

## ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES

August 20, 2008 – 3:00 P.M.

Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

### A. CALL TO ORDER – Chair

The meeting was called to order by the chair Tilmon Brown at 3:05.

The Introductory Statement was read by the staff.

The members present were Tilmon Brown, Tom Karwinski, Harris Oswalt, Bunky Ralph, Craig Roberts, and Barja Wilson.

Staff present was: Devereaux Bemis; John Lawler; and Gabriel Jones (Intern).

The Minutes of the previous meeting were approved as posted per a motion of Bunky Ralph.

The Mid-Month Requests were approved as submitted per a motion of Bunky Ralph.

### B. MID-MONTH APPROVALS

1. **Applicant's Name:** ARLO Investments  
**Property Address:** 1057 Selma St.  
**Date of Approval:** July 16, 2008

Repair roof, reconstructing framing as needed; repair fascia and eaves. All repairs to match the original in profile, dimension, material and pitch.

2. **Applicant's Name:** Bryce Logan  
**Property Address:** 1261 Selma Street  
**Date of Approval:** July 22, 2008

Paint the house in the current color scheme Sherwin Williams Duration paint:

Body – white

Trim and shutters – dark green

3. **Applicant's Name:** Wanda Cochran  
**Property Address:** 202 State Street  
**Date of Approval:** July 23, 2008

Resurface existing driveway with concrete scored according to submitted plans.

4. **Applicant's Name:** Clifford Peterson/Jean Buckner  
**Property Address:** 1221 Elmira Street  
**Date of Approval:** July 28, 2008

Replace roofing on porch with new materials to match existing in profile, dimension and material/color.

5. **Applicant's Name:** Jean Lankford  
**Property Address:** 356 Dauphin Street  
**Date of Approval:** July 31, 2008

Repaint building in existing color scheme or a shade lighter.

6. **Applicant's Name:** Maura Garina  
**Property Address:** 301 Government St.  
**Date of Approval:** August 1, 2008

Repair damaged fence with materials to match existing in profile, dimension, material and color.

7. **Applicant's Name:** Southeastern Construction & Painting  
**Property Address:** 118 Bush Avenue  
**Date of Approval:** August 4, 2008

Install new roof, 3 tab shingles, grey in color.

8. **Applicant's Name:** John Edward Walters  
**Property Address:** 310 S. Monterey Street  
**Date of Approval:** August 4, 2008

Replace rotten wood siding as necessary with new materials to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Re-paint building. Colors to be submitted at a later date.

9. **Applicant's Name:** Ellen Sheffield  
**Property Address:** 58 Lee Street  
**Date of Approval:** August 5, 2008

Paint house in existing color scheme.

10. **Applicant's Name:** Thomas Roofing Co.  
**Property Address:** 111 LeVert Avenue  
**Date of Approval:** August 7, 2008

Repair roof on front porch and upper French Tile slope. Repairs to match existing in profile, dimension, color and materials.

11. **Applicant's Name:** Maura Garino  
**Property Address:** 1321 Dauphin Street  
**Date of Approval:** August 7, 2008

Repaint house in the existing color scheme.

12. **Applicant's Name:** Kiel Home Renovations  
**Property Address:** 110 Bradford Avenue  
**Date of Approval:** August 7, 2008

Install new roof using GAF timberline shingles charcoal black in color.

### C. OLD BUSINESS

1. **104-08-CA:** 453 Dauphin  
**Applicant:** Douglas Kearley for Luke Fondren  
**Request:** Install Iron gallery & garde de frise to match that approved for next door. Remove center 2 windows & install a pair of French doors with transoms. Western most center window to be a window and jib door. Repair windows, stucco, etc. Install new dimensional fiberglass shingles, repair parapets. Install new gutter & downspouts. Install new Kynar finished aluminum

storefront and stucco masonry bulkhead. Install new wood door to second floor stairs.

**Approved as amended. Certified Record attached.**

2. **105-08-CA:** 106 Levert

**Applicant:** Pete J. Vallas for Mr. & Mrs. Banks Ladd

**Request:** Additions & alterations to include interior remodeling of the kitchen and laundry rooms and living areas. Adding a rear porch to the south of the existing garage and new living area; adding two bedrooms on a partial second floor at the rear above the existing garage and new living area; replacing the existing entry door and flanking French doors (which are shorter than the head height of the existing windows and in poor condition) with three matching taller French doors to align with head height of existing windows and to match the existing French doors but taller; add brick soldier courses to all existing and new openings.

**Held over at owner's request. Referred to Design Committee.**

3. **106-08-CA:** 159 & 161 Dauphin St.

**Applicant:** Ben Cummings for Sean Coley

**Request:** Adaptations to the original proposal include addition of lights above the right balcony to replace the proposed stucco band; removal of the top awning and balcony on the left; addition of a cornice above the left entrance and incorporating the existing marble panel into the façade on the left.

**Approved with conditions. Certified Record attached.**

4. **107-08-CA:** 102 Levert Ave.

**Applicant:** Mr. & Mrs. English Parks Moore

**Request:** Request to alter the windows and roofing materials previously approved.

**Approved as amended. Certified Record attached.**

**D. NEW BUSINESS**

1. **108-08-CA:** 312 McDonald Avenue

**Applicant:** William E. Clarke

**Request:** Replace old shed.

**Tabled for 60 days at the owners' request.**

2. **109-08-CA:** 1650 Dauphin Street

**Applicant:** Mr. & Mrs. T. Clarke

**Request:** Construct a 5 x 8 addition on rear.

**Approved. Certified Record attached.**

3. **110-08-CA:** 112 Government Street/62 S. Royal

**Applicant:** Mike Cowart for Windwood Mobile, LLC

**Request:** Install lighting in the parking lot.

**Approved as amended. Certified Record attached.**

4. **111-08-CA:** 1507Springhill Avenue  
**Applicant:** Neon Zone for Marvin Hewatt Ent.  
**Request:** Install signage.  
**WITHDRAWN**

5. **112-08-CA:** 61 S. Ann  
**Applicant:** Hoang Bui for Linda La  
**Request:** Install Grassy Pavers in front yard.  
**Denied. Certified Record attached.**

#### **E. OTHER BUSINESS and ANNOUNCEMENTS**

1. Guidelines: Guidelines Review Status:  
Tilmon suggested the Board review guidelines first, through e-mail exchange, and later, after a scheduled architectural review board meeting. Craig suggested a retreat to discuss ideas, review the current literature, and also to revise anything as needed. The Board agreed on creating a guidelines review retreat. Bunky suggested the Arts Council Building as meeting area; Harris suggested the Mobile Gas Company.
2. Luncheons: The Board felt the luncheons had a positive effect and they will be continued.
3. Retreat: The Board felt the Retreat had been very helpful and agreed it should be done regularly.

Staff brought up a concern about 404 Chatham. Bemis received a call the day before from the Councilman Carroll who wanted to know why it was not on the agenda for today. Bemis replied that nothing had been received until the day before and it had missed the deadline to be on the agenda by two weeks. Bemis went by the property that morning and noted that the work had already been done. It will be on the September 3 agenda.

106 Levert Design Review Committee: Harris Oswalt asked about scheduling the design review committee meeting for the application of 106 Levert (Mr. & Mrs. Banks Ladd). The Board agreed on 2:30 pm, Wednesday, August 27, 2008.

#### **F. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 5:45.

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

**104-08-CA:** 453 Dauphin  
**Applicant:** Douglas Kearley for Luke Fondren  
**Received:** 06/25/08  
**Meeting:** 08/20/08

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Lower Dauphin Street  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Renovate the façade installing a new cast iron balcony. Two upper windows to be converted to doorways; install new storefront system; install new downspouts and roof.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This is a typical downtown two story storefront, built in 1855. It is the right half of a building that has received approval for this same types of work.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the 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 district...”

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. This is one of a number of two story storefronts along and near Dauphin. It has gone through numerous changes during its existence. It consists primarily of a first floor storefront with stairway door that leads to the second floor.
- B. The guidelines state, “...a new more compatible [storefront] design mat be introduced....a balcony or gallery appropriate to the age and character of the building may be added.”
- C. The applicant is proposing to have the front match the front of 451 Dauphin approved by the Board.
  - 1. Install Iron gallery & garde de frise to match that approved for next door.
  - 2. Remove center 2 windows & install a pair of French doors with transoms. Western most center window to be a window and jib door.
  - 3. Repair windows, stucco, etc.
  - 4. Install new dimensional fiberglass shingles, repair parapets.
  - 5. Install new gutter & downspouts.
  - 6. Install new Kynar finished aluminum storefront and stucco masonry bulkhead.
  - 7. Install new wood door to second floor stairs.

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

This contributing building is one of several like it in the area. Though no balcony currently exists, the Board often approves them as something unique to downtown. The new storefront is acceptable in design (though staff is not familiar with Kynar). The alterations to the upper floor are necessitated by the installation of the proposed balcony. Staff recommends approval.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Douglas Kearley & Luke Fondren were present to discuss the application. Mr. Fondren does not own the building next door, but he is using the same architect so the two buildings will be

similar. From questions by the Board it was determined that the door front will be white and the shutters will be wood.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussion occurred concurrently with the beginning of the public hearing when details of the plan were worked out.

### **FINDING OF FACT**

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion the Board finds the facts in the Staff report adding fact "8. The shutters will be wood." The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

### **Decision on the Application**

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the facts amended and found by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 8/20/09.**

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

**105-08-CA:** 106 Levert  
**Applicant:** Pete Vallas for Mr. & Mrs. Banks Ladd  
**Received:** 06/25/08  
**Meeting:** 08/06/08

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Ashland Place  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Adding a rear porch to the south of the existing garage and new living area; adding two bedrooms on a partial second floor at the rear above the existing garage and new living area; replacing the existing entry door and flanking French doors (which are shorter than the head height of the existing windows and in poor condition) with three matching taller French doors to align with head height of existing windows and to match the existing French doors but taller; add brick soldier courses to all existing and new openings.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This is a modest, one story double gabled house with front inset porch built in 1936 for Mrs. S. O. Starke.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the 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 district...”

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. This is one of the smaller houses in Ashland Place built with six rooms and two baths according to the original building permit. The building presents two gables to the front with an inset porch and a low hip over the main portion of the house. A series of hips and gables cover the rear rooms. This originally appeared on the August 6 agenda. Following a denial vote, the applicants objected that they had not had adequate time to prepare a rebuttal for the staff report. At the applicants request, the vote was withdrawn and a rehearing was scheduled for this meeting.

- B. The guidelines state,  
**“A roof is one of the most dominant features of a building. Original or historic roof forms, as well as the original pitch of the roof should be maintained. Materials should be appropriate to the form and pitch and color....**

*The exterior material of a building helps define its style, quality and historic period....* **Often one of the most important decorative features of a house, doorways reflect the age and style of a building. Original doors and openings should be retained along with any moldings, transoms or sidelights....**

*The type, size and dividing lights of windows and their location and configuration (rhythm) on the building help establish the historic character of a building. Original window openings should be retained as well as original window sashes and glazing.* The Secretary of the Interior standards state:

- 1. Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.
- 2. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated

- from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.
3. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.
- C. The applicant is proposing to expand the connector from the house to the garage with a two-story addition and create a rear porch; also enlarge the garage to two stories.
- a. There will be a rear porch to the south of the garage and at the back of the house.
  - b. The connector will expand to the south the distance to the wall of the house.
  - c. The connector will bump out closer to the front of the house.
  - d. Windows along the south wall will be altered from double windows to small single windows. Soldier courses will be installed over the windows and the decorative shutters will be removed.
  - e. Soldier courses will be added over the windows and doors of the front.
  - f. The main double French door will be replaced.
  - g. The south side elevation will remain except where the connector, garage and porch will be altered or added.
  - h. The rear elevation will be altered with the porch, garage and connector.
  - i. The rear door will be altered and relocated.
  - j. Major alterations will occur with the addition of a second story to the connector and the garage.
  - k. The two story additions will be under cross-hipped roofs that step up from the original roofline.
  - l. Inset shed roof dormers will be placed on the south and east elevations.
  - m. Inset shed roof dormers will be placed on the north side elevation with a double windowed oriel under an extension of the main roof,
  - n. The oriel would appear to be made of lapped siding.
  - o. The dormers will be roofed with metal.
  - p. Soldier courses will be placed over all windows and doors
  - q. Rowlock sills for all windows
  - r. All new materials will match the historic materials; the oriel and parts of the dormers will be wood.
  - s. The fireplace will not be built.
  - t. Roofing materials will be Timberline

## STAFF ANALYSIS

This contributing building is one of the modest structures in Ashland Place built just prior to World War II. As a later house built during the depression the original owners maintained a simplicity appropriate to the times.

The current owners wish to create more living space by raising the rear roofs. The Board allows this provided the new roofs are not higher than the original or at least do not appear higher than the original roof. Though the new roof will be hidden by the front gable, when viewed straight on it will be visible when viewed from either side. There are no dimensions on the plans but new roofs appear to be quite a bit higher than the original roof.

Dormers generally have the same roofs as the main building. Though this is by no means a given, introducing a metal, shed roof on the addition adds to the disconnect between the historic building and the new addition. The placement of wood on the oriel also introduces a new finish that does not blend with the historic structure or the new addition.

The massive addition on the north completely alters that elevation. A less extreme alteration to the two kitchen windows would be desirable. Staff sees no objection to the soldier courses in the addition. However, introducing the soldier courses to the original house creates a false history and embellishes a



building that did not originally have such. The replacement of the front door not only changes the current type of door but also replaces the molding around the door. Staff sees no objection to the rear porch since the Board normally approves expansion or rear porches provided they do not impair the integrity of the house or the neighborhood.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Mr. Banks Ladd was present to discuss the application. He stated that they were working with the architect to address some of the concerns of the Board expressed at the previous meeting. However, they had not had sufficient time to finalize a plan.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

It was discussed and the Board offered to establish a Design Review Committee to meet with the Ladds and their architect Pete Vallas. Mr. Ladd agreed to the plan and a committee would be established and the Ladds would be contacted.

### **FINDING OF FACT**

There was no finding of fact.

### **Decision on the Application**

The Chair appointed a committee of Barja Wilson, Tom Karwinski and Bunky Ralph to meet with the Ladds to assist in a design. The application was held over.

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

**106-08-CA:** 159 & 161 Dauphin St.  
**Applicant:** Ben Cummings for Sean Coley.  
**Received:** 07/18/08  
**Meeting:** 08/20/08

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Lower Dauphin St.  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** B-4  
**Project:** To maintain the buildings as constructed.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

The building may date back to the 1860, but has been remodeled several times. In September of 2007 the applicants requested the alteration of the front, which was approved by the ARB. Recently, the work on the building was completed and upon inspection, it was determined by staff that the built design was significantly different from what was approved. A temporary Certificate of Occupancy was granted and the owners made application to the ARB for approval of what was built. This was originally scheduled to be heard at the August 6 meeting, but at the request of the owners it was held over so they could have a chance to more adequately respond to the staff report which was late in being posted on the web.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the 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 district...”

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. These are two buildings located on Dauphin Street facing Bienville Square. When the work began the ground floors had modern storefronts and the upper floors were plain stucco with expansion joints and a narrow band at the cornice.
- B. The guidelines state, “All exterior work ... must be submitted to the ... Review Board in order to receive a building permit.”
- C. The applicant is requesting to maintain the buildings as constructed, which do not match the previously approved plans.
  1. 159 Dauphin Street
    - a. The first floor originally had three bays consisting of double, multi-paned and paneled door with four light transoms above. A cast iron gallery on tall post utilized a picket and circle design. Two pairs of individually roofed, French doors opened onto the second story balcony.
    - b. The first floor used a traditional treatment of recessed doors flanking centered, extended display windows. The display area has wide, short, single light transoms, while the doors have large square transoms. A marble art deco panel and sill were discovered on the second floor during the renovation. These were uncovered and left exposed while the traditional French doors from the original design were used. The awnings over the doors were not installed. There was no balcony installed.
  2. 161 Dauphin Street.
    - a. The original design for the first floor had two recessed doors flanking a centered, extended, triple bay display window with short four light ransoms above and bead board panels below. The 2/3 glass doors had large 3/1 transoms. A cantilevered balcony with wrought pickets was at the second floor with three sets of paired French

doors surmounted by a decorative lintel. There was to be an investigation into the condition of the bricks.

- b. The first floor uses a three bay, double French door façade with the far right bay recessed and operable. Large, square transoms surmount the door. A supported, picket and circle balcony covers almost the full width of the building. Three bays of double French doors allow access to the balcony and are surmounted by paneled lintels. Three goose necked lights are centered over each bay.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

Basically elements of the two buildings have been switched with a few alterations. Since the Board was precluded from reviewing the plans beforehand, it is difficult to determine what might have been approved in plan that now may seem inappropriate once done. Staff sees two areas of concern.

On 159 the marble panel has an Art Deco appearance and the traditional French doors now seem out of place. However, the switching of the balconies to the more curvilinear balustrade might provide a solution and blend better than the more traditional supported balcony. Using a canvas awning, as originally proposed but with a 1930s style, might help the French doors blend better with the marble panel and elongate them so they are not underscaled. Alternately, different windows to be more in character with the marble panels might provide a workable solution. In any case, the use of French doors on the second floor is completely out of context without a balcony. Staff suggests the balcony be installed or more modern windows.

On 161 the removal of the stucco on the second floor exposed an unattractive brick front with very roughly laid bricks. It is probable that this brick was never meant to be seen, and the stucco finish would have been more appropriate. Also, the loss of the stucco resulted in the loss of the cornice line. The addition of the lights appears acceptable but the drawing shows three lights and there are only two.

Staff believes that had the Board had an opportunity to comment on the second floor of 159 Dauphin a different design solution may have been considered in light of the exposed marble panel. Staff does believe the exposed brick and lack of cornice give 161 Dauphin an unfinished appearance and suggests that the upper floor be stuccoed and a cornice similar to the band at 159 be installed.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Mr. Sean Coley and Mr. Ben Cummings were present to discuss the application. Mr. Coley explained that he and his sister had inherited the buildings. He stated it was in poor condition when they purchased it and decided to invest in the buildings as part of their civic duty. Currently he had only one tenant and they were reluctant to spend more money until they were sure they would be able to rent the other spaces.

They also explained that the decision to keep the marble was made when it was discovered and at that time the plan to switch the facades was decided. They believe the brick is attractive and that was the reason they decided to expose it.

Board members asked why the 2nd floor doors were not straight across but canted inward. They were told the French doors followed the line of the existing marble sill. A Board members suggested that an iron grill be placed in the doorways.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussed the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor of 159. There was discussion about the modern looking marble and the traditional French doors. There was general agreement that the use of a more modern appearance to the French doors would be an appropriate design solution.

There was general agreement that the modern aesthetic of the rough brick at 161 was acceptable. However, there was still some concern about the lack of a cornice.

## **FINDING OF FACT**

Jim Wagoner moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion the Board finds the facts in the Staff report amending fact 2Cb to indicate there are two goose necked lights. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

### **Decision on the Application**

Harris Oswald moved that, based upon the facts amended and found by the Board, that the application does impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued with the conditions: the mullions & muntins be removed from the 2<sup>nd</sup> story French doors at 159 Dauphin and replaced with a single pane of glass; and that a cornice be installed at 161 Dauphin that matches the cornice at 159. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 8/20/09.**

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

**107-08-CA:** 102 LeVert Avenue  
**Applicant:** Mr. & Mrs. English Parks Moore  
**Received:** 06/14/08  
**Meeting:** 07/02/08

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Ashland Place  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Install wood windows to replace the steel casements and alter the roofing material to a synthetic shingle.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

The house was built by Russell C. English in 1928.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the 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 district...”

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. In 2006 the sunroom on the east side was removed by a previous owner. The Board approved repairs to the house from the damage caused by that removal. A year later the Board approved the demolition and removal of a non-historic shed and greenhouse for an in-ground swimming pool. There was also an approval for a new stone walk in the front yard and a new wood shadowbox privacy fence: removal of the existing rubble wall and construction of a fence ranging from 7 to 8 feet with stone posts and wood posts. The fence was never built. In July the Board approved the addition of a wing. As part of that condition, the owners were to match the roof and windows.
- B. The Guidelines state, “The type, size and dividing lights of windows and their location and configuration (rhythm) on the building help establish the historic character of a building. Original window openings should be retained as well as original window sashes and glazing. Where windows cannot be repaired, new windows must be compatible to the existing. The size and placement of new windows for additions or alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.”...” A roof is one of the most dominant features of a building. Original or historic roof forms, as well as the original pitch of the roof should be maintained. Materials should be appropriate to the form and pitch and color.”
- C. Install wood casement windows and synthetic roofing.
  - 1. The original windows are steel casements with fixed panes.
  - 2. The steel casements present a flat exterior.
  - 3. The proposed windows are double paned wood windows.
  - 4. The windows will be set in the stucco and stone walls.
  - 5. The roof is a true slate.
  - 6. The request is for a synthetic shingle that blends with the existing roof.

## STAFF ANALYSIS

The Board has approved the addition to the building. The proposed windows are double paned wood windows that are considered inappropriate for replacement of true divided light wood windows. In this case, the profile of the windows is much thicker than the original steel casements. These double paned insulated windows are neither the materials nor the profiles of the existing. Though not generally allowed in the historic district, the use of a single thickness aluminum or vinyl window painted black might better approximate the original design of the steel windows. The use of an interior storm could give the owners the desired energy efficiency.

The Board has approved the use of synthetic shingles in other cases. This would appear to be a good substitute for the slate. However, the applicants should be warned there have been problems reported with some of the new synthetics.

## PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. & Mrs. Moore were present to discuss the application. She noted that the windows would be over \$5,000 each to replace.

## BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the roof and noted it was asbestos shingle. Craig Roberts noted that the Slate Line shingle in black would also work for their house. It was pointed out that the replacement windows would be placed on the addition and they would help differentiate from the original house.

## FINDING OF FACT

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion the Board finds the facts in the Staff report amending fact C5 to indicate the original roof was asphalt shingle. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

## Decision on the Application

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the facts amended and found by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Staff noted the proposed shingle was Certainteed Grand Manor thought the Board would also accept Slate Line

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 8/20/09.**

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

**108-08-CA:** 312 McDonald  
**Applicant:** William E. Clarke  
**Received:** 08/01/08  
**Meeting:** 08/20/08

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Leinkauf  
**Classification:** Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Request to retain a vinyl shed already installed.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

The house was built around 1914 for Clarence Dumas.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the 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 district...”

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. Following a complaint, a Notice of Violation was issued on June 27 for a utility shed in the back yard.
- B. The Guidelines state, “The appropriateness of accessory structures shall be measured by the guidelines applicable to new construction. The structure should complement the design and scale of the main building. “
- C. The applicant is proposing to retain a shed.
  - 1. The shed appears to be made of vinyl.
  - 2. The shed appears to be too close to the property line.

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

The building does not meet the requirements of the ARB for materials or the UDD for setbacks. Since the owner is preparing plans for a replacement, staff suggests that the owner be given a deadline to have the shed removed.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

William and Betty were present to discuss the application. They stated their previous application had collapsed and he replaced it without realizing he need permission. He would like to replace the vinyl exterior with wood and will bring back a plan.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussed the application and offered the stock MHDC storage shed plans as a guide for his proposed work.

**FINDING OF FACT**

There was no finding of fact.

### **Decision on the Application**

Bunky Ralph moved that, the application be tabled for 60 days by which time the owners should have a new plan submitted. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.



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

**109-08-CA:** 1650 Dauphin Street  
**Applicant:** Mr. & Mrs. T. Clarke  
**Received:** 08/04/08  
**Meeting:** 08/20/08

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way  
**Classification:** Non-Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Construct a 5 x 8 addition on the rear elevation.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

The house is one of the few ranch houses in the ODW area on Dauphin Street. It sits on the corner of N. Monterey and was apparently built in the late 1950s.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the 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 district...”

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. The house is non-contributing but sits at the entranceway to North Monterey Street.
- B. The guidelines state, “Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.”
- C. The applicant is proposing to extend a rear wing.
  - 1. The building is a yellow brick gable to the side, with two intersecting wings on the rear.
  - 2. A garage attaches to the rear east wing.
  - 3. A deck with inset porch is located between the two rear wings.
  - 4. A hipped roof will tie into the other roofs.
  - 5. All materials and details are to match the original as closely as possible.
- D. Clarifications
  - a. What are the materials?

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

Generally an addition is preferred to be on the rear. This small addition is nestled within existing building planes. The design matches and respects the original design of the house. If the Board is satisfied with the materials, staff sees no objection to the addition.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Nodar Gvishnivili was present to discuss the application. He said he could find brick that match the color of the original but not the size. He would use the mortar to achieve as cohesive a look as possible. The windows will match the existing.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussion occurred concurrently with the beginning of the public hearing when details of the plan were worked out.

## **FINDING OF FACT**

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

## **Decision on the Application**

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 8/20/09.**

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

**110-08-CA:** 112 Government Street/62 S. Royal  
**Applicant:** WRICO Signs for Hampton Inn and Suites  
**Received:** 08/04/08  
**Meeting:** 08/20/08

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Church Street East  
**Classification:** Non-Contributing  
**Zoning:** B-4  
**Project:** Install lighting for the parking lot, the sign and a color for the Veet's common wall.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This is the parking lot for the Hampton Inn. The lot sits on the corner of Government and Royal and is a separate lot of record from the hotel.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states "the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the 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 district..."

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. There will be three metal halide lights on concrete poles placed in the parking lot.
- B. The guidelines state, "...where lighting impacts the exterior appearance of a building or of the district in which the building is located, it shall be reviewed for appropriateness as any other element."
- C. The applicant is proposing to install lighting and paint Veets.
  - 1. There will be three lights installed in the parking lot and one on the ground for the sign.
  - 2. They will be metal halide high pressure sodium compact fluorescent lights.
  - 3. Specifications for the lighting are enclosed.
  - 4. Poles will be 30 feet tall and concrete.
  - 5. The main body of the walls at Veets will be BLP Charles Street Brick.
  - 6. The north and west walls of Veet's will be painted.
- D. Clarifications
  - 1. What color will the pole be painted
  - 2. What color will the light housing be?

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

Staff sees no problem with the application if the Board is satisfied with the design of the pole and light. The color would appear to be appropriate to the building.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Mike Cowart was present to discuss the application. The fixtures will be bronze in color. There was some concern about the height of the lights. Mr. Cowart explained there would be a trade-off of size versus number of lights. He stated the poles would be metal and the poles and houses would be bronze in color.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussed the number versus height and agreed that the height would be less objectionable than a proliferation of parking lot lighting.

## **FINDING OF FACT**

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion the Board finds the facts in the Staff report amending fact C4. to indicate the poles will be metal and adding fact C7 that the lights would be bronze with bronze poles. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

## **Decision on the Application**

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the facts as amended and found by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 8/20/09.**

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

**111-08-CA:** 1507 Springhill  
**Applicant:** Neon Zone for Marvin Hewatt Ent.  
**Received:** 08/04/08  
**Meeting:** 08/20/08

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way  
**Classification:** Non-Contributing  
**Zoning:** B-2  
**Project:** Install three signs.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This is a new gas station, convenience store and rental retail property.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the 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 district...”

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. The applicants presented a sign package at an earlier meeting that exceeded the allowable signage.
- B. The guidelines state, “For buildings without a recognizable style, the sign shall adopt the decorative features of the building, utilizing the same materials and colors.”
- C. The applicant is proposing to install three signs.
  - 1. A wall sign of red, acrylic letters with aluminum returns and bronze jewelite trim. No illumination. It will be 22’3” x 2’6” for a total of 55.625 sq. ft.
  - 2. Install canopy signage of red neon aluminum letters with aluminum returns and 1” black jewelite trim. It will be 8’ 11” x 18” for a total of 13.4 sq. feet. No illumination.
  - 3. Install a 7 x 3.5 monument sign on a brick base 1.5 feet high (49 sq. ft.), made of plastic and aluminum. It will be illuminated with ground based lights.

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

There is a maximum of 64 square feet of signage per building. However, the Board can allow up to 64 sq. ft. per tenant. Using this formula, the signs are within the allowable signage. Provided the Board is satisfied with the materials and the design, the staff sees no objection to the application.

**WITHDRAWN**

The application was placed on the agenda in error.

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

**112-08-CA:** 61 S. Ann  
**Applicant:** Hoang Bui for Linda La  
**Received:** 08/6/08  
**Meeting:** 08/20/08

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way  
**Classification:** Non-Contributing  
**Zoning:** R-1  
**Project:** Install Grassy Pavers in the front yard.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

Thought the house is old enough to be considered contributing, the changes made to the front are severe enough for the house to be considered non-contributing.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the 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 district...”

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. This home is located on S Ann Street across from the N end of the Greek Orthodox Church property. The Board considered a request for a pergola approximately one year ago.
- B. The guidelines state, “Modern paving materials are acceptable in the historic districts. However, it is important that the design, location and materials be compatible with the property.”
- C. The applicant is proposing to install Grassy Pavers in the front yard.
  - 1. Grassy Pavers are a reinforced high density Polyethylene material designed for traffic areas.
  - 2. They are suitable for driveways and parking lots among other applications.
  - 3. They are designed to allow grass to grow and water to penetrate the soil.
  - 4. The Board has encouraged this type of material in commercial lots but has never considered it in a residential setting.
  - 5. The size of the proposed area to be Grassy Paved is not delineated but it would be a substantial portion of the north half of the front yard.
- D. Clarifications
  - a. What is the size of the area?

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

Though this is a non-contributing building it sits on a major traffic corridor in the historic district. This would be a very acceptable material in the front of a commercial establishment but staff is concerned that this would create a parking lot in front of the house. Generally, parking is not allowed in the front yards of residences in the historic districts.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Mr. Hoang Bui was present to discuss the application. He stated that they just wanted to have the area to turn around in and that no one parked there. The letter from the neighbor was distributed to the Board

that said the front yard was used for parking and she objected to the application. The applicant said the front yard was only used for parking by guests.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussed the application. It was suggested that this was simply a way to grow grass while another pointed out that the literature for the product noted parking lots as a use. It was determined that if this product were a hard surface the Board would deny it outright.

### **FINDING OF FACT**

Harris Oswald moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

### **Decision on the Application**

Harris Oswald moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be denied. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Following the vote the applicant returned and asked if he could create a rock garden in the space. He was told he would need to make application to the Board with a design.