

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES

August 5, 2009 – 3:00 P.M.

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

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Jim Wagoner, called the meeting to order at 3:05. Gertrude Baker, Bill James, Tom Karwinski, Bradford Ladd, Harris Oswalt, Craig Roberts, and Janetta Whitt-Mitchell were in attendance.
2. Mr. Oswalt moved to approve the minutes of the July 15, 2009 meeting. The motion passed unanimously.
3. Mr. Karwinski moved to approve the mid month COAs granted by Staff as amended. The motion passed unanimously.

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED

1. **Applicant: Brandon Prichett**
 - a. Property Address: 17 McPhillips Ave.
 - b. Date of Approval: 07/14/09
 - c. Project: Remove shingles. Repair and replace roof decking. Reroof house with shingles to match existing.
2. **Applicant: Juanita Owens**
 - a. Property Address: 135 South Broad St.
 - b. Date of Approval: 07/10/09
 - c. Project: Reroof house with brown shingles.
3. **Applicant: Carolyn Eichold**
 - a. Property Address: 1219 Church St.
 - b. Date of Approval: 07/07/09
 - c. Project: Repaint, body Georgian Green, trim Lancaster Whitewash, shutters green, door barn red, porch battleship grey. Add new shutter to front window right of porch.
4. **Applicant: Charles McDonald**
 - a. Property Address: 66 North Monterey St.
 - b. Date of Approval: 07/06/09
 - c. Project: Reissue of 9 October 2007 COA. Repair and replace rotten wood as need including siding, trim, and any architectural details matching the existing in material, profile, and dimension. Repaint per existing color scheme. Repair and step up the foundation with materials to match the existing foundation..
5. **Applicant: Tony Axt**
 - a. Property Address: 1413 Eslava St.
 - b. Date of Approval: 07/06/09
 - Project: Install a six foot wood privacy fence left natural on east property line and continuing along the rear of the property to meet the existing fence on the west. The fence will begin approximately ten feet from the back corner of the house before extending to the rear of the property.
6. **Applicant: Society of 1842**
 - a. Property Address: 110 S. Claiborne St.
 - b. Date of Approval: 07/08/09
 - c. Project: Reroof as per existing; new copper flashing and guttering; repair and repaint cracked stucco; repair rotten wood and replace to match existing in profile and dimension; repair porch decking, shutters, and doors as needed; repoint brick using lime / sand mortar mixture. Remove vegetation from the exterior.
7. **Applicant: Charles Harris**

- a. Property Address: 1700 Church St.
 - b. Date of Approval: 07/13/09
 - c. Project: Repair and replace rotten wood siding as necessary to match existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repair screen as necessary.
- 8. Applicant: Senior Bowl**
- a. Property Address: 151 Dauphin St.
 - b. Date of Approval: 07/13/09
 - c. Project: Repair and replace built up roof using single ply roofing; modified roofing and shingle roofing. All work to be hidden by the parapet.
- 9. Applicant: Wendell Quimby**
- a. Property Address: 1111 Montauk Ave.
 - b. Date of Approval: 07/07/09
 - c. Project: Reroof with black, 3-tab asphalt shingles..
- 10. Applicant: Caroline Ward**
- a. Property Address: 111 Houston St.
 - b. Date of Approval: 07/16/09
 - c. Project: Reroof outbuilding with spare asbestos tiles to match existing, replace rotten siding on garage on main house as necessary to match existing material, profile and dimension. Replace rotten wood on shutters on rear garage. Install French drain around house.
- 11. Applicant: Lawrence Stacey**
- a. Property Address: 56 South Catherine St.
 - b. Date of Approval: 07/14/09
 - c. Project: Repair and replace porch decking on rear porch with tongue-and-groove to match existing. Repair and replace balustrade with MHDC stock railing.
- 12. Applicant: Michele Bryant**
- a. Property Address: 958 Old Shell Rd.
 - b. Date of Approval: 07/14/09
 - c. Project: Repaint per existing color scheme.
- 13. Applicant: Byron Cruthirds**
- a. Property Address: 306 Charles St.
 - b. Date of Approval: 07/21/09
 - c. Project: Repaint house per existing color scheme.
- 14. Applicant: Juanita Owens**
- a. Property Address: 1256 Old Shell Rd.
 - b. Date of Approval: 07/21/09
 - c. Project: Repair and replace rotten wood siding to match existing in profile and dimension. Repair and replace skirting to match existing. Paint body of house beige. Paint trim and ironwork charcoal. Replace missing window panes. Replace roof shingles to match existing. Temporarily secure back entrance by placing ply board over door.
- 15. Applicant: James King for Mrs. Alva H. Whiddon**
- a. Property Address: 557 Church St.
 - b. Date of Approval: 07/22/09
 - c. Project: Paint front porch columns white.
- 16. Applicant: Debra Pelt**
- a. Property Address: 107 N. Pine St.
 - b. Date of Approval: 07/22/09
 - c. Project: Repaint building the following Valspar color scheme. Body to be Montpelier Peach. Trim to be Sweet Sand.
- 17. Applicant: Marty Henken**
- a. Property Address: 111 S. Dearborn St.

- b. Date of Approval: 07/16/09
- c. Project: Update of a COA dated June 7, 2001. Install 6' privacy fence with finished cap around perimeter of property. Fence to begin at point east of existing Oak tree, running along north and east property line, and on the south creating a separation between carport and yard. Install a gate to match the fence between the carport and the corner of the house.

18. Applicant: Durant Abernethy

- a. Property Address: S32 McPhillips St.
- b. Date of Approval: 07/22/09
- c. Project: Remove front picket fence. Repair kitchen windows to match existing in profile, dimension and material.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 070-09: 204 Michigan Avenue
 - a. Applicant: Cameron Pfeiffer and Shane Traylor
 - b. Project: Balustrade Reconstruction. Door and window replacement.
APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
2. 071-09: 1255 Dauphin St.
 - a. Applicant: Bebe Lindsey for the School of Math and Science
 - b. Project: Paint 8' stainless fence green to match existing fencing.
APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
3. 072-09: 507 Saint Francis Street
 - a. Applicant: Ormandos M. Jackson
 - b. Project: Front Porch Reconstruction; Rear Porch Construction.
APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
4. 073-09: 505 Saint Francis Street
 - a. Applicant: Ormandos M. Jackson
 - b. Project: Remove existing concrete porch. Construct porch with on brick foundations. Construct a wood stoop to side of house and wood deck to rear of house. Repair and replace roofing and windows.
DENIED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
5. 074-09: 309 West St.
 - a. Applicant: Matilde Garciandia
 - b. Project: Fencing Approval.
APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
6. 0575-09: 351-353 George St.
 - a. Applicant: Coleman Mills for Kevin and Susan Carley
 - b. Project: Rear Addition.
APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
7. 076-09: 165 State Street
 - a. Applicant: Devereaux Bemis
 - b. Project: Paint house. Install concrete walkway.
APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
8. 077-09: 453 Dexter Ave.
 - a. Applicant: Bobby White for Jerry Kerley
 - b. Project: Demolition Request.
WITHDRAWN.
9. 078-09: 910 Government St.
 - a. Applicant: Will Singleton for Roy and Debbie Isbell
 - b. Project: Reroof house.
APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
10. 079-09: 1705 Conti St.

- a. Applicant: Marion C. Forrest
- b. Project: Retain floodlights.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

11. 080-09: 261 Dauphin St.

- a. Applicant: Elizabeth Sanders for the Downtown Alliance.
- b. Project: Sign Approval

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Guidelines
2. ARB Training Session
3. Discussion

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

070-09-CA: 204 Michigan Avenue
Applicant: Cameron Pfeiffer and Shane Traylor
Received: 07//09
Meeting: 08/05/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Leinkauf
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Remove deteriorated replacement balustrade. Construct a balustrade using MHDC stock plans.

BUILDING HISTORY

This classically detailed and grandly proportioned house was built in 1905.

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 acquired this house in 2002. A previous owner removed a later two-story addition that engulfed the house’s front porch and balcony. The previous and the present owner were both denied Banner and Shields on account of the balcony balustrade, the front door, and second-story fenestration installed after the removal of the porch infill. Damage stemming from Hurricanes Ivan and Katrina motivated the applicant to submit an application for removing and replacing the above with designs more in keeping with style and period of the house. The replacement of the existing double front doors with a single door with flanking sidelights and the replacement of the French door with a large window mirror in size, scale, profile, and detail front door and window of nearby 207 Michigan Avenue, a house of comparable and date and size.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Often one of the most important decorative features of a house, doorways reflect the age and style of a building.”
 - 2. “The type, size and dividing lights of window and their location and configuration (rhythm) on the building help establish the historic character of a building. Original window opening should be retained as well as original sashes and glazing.”
 - 3. “The size and placement of new windows for addition and alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.”
 - 4. “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture. Historic porches should be maintained and repaired to reflect their period. Particular attention should be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking posts/ columns, proportions and decorative details.”
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. East Elevation (see submitted drawings and photographs)

- A. Remove existing balustrade from balcony.
 - B. Replace balustrade with MHDC stock balustrade design.
 - C. Remove wood obscuring second-story transom moldings.
 - D. Replicate (when necessary) second-story transom moldings.
 - E. Repair and paint second-story French doors (painting previously approved).
 - F. Remove deteriorated balcony decking.
 - G. Replace deteriorated balcony decking in kind.
 - H. Repair and paint concrete steps.
 - I. Remove existing front doors.
 - J. Replace existing double doors with a single door with flanking transoms (per submitted drawings).
 - 1. Door, transom, jambs, sidelights, and moldings to match 207 Michigan Avenue.
 - 2. Wood door to feature a glazed panel above a solid fielded panel.
 - 3. Sidelights to feature a glazed panel above solid fielded panel.
 - 4. Sidelights and transoms to be plain glaze for the time being.
 - K. Remove later French doors to left of front door.
 - L. Replace French door with single pane window with profile, moldings, dimensions, and materials matching window at 207 Michigan Avenue.
 - 1. Area below window to faced with wood siding to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material.
 - M. Install lantern from porch ceiling before door
1. South Elevation
- A. Remove deteriorated one-over-one windows at southeast corner of first story.
 - B. Replace windows with wood nine-over-one to match rest of windows.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The submissions outlined in this application would repair storm damage and remove unsympathetic restoration efforts. The rotten and buckled balcony decking cannot be removed without first removing the encircling balusters and railing. The proposed MHDC stock balustrade is in keeping with style of the house. While surviving documentation does not record the appearance of the original front door and window treatments, the proposed designs are based on contemporaneous door and window designs on a house across the street. The door configuration, a single door with flanking sidelights and overhead transom, was a popular front entry treatment for houses of this style and date. The proposed first floor window treatment is also based on historical precedent for the period and within the district. The replication of the second floor window moldings, along with the removal and replacement of later windows on the south elevation with windows matching the rest of the elevation, would recapture integrity of detail lost through later changes. Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or historical character of the house or the district. Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Shane Traylor was present to discuss the application. Mr. Traylor questioned whether there was a better alternative to tongue-and-groove decking for the balcony.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Karwinski suggested Deck So Teck. Mr. Bemis suggested priming all of the boards. Mr. Karwinski informed the applicant that while certain aspects of the application were good in concept, the sketches of the proposed window and door did not match the comparative examples. He noted that the door proposal called for two inch jambs. Typically jambs are four inches. Mr. Karwinski noted that changing the size of the jambs would alter the dimension of the sidelights. He added that the window and door designs lacked the frames found on the 207 Michigan Street prototype. Mr. Traylor explained that the designs were schematic. He said he would replicate the door and window treatments at 207 Michigan Avenue exactly.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Karwinski moved that, based upon the facts as amended by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 8/05/10

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

071-09-CA: 1255 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Bebe Lindsey for the School of Math and Science
Received: 07/14/09
Meeting: 08/15/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Fence Approval

BUILDING HISTORY

This complex of masonry buildings once housed the Dauphin Way Baptist Church. The 1942 sanctuary, with its Romanesque Revival façade, faces Dauphin Street. Flanking educational buildings were constructed in 1949. A Christian Life Center was constructed in 1970 to the rear of the sanctuary.

The congregation relocated in the 1980s. The buildings remained vacant for a number of years. Several proposed redevelopment plans did not materialize. In the 1990s, the Alabama School of Math and Science purchased and renovated the property. Subsequent construction has taken place.

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 School of Math and Science plans to gradually install uniform fencing around its campus. The long term plan calls for the use of the enclosure of all the properties fenced areas with the fencing of the same design and materials as that along Dauphin Street. On November 5, 2008, the Board allowed the School of Math and Science to install a temporary chain link fence along the west side of the campus’s Ann Street parking lot. The Board’s approval was provisional. The applicants were required to return to the Board within a year with final plans for fencing and landscaping the parking lot. On January 14, 2009, ASMS came to the Board with a second fence proposal. The School had erected an 8’ fence along the south property line. The Board denied the request to retain the 8’ chain link fence, giving the School until November to remove the fencing.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. Fencing “should complement the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement, and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the historic district.”
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. Paint 8’ chain link fence along the south property line green to match existing fence

STAFF ANALYSIS

Staff believes the chain link fencing impairs the historic integrity of the neighborhood and should be removed. However, since the green six foot fencing can remain until November 5, 2009, the staff sees no reason to deny the School the request to retain the eight foot section until that time. Staff also sees no reason to require the painting of the fence, but has no objection to it. The School must remove all recent chain link fencing by the November 5 deadline. Otherwise, on November 6, a Municipal Offense Ticket will be issued.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Ms. Bebe Lindsey was present to discuss the application. Ms. Lindsey explained that the School does not particularly want to paint the fence. A tree fell on the previous chain link fence in 2008. The present fence was installed as a replacement at that time. The person who authorized the installation was unaware that she needed approval to install the fence. Ms. Lindsey said that School and the Foundation will do whatever possible to keep the fence. She informed the Board that the Dauphin Street fencing was a result of a donation. The donor's bequest was not sufficient to fence the entire complex. She said that while the State pays for the School's room, board, and tuition, the Foundation, which owns the building, must raise funds to cover maintenance expenses. Since the State budget cuts, the Foundation has been doing all it could to cover operational, educational, and maintenance expenditures. Ms. Lindsey added that Staff and faculty have been performing the necessary tasks to open the School for the upcoming term.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Bemis clarified that the real request was to keep the fence until November. Mr. Ladd asked Ms. Lindsey if she had investigated the availability of stimulus money. Ms. Whitt-Mitchell noted that while she was with the Foundation, there was not an awareness of the responsibilities of being a part of a historic district. Mr. James asked Ms. Lindsey about the timing of the School's fiscal year. Ms. Baker reminded the Board that it has no control over budgetary matters. The Guidelines need to be upheld. Mr. Roberts stated that the State should better allocate the funds required to run its educational institutions. He said the Foundation needed to allocate funds for a more appropriate fence. Mr. Wagoner mentioned the letter written to Staff which called for the removal the inappropriate fence.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Oswalt moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, amending fact (A) by removing "giving the School until November to remove the fencing" and adding that the current request under (C) includes retaining the fence until November. Mr. Karwinski added that the chain link fence was never approved. Mr. Karwinski amended Mr. Oswalt's motion by reiterating that the chain link fence was denied for reasons of impairment, but the fence could remain in place until November.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Karwinski moved that, based upon the facts as amended by the Board, the application does impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness not be issued. Ms. Baker and Ms. Whitt-Mitchell opposed.

DENIED

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

072-09-CA: 507 St. Francis Street
Applicant: Ormandos M. Jackson
Received: 07/15/09
Meeting: 08/5/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial
Classification: Non-contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Front Porch Reconstruction Approval; Construct rear porch.

BUILDING HISTORY

This house dates from 1908. It was originally a two-story house with tiered side galleries. The building served as a multi-tenant property. The second story has since been removed and the side gallery in-filled.

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 house appeared before the Board on May 20, 2009. The applicant made unauthorized changes to the dilapidated building. Staff granted a midmonth approval to stabilize the foundation on February 5, 2009. The applicant proceeded to go beyond the approved scope of work. Staff received a 311 notification. Subsequently, Staff visited the site. The applicant was informed he would need to appear before the Architectural Review Board. The applicant continued to go beyond the approved scope of work on both this property and the adjacent property, 505 St. Francis Street. A Notice of Violation was issued on May 6th. A stop work order was issued on May 11th. The applicant appeared before the Board at the May 20th meeting. The application was tabled. The applicant was asked to submit a full design proposal to Staff no later than Tuesday, May 26, 2009 for inclusion in the June 3rd Meeting. The Board approved and amended the applicant’s scope of work, but he was required to submit the front porch columns for staff approval and return to the Board with plans for the south elevation. The applicant submitted plans of the north and south elevations on July 15, 2009. Staff visited the site on July 20th. Work had been done without issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness. A Stop Work Order was issued. The plans do not match the unauthorized work. The side stoop did not appear in the plans. The back porch has lowered in execution. Wood pilings were substituted for brick piers. A break was inserted in the balustrade to allow for ingress and egress. The porch decking is of a type deemed inappropriate by the Guidelines. Clarifications are required for these departures and additions.

Unapproved work that does not meet the Guidelines;

1. Porch balustrade on North Elevation
2. Steps on North Elevation
3. Railing on West Elevation

4. Porch on South Elevation

- a. pilings
- b. decking
- c. balustrade

B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:

- 1. “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture. Historic porches should be maintained and repaired to reflect their period. Particular attention should be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking posts/ columns, proportions and decorative details.”
- 2. “The form and shape of the porch and its roof should maintain their historic appearance.”
- 3. “The balustrade of the stairs should match the design and materials of the porch.”
- 4. “Foundation screening should be recessed from the front of the foundation piers. Lattice, if used, should be hung below the skirt board or siding, between piers and framed with trim.”
- 5. “Often one of the most important decorative features of a house, doorways reflect the age and style of a building.”
- 6. “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. Scope of Work

1. North Elevation

- A. Install three square section columnar posts.
- B. Install balustrade
- C. Construct wood steps.
- D. Install Lattice skirting between foundation piers.

2. West Elevation

- A. Construct porch stoop.
 - 1. Pilings to support stoop.
 - 2. Treated wood decking to cover stoop.
 - 3. Wood balustrade to enclose west and south sides of stoop.
 - 4. Wood steps to extend North off stoop.

3. South Elevation

- A. Install French Doors.
- B. Construct a Porch.
 - 1. Piers to support porch.
 - 2. Wood decking to cover porch.
 - 3. Install two square section columnar posts.
 - 4. Install balustrade between posts.
 - 5. Install one-step wood stoop.

D. Clarifications

- 1. Rear porch decking materials
- 2. Rear foundation materials
- 3. Dimensions on any aspects of the plans
- 4. Design and materials for front, side and rear steps
- 5. Balustrade design for front, side and rear
- 6. Materials list

STAFF ANALYSIS

Despite repeated conversations with the applicant, a complete application with all proposed work has never been submitted. The applicant submitted plans for the north and south elevations on July 15, 2009. He also submitted, as requested, designs for the porch columns. The applicant was informed that these plans would be submitted to the Board for the August 5, 2009 meeting. The applicant was told not to commence work prior to the August 5, 2009 meeting.

Sometime between July 15 and July 20, the applicant began construction work on the front and rear porches. A Stop Work order was issued on July 20.

Work that has been done to date does not match the current submission. The railings on all three elevations, the decking on the south and west elevations, and the pilings on the rear elevation do not meet the standards set by the Guidelines. A Municipal Offence Ticket was issued.

Staff recommends approval of the plans submitted upon clarification of the materials. Staff recommends the applicant be required to redo the work to match the plans submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Ormandos Mark Jackson was present to discuss the application. Mr. Jackson asked the Board to think of preservation in a general sense. He asked the Board to consider the condition of the house before the work commenced. Mr. Jackson told the Board that he considered the present condition of the house an improvement which in no way impaired the district. He said the front doors were approved. Mr. Jackson added that he was willing to do whatever the Board wants. He closed by saying the house was shotgun to which he added a stoop.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Wagoner raised the issue of impairment. He reminded the Board that their duty was to determine whether the proposed plans impaired the integrity of the house and the district. He told Mr. Jackson that the Board has to consider the plans as submitted. The actual work does not match the proposed plans or meet the Guideline's standards. Mr. Jackson said he would correct the work. Mr. Karwinski told Mr. Jackson that the Board would require more accurate plans. Mr. Jackson pointed out that the Board just approved work which did not match the submitted plans. Mr. Wagoner stated that the Board was considering the application before them at this time. Mr. Ladd asked if the application could be approved in part, leaving out the side entrance. During the discussion it was made clear that the plans were acceptable, but the work that had been done on the property was not. The Board noted that if the plans were approved, Staff was to insure that that they were carried out correctly. The applicant was instructed to submit plans for the side entrance and to make the existing work conform to the plans or to submit new plans.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Mr. Oswalt moved that, based upon the facts as amended by the Board, the application as submitted does not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. Mr. Karwinski voted in opposition.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 8/09/10

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

073-09-CA: 505 St. Francis Street
Applicant: Ormandos M. Jackson
Received: 07//09
Meeting: 08/05/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Remove concrete porch; Replace concrete porch with wood porch supported by brick piers. Construct a side stoop with railing and steps on west elevation. Construct a deck on brick piers with wood balustrade.

BUILDING HISTORY

This side hall house was constructed in 1900. Circa 1910, an addition was made to the rear of the house.

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. On April 23, 2009, Staff granted a midmonth which allowed the applicant to repair and stabilize the roof and the foundations of this house. The applicant went beyond the approved scope of work. A projecting side ell was demolished. The siding was removed. A stop work order was issued on May 11, 2009. Staff issued a mid month COA allowing the applicant to obtain a building permit for “interior work only with no changes to the existing exterior condition.” Subsequent work exceeded the specified scope of work. The applicant submitted elevation drawings for the north and south elevations on July 15, 2009. The proposal for the north elevation would entail the replacement of concrete porch with a pier supported porch. After the submission the plans, work proceeded and exceeded that allowed by the July 15th COA. The drawings showed the addition of stoop on the west elevation, but west elevation drawings were not provided. As depicted in north and south elevation drawings, the stoop’s railings and pilings mirror those on 507 St. Francis Street. If so the railings are of a design and the pilings are of a materials deemed inappropriate by the Guidelines. A Stop Work Order was issued on July 20, 2009.
- B. The Design Guidelines for Mobile’s downtown commercial buildings, state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture. Historic porches should be maintained and repaired to reflect their period. Particular attention should be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking posts/ columns, proportions and decorative details.”
 - 2. “The form and shape of the porch and its roof should maintain their historic appearance.”
 - 3. “The balustrade of the stairs should match the design and materials of the porch.”

4. "A building's base, or foundation, gives the building a sense of strength and solidity, and serves to "tie" the structure to the ground. Traditionally residential buildings were raised on piers."
5. "Foundation screening should be recessed from the front of the foundation piers. Lattice, if used, should be hung below the skirt board or siding, between piers and framed with trim."
6. "Often one of the most important decorative features of a house, doorways reflect the age and style of a building."
7. "The type, size and dividing lights of window and their location and configuration (rhythm) on the building help establish the historic character of a building. Original window opening should be retained as well as original sashes and glazing."
8. "Where windows cannot be repaired, new windows must be compatible to the existing. The size and placement of new windows for addition and alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building."
9. "The exterior of a building helps define its style, quality, and historic period." The original siding should be retained and repaired. Replacement of exterior finishes, when required, must match the original in profile, dimension and material."
10. "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. Scope of Work:

1. North Elevation
 - A. Remove existing concrete porch.
 - B. Replace porch with wooden porch.
 1. Brick piers to support porch.
 2. Tongue-and-groove decking to cover porch.
 3. Shorten porch posts to height requirements of proposed porch.
 5. Redistribute original posts to install a fourth post to left of door.
 6. Install lattice skirting between porch piers.
 7. Repair six-over-six wood windows.
2. West Elevation
 - A. Install wood siding to match siding on North Elevation.
 - B. Install 3 six-over-six wood, true divided light windows.
 - C. Install a tripartite window.
 - D. Install a door.
 - E. Construct a porch stoop.
 1. Pilings to support stoop.
 2. Wood decking ?
 3. Wood balustrade with finials to enclose stoop to north and east .
 4. Wood steps with railing to match balustrade to extend from south side of porch.
3. South Elevation
 - A. Replace wood siding.
 - B. Install a 21 light French door.
 - C. Install awning with brackets above door.
 - D. Install a six-over-six, true divided light wood window.
 - E. Construct a wood deck.
 1. Piers to support deck.
 2. Wood decking to cover deck.
 3. Wood balustrade with finials to encircle deck south and east sides of deck.

4. East Elevation
 4. Wood steps to extend from west south side of deck
 - A. Install wood siding.
 - B. Install 4 six-over-six true divided light wood windows.
5. Reroof house.

Clarifications

North Elevation

1. What is the design of the balustrade?
2. How will the columns be altered to fit the proposed porch?
3. Dimensions of elements and porch.

West Elevation

1. What is the design of the stoop's balustrade?
2. Is the stoop to be supported by wood pilings or brick piers?
3. What is the design of the tripartite window?
4. Will a lattice skirt occupy the foundation bays?
5. What is the design of the door?
6. What type decking will be used?

South Elevation

1. What is the design of the deck's balustrade?
2. Will the deck be supported by wood pilings or brick piers?
3. What is the material of the door?
4. What is the awning material?
5. Will there be a stair railing?

East Elevation

1. Will a lattice skirt occupy the foundation bays?
2. What is the proposed roofing?

STAFF ANALYSIS

The applicant submitted plans for house's north and south elevations on July 15, 2009. Despite repeated conversations with the applicant, a complete application for all proposed work with plans and has yet to be submitted. In addition, preceding and subsequent unauthorized work impaired the architectural and historical integrity of the house and the district. Because the applicant removed the exterior siding, doors, windows, an original ell wing and the trim work, a Stop Work Order and Municipal Offense ticket has been issued.

Staff recommends denial of the current plans which have been submitted for the following reasons:

- The applicant did not provide drawings for the east and west elevations. The Board requires measured and detailed drawings for all elevations.
- The plans provided are incomplete. The applicant needs measurements and materials delineated, as well as size and style of doors and windows, for all elevations.
- The plans fail to depict the replacement of the western wing of the building. The removal of the side ell altered the appearance and integrity of the west elevation. The applicant seeks to build a

- The above-mentioned clarifications need to be answered completely.

Because of the history of this project and the problems that have arisen from inadequate plans, Staff recommends denial until all aspects of the project are before the Board for consideration. Furthermore, Staff notes, because this is a contributing, historic building, the applicant will be required to match all historic elements removed thus far. This includes installing new wood siding which precisely matches the historic siding, replacing all trim with wood trim, installing single pane, true divided light wood windows to match the historic windows (of which a couple remain on the site), and installing porch columns to match the existing.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Ormandos Mark Jackson was present to discuss the application. Mr. Jackson insisted he had submitted a full set of plans. Staff reminded Mr. Jackson they needed an elevation drawing of all four sides of the house. Staff also asked Mr. Jackson to review the list of clarifications needed for his project and to resubmit plans which addressed these clarifications.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Wagoner informed the applicant that the Board requires a full set of plans for consideration. Only after the submission a set of scale drawings with an accompanying materials list, would the Board review the application.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Oswalt moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the facts as amended by the Board, the application does impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness not be issued.

DENIED

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

074-09-CA: 309 West Street
Applicant: Matilda Garciandia
Received: 07/20/09
Meeting: 08/05/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Leinkauf
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Fencing Approval.

BUILDING HISTORY

This Spanish Colonial Revival house was built in 1917.

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 property last appeared before the Board on May 7, 2008 The Board approved the enclosure of the rear porch. The present applicant comes before the Board with a fencing proposal.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Fences “should complement the building and not detract from it. Design, scale placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District.”
 - 2. “The height of solid fences is usually restricted to six feet, however, if a commercial property or multi-family housing adjoins the subject property, an eight foot fence may be considered.”
 - 3. “The finished side of the fence should face toward public view.”
- C. Scope of Work (see site plan):
 - 1. Remove existing chain link fence from interior lot, north property line, and east property line.
 - 2. Extend 6’ stuccoed concrete wall on south property along east property line.
 - 3. Wall to extend along north property, turning south and tying into the front plan of the west elevation’s projecting bay.
 - 4. wall to extend from existing terminus on south lot line to front plan of porte-cochere.
 - 5. Paint wall white to match house.
- D. Clarifications
 - Will the wall use a true stucco system?

STAFF ANALYSIS

The design of the proposed fence is in keeping with style of the house. Additionally, construction of the wall would remove a chain link fence, a fencing type deemed inappropriate by the Guidelines. Staff does not believe this proposal impairs the architectural or historical character of the house or the district and therefore recommends approval.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Ms. Matilda Garciandia and Mr. Doug Martin were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Roberts addressed the clarification in the Staff Report. He described to the applicant the true stucco process and explained the difference in appearance between true and faux stucco techniques. Mr. Karwinski asked the applicant how the wall would be finished. Would the surface be smooth or would it match the house? He also asked if the wall would have a cap. The applicants informed the Board that the wall faces would be smooth sand finished and surmounted by a cap. Mr. Karwinski then asked the applicants if the wall would have a gate. They answered no. The applicants agreed to come to Staff with the stucco method. Mr. Oswalt noted that the facts needed to be altered.

FINDING OF FACT

Ms. Whitt-Mitchell moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, amending fact C (3) to read “Wall to extend along north property line, turning south and truing into the front plan of the north elevation’s projecting bay.” The applicants are to submit the stucco method to Staff for approval.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Karwinski moved that, based upon the facts as amended by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued conditioned on the stucco method being submitted to the staff.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 8/05/10

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

075-09-CA: 351-353 George Street
Applicant: Coleman Mills
Received: 07/20/09
Meeting: 08/05/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification:
Zoning: Contributing
Project: Rear Addition.

BUILDING HISTORY

A corner store and bungalow comprise this complex. The Sanborn Maps indicates that the two buildings were joined by connector as early as 1904. The conjoined buildings were remodeled in the 1920s. Since the early 1990s, the complex has housed several restaurant establishments.

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 buildings recently changed ownership. The proposed addition is located off the east (rear) elevation’s courtyard. It would extend the existing connector between the buildings as well as connect the two kitchens.
- B. Mobile’s Historic Districts and Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation state in pertinent part:
 - 1. “The exterior material of a building helps define its style, quality and historic period. The original siding should be retained and repaired. Replacement of exterior finishes, when required must match the original in profile, dimension and material.”
 - 2. “The goal of new construction should be to blend into the historic district, but to avoid creating a false sense of history.”
 - 3. “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.”
 - 4. “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. Scope of Work (per submitted plan):
 - 1. Construct a 6’ 11” by 5’ 6” Connector on east elevation.

- A. Siding to match existing in profile, dimension and material.
 - B. Shingles to match the existing.
2. Repair and replace rotten wood work.
3. Paint buildings white.

Staff Analysis

The proposed connector is located off the restaurant's rear courtyard. It is small in size and not visible from the street. The siding and roofing materials match the existing. Repair and replacement and painting comprise the remainder of the application. Staff does not believe this application impairs the integrity of the buildings or the district and therefore recommends approval of the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Coleman Mills was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. No questions ensued. The Board discussed the interior's plan. Mr. Blackwell clarified that the connector would join two separate kitchens.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Karwinski moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Karwinski moved that, based upon the facts as amended by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 9/05/10

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

Devereaux Bemis recused himself.

076-09-CA: 165 State Street
Applicant: Devereaux Bemis
Received: 07/20/09
Meeting: 08/05/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: DeTonti Square
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Painting Approval. Replace concrete in rear with pavers. Extend paved area to form paved walk from gate to rear door.

BUILDING HISTORY

Six two unit two-story brick stores were built on this block of State Street circa 1839. Numbers 165-167 form one of two remaining units of those store buildings. They are among the oldest surviving buildings in the city.

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 property last appeared before the Board on December 17, 2009. The Board approved the applicant’s repair and painting submissions. The current proposal calls for repainting the building in effort to seal earlier applications of lead paint.
- B. Mobile’s Historic Districts an state in pertinent part:
 - 1. “The exterior material of a building helps define its style, quality and historic period. Replacement of exterior finishes, when required must match the original in profile, dimension and material. Particular care must be taken with masonry.”
 - 2. Modern paving materials are acceptable in the historic districts. However, it is important that the design, location and materials be compatible with property.”
 - 3.
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. Paint house to match existing stucco, Parex color Khaki 10414 (60).
 - 2. Paint fence green to match exiting window and trim, repairing rotten wood when necessary.
 - 3. Replace concrete in rear with pavers to extend beneath stairs and create a walk from gate to rear door.

Staff Analysis

This building was painted as early as the 1950s. It was painted salmon when the applicant required the property in 2000. Staff does not believe painting the house or the installation of pavers impair the architectural character of the building or the historical character of the district. Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Bemis recused himself and left the room. No one was present to represent the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. James asked whether repainting painted brick surfaces complied with the Secretary of Interior standards. Ms. Coumanis indicated it did. The Board and Staff discussed the appropriate ways of removing paint from brick surfaces.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Karwinski moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Karwinski moved that, based upon the facts as amended by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 8/05/10

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

WITHDRAWN

077-09-CA: 453 Dexter Avenue
Applicant: Bobby White for Jerry D. Kerley
Received: 07/22/09
Meeting: 08/05/09

Historic District: Leinkauf
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Demolition

BUILDING HISTORY

This house brick house, with a projecting entrance vestibule and a recessed side porch (since filled in), dates from the 1920s.

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 house is part of the new Leinkauf expansion. On March 12, 2009, an attic fire caused severe structural damage to the home. While not apparent from the street, the internal damage to the house was extensive. The applicant’s insurance fails to cover the full reconstruction of his home. The applicant, for reasons of ill health, is represented by Mr. White. On account of his physical condition and financial straits, the applicant requests permission to demolition his home.
- B. In regards to demolition, the Guidelines read as follows: “Proposed demolition of a building must be brought before the Board for consideration. The Board may deny a demolition request if the building’s loss will impair the historic integrity of the district.” However, our ordinance mirrors the Mobile City Code, see §44-79, which sets forth the following standard of review and required findings for the demolition of historic structures:
 - A. *Required findings; demolition/relocation.* The board shall not grant certificates of appropriateness for the demolition or relocation of any property within a historic district unless the board finds that the removal or relocation of such building will not be detrimental to the historical or architectural character of the district. In making this determination, the board shall consider:
 - i. The historic or architectural significance of the structure;
This building is a contributing structure within the Leinkauf Historic District. Architecturally, the house reflects the local absorption of popular 1920s builder’s catalogs.
 - ii. The importance of the structure to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;
 - 1. This house is a contributing structure in the Leinkauf historic district. Similar catalog inspired houses and bungalows comprise this block as

- iii. The difficulty or the impossibility of reproducing the structure because of its design, texture, material, detail or unique location;
 - 1. The brick facing of the east (rear) elevation collapsed as result of the fire. Brick on the front and side elevations has cracked. The brick is no longer manufactured.
 - iv. Whether the structure is one of the last remaining examples of its kind in the neighborhood, the county, or the region or is a good example of its type, or is part of an ensemble of historic buildings creating a neighborhood;
 - 1. Similar catalog inspired houses and bungalows comprise this block and create a street scene of which this is integral as well as the block just north on Dexter Avenue.
 - v. Whether there are definite plans for reuse of the property if the proposed demolition is carried out, and what effect such plans will have on the architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological, social, aesthetic, or environmental character of the surrounding area.
 - 1. If granted demolition approval, the owner of the house would like to extend the existing concrete block wall that currently ties into northeast corner of the house across the lot. The area to either side of the wall would be landscaped. The applicant would continue to live in the garage/guest house located in the rear of the property.
- B. *Content of applications.* All applications to demolish or remove a structure in a historic district shall contain the following minimum information:
- vi. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
 - 1. The applicants acquired the property in 1995.
 - vii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
 - 1. The applicant plans to demolish the house or allow the house to decay.
 - viii. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
 - 1. The property has not been listed for sale.
 - ix. Description of the options currently held for the purchase of such property, including the price received for such option, the conditions placed upon such option and the date of expiration of such option;
 - 1. Not applicable.
 - x. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
 - 1. None other than the creation of the front wall.
 - xi. Financial proof of the ability to complete the replacement project, which may include but not be limited to a performance bond, a letter of credit, a trust for completion of improvements, or a letter of commitment from a financial institution; and
 - 1. See attached paperwork.
 - xii. Such other information as may reasonably be required by the board.
- C. *Post demolition or relocation plans required.* In no event shall the board entertain any application for the demolition or relocation of any historic property unless the applicant also presents at the same time the post-demolition or post-relocation plans for the site.”
- D. In case of denial, the applicant has submitted an application for financial hardship.

C. Scope of Work:

1. Demolish House
2. Construct a six foot brick
 - A. wall to utilize bricks from demolished house
 - B. a brick stoop with arched gateway to punctuate wall
 1. stoop to be 1' high, ' long, and ' deep
 2. arch to measure, ' high and ' wide
 3. iron gate to be located in arch
3. Landscape property

D. Clarifications

1. What is the location of the fence?
 - A. Will the wall occupy the front plane of the existing house?
 - B. Will the wall continue around the lot on line of the existing south elevation?
2. Clarify the treatment of the gateway.
 - A. Will the gateway occupy the site of the vestibule?
 - B. What are the dimensions of the gateway?
 - C. What is the design of the gate?
 - D. What are the dimensions, width and depth, of the stoop?

STAFF ANALYSIS

This fire damaged home appeared before the Board at the July 15th meeting. Before the fire, this house was in excellent condition. The fire resulted in the almost complete loss of the internal roofing system. It also caused extensive damage to the internal wall structure. Generally the Board does not approve demolitions. Based on the condition of the house and the state of the applicant's health and finances, staff recommended approval of the demolition request provided part of the house was saved to maintain a street line.

During the July 15th meeting, the Board requested that part of the house, the vestibule and chimney, be salvaged. The submitted plan does not do that. It does not meet the standards set by the Guidelines. In effect the property would have a house at the rear of the site and a six foot wall bisecting the front yard. This is out of character with the neighborhood and impairs the historic district. The staff recommends that no fence be built following the demolition of the house.

WITHDRAWN

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

078-09-CA: 910 Government Street
Applicant: Will Singleton for Roy and Debbie Isbell
Received: 07/22/09
Meeting: 08/05/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-B
Project: Reroof House.

BUILDING HISTORY

This Greek Revival house, which features a pedimented temple front and recessed side wings, was built in 1854-1855.. The use of two-tiered galleries was a common 19th-Century design solution for mitigating the heat of the summer, providing a place for outdoor living, and manifesting stylistic consciousness. Between 1891 and 1904 a rear wing was added.

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

- D. On May 20, 2009, this house suffered severe fire damage. A midmonth Certificate of Appropriateness was issued for all in kind replacements.
- E. Mobile’s Historic Districts an state in pertinent part:
 - 1. “A roof is one of the most dominant features of a building. Original roof forms, as well, as the pitch of the roof should be maintained. Materials should be appropriate to the form and pitch and color.”
- F. Scope of Work:
 - 1. Remove asbestos shingles from roof.
 - 2. Reroof house using ArrowLine permanent metal enhanced slate roofing tiles.

Staff Analysis

There are an increasing number of metal roofing options. The pitch, color, ribbing, and texture of metal roofing options must be considered. Metal roofing tiles that simulate slate have been used elsewhere in the Historic Districts. However, staff does not believe the proposed roofing is appropriate to the architectural or historical integrity of the house, therefore recommends a more traditional or traditional appearing material be used.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Roy and Debbie Isbell were present to discuss the application. Mr. Bemis showed the Board and the applicants composite faux slate tiles. Ms. Debbie Isbell brought a sample of the roof type submitted in the application, as well as alternative choices for the Board's review. Mr. Isbell presented the Board a history of the house and their intentions. He noted the previous roofing materials, wood shingle followed by asbestos tiles. Mr. and Mrs. Isbell reported that after investigating roofing options they believe ArrowLine to be the best option. They cited the warranty and wind strength of ArrowLine roofing. The Isbells cited two examples in the historic districts that utilize ArrowLine roofs, 311 Ann Street and 207 Roper Street. Mr. Bemis noted that metal roofs are flatter than dimensional shingles. He recommended the use of the latter.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.. Mr. Roberts disagreed with the Staff recommendation. He commended the applicants for investing in such a high quality product. Mr. Roberts noted that real slate looks just as flat as the proposed roofing. Mr. Oswalt asked about the original roof. Mr. James questioned the proposal's merits against the Secretary of the Interiors Standards. Mr. Wagoner asked the applicants which option they would like to submit, the black slate type or the wood shingle type. Ms. Whitt-Mitchell, Mr. Roberts, and Ms. Karwinski preferred the black slate.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Karwinski moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, adding that the black slate variety be used to roof the house.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Karwinski moved that, based upon the facts as amended by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued.

Mr. James voted against issuing a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 9/05/10

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

079-09-CA: 1705 Conti Street
Applicant: Marion C. Forrest
Received: 06/23/09
Meeting: 08/05/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Retain Floodlights.

BUILDING HISTORY

In November of 2007, the owner of the property requested and was granted a demolition permit for the house which stood on this property. In February of 2008, MAWSS requested and was granted approval to build a lift station on the 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

- G. The City received a 311 on this property on June 23, 2009. The SRO concerned the use of inappropriate and unapproved floodlighting.
- H. Mobile’s Historic Districts an state in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Lighting can be an important element in the historic districts. Therefore, where lighting impacts the exterior appearance of the district in which the building is located, it shall be reviewed for appropriateness as any other element.”
- I. Scope of Work:
 - 1. Install steel light posts atop concrete bases.
 - A. Lighting units to flank lift station
 - B. Floodlights to be installed.

Staff Analysis

Lighting serves many purposes. It can both highlight a building and provide security for an area. As currently installed, the floodlights direct a glare in the direction of Conti Street. Staff recommends that the lights be redirected in manner that minimizes the glare for vehicular and pedestrian traffic. Upon redirection of the lights, Staff recommends their retention.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Ray Miller was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Miller explained to the Board that the lighting program was developed after the application was approved. Mr. Roberts questioned the use of industrial lighting in a residential district. Mr. Miller said the lights will be redirected and downcast. He said the lights could be turned off at night. They are only needed when a mechanical failure occurs.

FINDING OF FACT

Ms. Whitt-Mitchell moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, adding that the floodlights will only be turned on in emergency circumstances.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the facts as amended by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 9/05/10

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF COMMENTS

080-09-CA: 259-261 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Elizabeth Sanders for the Downtown Alliance
Received: 06/25/09
Meeting: 08/05/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Sign Approval.

BUILDING HISTORY

As indicated by one of the Troost Maps, a two-story brick building stood on this site as early as 1840. Staff files indicate that the street façade was remodeled on two separate occasions. Modifications first occurred in 1899. The firm of Hutchison, Holmes, and Hutchison carried out a second round of renovations in the 1920s. The shallow second-floor canopy featuring bracketed eaves and terracotta tiles dates from that time.

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

- J. On October 28, 2005, the occupants of this building received approval to suspend a an 8 square foot sign from a bracket affixed to the buildings façade. The current applicants come before the Board with a proposal for signage to be mounted to the façade.
- K. Mobile’s Historic Districts an state in pertinent part:
 - 1. “The overall design of all signage including mounting framework shall relate to the design of the principal building on the property. Buildings with a recognizable style such as Greek Revival, Italianate, Victorian, Queen Anne, Neoclassic, Craftsman, et. al., shuld use signage in the same style. This can be done through use of similar decorative features such as columns or bracket.”
 - 2. “The size of the sign shall be in proportion to the building and the neighboring structures and signs.”
 - 3. The total maximum allowable sign area for all signs is one and one half square feet per linear foot of the principal building, not to exceed 64 square feet.”
 - 4. “The size of the sign shall be determined by measuring the area within each face of a geometric shape enclosing all elements of informational or representational matter including blank signage. Structural supports not bearing information shall not be included in the computation of display area.”
- L. Scope of Work:
 - 1. Mount a 19’ by 40’ brushed aluminum sign below the inner two windows of the second floor.

- A. Sign to feature the name of the establishment “The Downtown Mobile Alliance” and the establishment’s logo.
- B. No lighting is involved.

Clarification

- 1. How will the sign be mounted?

Staff Analysis

The proposed sign does not exceed the maximum amount of square footage allowed by the Guidelines. The sign will not be illuminated. The design and size of the proposed sign do not impair the architectural or historical character of the building or the district. Pending clarification on how the sign will be mounted, Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Ms. Elizabeth Sanders was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. No discussion took place.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Oswalt moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Oswalt moved that, based upon the facts as amended by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 9/05/10