property has appeared before the Architectural Review Board (ARB) seven (7) times. In 1996, A Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) was granted to construct a new residence with carport and storage unit, in addition to a wood fence and stuccoed wall. In 1997 conceptual approval was granted for construction of a two-story brick home. In 2005, approval was granted to construct a stuccoed block wall along the property line as well as a wood fence. A COA was issued in 2009 for the construction of a garage and extend the existing wall. Later in 2009 a COA was issued for the construction of a second story addition. In 2014, this COA was reissued. In 2020, a COA was issued for the construction of a one and one-half story garage, paved driveway, motor court, extension of the stuccoed block wall, and the installation of an iron gate.

SCOPE OF WORK (per submitted application, plans, and correspondence)

1. Install a 75” tall wall/fence to run along the eastern end of the south property line.
 - a. The structure would be a combination of a 30” stuccoed block wall topped by a 45” high wrought iron fence.

- b. The wall/fence would measure approximately 24' long in total and be -comprised of two (2) 10' segments of wrought iron fencing, each of which would sit above the block wall in sections created by two 8' end columns (one which is existing) and one center column, all of which would be of block topped with pyramidal concrete caps.

STAFF REPORT

A. Applicable standards from the *Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts (Guidelines)*:

1. **10.2** Design a fence to be compatible with the architectural style of the house and existing fences in the neighborhood.
 - Design a fence located behind the front building plane to not exceed 72" in height. If the subject property abuts a multi-family residential or commercial property, a fence up to 96" will be considered.
 - An alternative fence material with proven durability, matte finish and an accurate scale and proportion of components is acceptable. A simple wood and-wire fence is acceptable provided it is appropriate to the style of the house.
2. **10.3** Design a wall to be compatible with the architectural style of the house and existing walls in the district.
 - When building a solid wall, use a finish and material that is similar in texture, mass and durability to historic walls in the neighborhood.

ACCEPTABLE FENCE MATERIALS Materials that have a similar character, durability and finish to those of fences of historic properties in the district are acceptable.

These often include:

 - Wood picket
 - Wood slat
 - Wood lattice
 - Iron or steel»
 - Historically appropriate wire fences
 - Aluminum that appears similar to iron

UNACCEPTABLE FENCE MATERIALS Materials that do not have a similar character, durability and finish to those of fences of historic properties in the district are unacceptable.

These often include:

 - Chain link
 - Stockade
 - Post and rail
 - Masonite
 - PVC
 - Plywood or asbestos paneling
 - Razor wire
 - Barbed wire

ACCEPTABLE WALL MATERIALS Materials that have a similar character, durability and finish to those of fences of historic properties in the district are acceptable.

These often include:

 - Brick
 - Stone
 - Stucco over masonry

UNACCEPTABLE WALL MATERIALS Materials that do not have a similar character, durability and finish to those of fences of historic properties in the district are unacceptable.

These often include:

- Unstuccoed concrete block

B. Staff Analysis

The application proposes the construction of a fence/wall along a portion of the south property line at 221 S. Dearborn Street. The house at 221 S. Dearborn is a non-contributing structure. The design of the proposed fence/wall combination is compatible with the design of the house and would abut a block wall extant on the property. According to the *Guidelines*, iron and stuccoed block are accepted and compatible fencing and wall materials for Mobile's historic districts. (A.1-2)

The proposed structure does exceed the 72" height restriction placed on rear and non-corner side fences by the *Guidelines*. However, the proposed height of 75" will match the height of existing walls on the lot. (A.1) An existing 8' stuccoed block perimeter wall was approved by the ARB in 2005. In addition, a Certificate of Appropriateness was granted in May of 2020 to extend a portion of that existing wall eastward along the southern property line. The proposed design would abut the end portion of the existing wall on the southeast corner of the lot and run 24' westward. A gap in the wall structure along the south property would leave room for the curb cut into the driveway and for a previously approved 4' wide gate set at an angle between the wall and the garage.

In consideration of this application, it should be noted that the subject property is located on the southern edge of the Church Street East Historic District (which is bound by Canal Street on the south). Also, not only is this property non-contributing and non-historic, adjacent buildings to the east and west are as well.

C. Summary of Analysis

- 221 S Dearborn is a non-contributing property within the Church Street East Historic District, as are the adjacent properties to the east and west.
- The proposed wall/fence structure is compatible with the architectural style of the house and with the existing concrete wall on the property.
- The proposed design exceeds the 72" height limit mandated by the *Guidelines* but will match the height of the previously approved block wall extant at the property.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on Section B above, Staff believes the proposed construction, of an iron fence and stuccoed concrete block wall structure at 221 S. Dearborn Street would not impair the architectural or historic character of the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Tony Jones was present to discuss the application. He stated that he had nothing to add.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Allen asked if the design comprised a block wall topped by an iron fence. Mr. Jones replied that this was correct.

Mr. Allen asked what measurement was 75". Mr. Jones replied that the extant masonry column with the cap measures 75" and this would match the height of the proposed new column on the opposite end.

Ms. Maurin asked if there are any photos of this design on the property. Ms. Dawson replied that this particular design does not currently exist on the property.

Mr. Jones stated that the fence material matches that of the residence's second story balcony balustrade.

Ms. Davis asked why there are two site plans in the report. Ms. Dawson explained that the first site plan shows the property without the proposed wall/fence, and the second demonstrates in red coloring the location of the proposed structure.

Ms. Maurin asked if the site plan shows the extant column that the proposed plan is attempting to match. Ms. Dawson stated that it does and pointed out said column on the plan.

FINDING FACTS

Mr. Rodrigues moved that, based on the evidence presented in the application, the Board finds the facts in the Staff's report.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Allen, and it was approved unanimously.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Ms. Davis moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, the construction of a 75" high wall/fence at the southeast corner of the property at 221 S. Dearborn Street would not impair the architectural and historic character of the surrounding district, and a Certificate of Appropriateness should be granted.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Rodrigues and it was approved unanimously.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

The Board agreed that Ms. Dawson would schedule a meeting with the Design Review Committee to finalize discussions and coordinate a presentation concerning changes to the existing guidelines regarding windows.

The Board requested a meeting be coordinated with Mr. Bruce McGowin in order for Board members to be informed and updated on the current proposed changes to the city's historic preservation ordinance.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:35pm.

