

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 chair announced that there would be a Board Retreat on Saturday, August 09, 2008, at 9:00 a.m. at the Five Rivers Facility on the Cochran Causeway. It will be open to the public.

The Introductory Statement was read by the staff.

The members present were Tilmon Brown, Tom Karwinski, Mike Mayberry, Harris Oswald, Bunky Ralph, Craig Roberts, Jim Wagoner, and Barja Wilson.
Staff present was: Devereaux Bemis and John Lawler.

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

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

B. MID-MONTH APPROVALS

1. **Applicant's Name:** Sai Wo Au
Property Address: 1706 B Government St.
Date of Approval: July 7, 2008

Install metal painted sign, 19 sq. feet per design in file. Black lettering on building.

2. **Applicant's Name:** Emanuel Roberts
Property Address: 244 Warren Street
Date of Approval: July 8, 2008

Repair wood fence to match existing in material, height and plan. Repair balcony to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Paint repairs to match existing.

3. **Applicant's Name:** Jeff and Melanie Winter
Property Address: 1258 Texas Street
Date of Approval: July 8, 2008

Install wooden lattice infill between unpainted brick paint wood dark green or black (leave brick unpainted).

4. **Applicant's Name:** Scott Speck
Property Address: 214 S. Dearborn
Date of Approval: July 11, 2008

Repaint in following Behr color scheme: body Coconut Husk, trim Antique White, decking, shutters, and doors Shadow Ridge. Replace rotten wood as necessary.

5. **Applicant's Name:** James Brown
Property Address: 460 S. Jefferson
Date of Approval: July 14, 2008

Repair storm damage to roof and two windows with materials to match existing in profile, dimension, color and material. Paint new materials to match existing color scheme.

6. **Applicant's Name:** David Young/Hargrove and Assoc
Property Address: 9 St. Emanuel St.
Date of Approval: July 14, 2008

Repaint entryway to match existing color scheme. Repaint transom sign to match background color.

7. **Applicant's Name:** Robert Hope
Property Address: 2304 DeLeon Avenue
Date of Approval: July 14, 2008

Install new roof using architectural shingles, estate gray in color.

8. **Applicant's Name:** Edgar Hughes
Property Address: 1050 Palmetto Street
Date of Approval: July 15, 2008

Repaint building in this existing color scheme. Replace rotten wood as necessary to match existing in profile, dimension and material on foundation infill lattice.

9. **Applicant's Name:** Frank Lepik
Property Address: 1763 Old Shell Rd.
Date of Approval: July 15, 2008

Install new roof using 3 tab shingles, architectural GAF weathered wood.

10. **Applicant's Name:** Ken Baggette
Property Address: 20 S. Ann Street
Date of Approval: July 15, 2008

Install new roof using 3 tab shingles, charcoal or black in color.

11. **Applicant's Name:** James and Barbara Wilson
Property Address: 1218 Elmira Street
Date of Approval: July 15, 2008

Paint house in the existing color scheme: Body: cream, Trim: pale olive.

12. **Applicant's Name:** Stevie Gaston
Property Address: 1224 Elmira St.
Date of Approval: July 16, 2008

Paint house in the following Sherwin Williams paint scheme:

Body: Shore 8115
Trim: White
Accent: Barn Red 8380

13. **Applicant's Name:** Daouist Contracting for Marshall Foley.
Property Address: 255 Dexter Street
Date of Approval: July 16, 2008

Install new architectural shingled roof with new materials to match existing color.

14. Applicant's Name: Linda Sierke
Property Address: 1004 Savannah
Date of Approval: July 16, 2008

Repaint exterior in following Devoe color scheme (closely matches original): Body-Pilgrim Gray, Trim, White and Shutters Barn Red.

15. Applicant's Name: Mobile Variety Repair for Jimmie Lucas
Property Address: 1105 Elmira Street
Date of Approval: July 2, 2008

Repair and replace damaged roof and fascia; repair porch and steps; repair rotten or damaged siding as needed. All repairs are to match the original in profile, dimension, materials and design. Shingles to be a 25-year asphalt, black or gray in color.

16. Applicant's Name: Ethel Harris
Property Address: 1105 Elmira Street
Date of Approval: July 18, 2008

Repair storm/tree damage to building with new materials to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Paint new materials to match existing color scheme.

17. Applicant's Name: Jerry Irwin/Douglas Kearley
Property Address: 451 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: July 21, 2008

This COA replaces that of 24 April 2007.

Repair exterior stucco, removing paint to leave natural.

Repair/replace any brickwork as necessary.

Repair/replace as necessary the wood windows to match existing in profile and dimension.

Reroof with architectural/fiberglass shingles.

Reinstall any missing architectural elements, such as wood windows, operable wood shutters, wood louvers, and wood doors with historically accurate/appropriate elements to match original in profile and dimension.

Rebuild first floor storefront in off-white enameled aluminum with clear impact-resistant glazing and stucco over a masonry bulkhead per submitted plans.

Install a new iron gallery with iron columns per submitted plans.

Install new flush automatic garage door with applied panels on the east elevation per the submitted plans.

Enlarge an east elevation opening to create a new doorway and install a new wood door with transom per the submitted plans.

Enlarge an opening on the second floor of the north elevation to create new doorway and install a wood jib door leading to the gallery per submitted plans.

18. Applicant's Name: Grace Lutheran Church
Property Address: 1356 Government Street
Date of Approval: July 22, 2008

Paint the Dryvit/stucco on the rear of the church and on the ancillary building with Sherwin Williams paint:

Totally Tan and Sedate Gray

C. OLD BUSINESS

D. NEW BUSINESS

1. **088-08-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 to the August 20 meeting per a request of the applicants.

2. **089-08-CA:** 223 Dauphin Street

Applicant: Bill & Mary Monahan

Request: Remove the Carrara glass on the transom and stucco to match the other stucco on the building.

Approved: Certified Record attached.

3. **090-08-CA:** 1114 Palmetto

Applicant: Mr. John Grow

Request: Expand the deck by 3 feet and replace the canopy.

Approved: Certified Record attached.

4. **091-08-CA:** 62 S. Royal Street

Applicant: Wrico Signs for Hampton Inn & Suites

Request: Install an aluminum, vinyl and lexan sign.

Withdrawn by the owner.

5. **092-08-CA:** 1055 Selma Street

Applicant: Brian A. McNab

Request: Add wood handrail to front steps to match existing porch rail. Move existing E window 12 feet toward rear of house to meet code for window in a bedroom. Add a slightly shorter window to the east elevation 2'9" north of location of existing window. Window to be wood frame to match. Move window on west elevation to match east elevation. Move back door to center

of rear elevation. Install 6-foot privacy fence around back yard and E side tapering to 3-foot white picket around front yard.

Approved: Certified Record attached.

6. **093-08-CA:** 1102 Savannah Street

Applicant: Ben Cummings for Mr. and Mrs. Charles Ingram

Request: Repair to the roof structure after fire damage and insertion of windows in the new gable end.

Approved: Certified Record attached.

7. **094-08-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.

Held over to the August 20 meeting per a request of the applicants.

8. **095-08-CA:** 159 Dauphin Street

Applicant: Victor Sign Co.

Request: Install signage for Edward Jones.

9. **096 -08-CA:** 263 N Conceptions Street

Applicant: John V. & Nancy C. Lee

Request: Installation of double French doors on north side; installation of a roof to cover the entrance & landing; installation of steps from the landing to the ground. Install a handicapped ramp on the west side. The roof, columns and cornice will duplicate the materials and appearance of the original cottage. Lattice will screen the landing's base and the handicapped ramp. The ramp's railings will match front porch rails.

10. **097-08-CA:** **306 George St.**

Applicant: Britney Jara for James Shelton

Request: Remove existing chain link fence and replace with a 6-foot treated pine, do-eared privacy fence. Fence to run along both sides of property.

Approved: Certified Record attached.

11. **098-08-CA:** 244 S. Warren St.

Applicant: Emanuel & Belinda W. Roberts

Request: Screen patio and construct a 12 x 14 foot storage building.

Approved: Certified Record attached.

12. **099-08-CA:** 254 St. Anthony Street
Applicant: Society of 1868
Request: General renovations and repair to the building to include providing for ADA accessibility requirements.
Approved: Certified Record attached.
13. **100-08-CA:** 1555 Monroe St.
Applicant: Lynette Botha Muller
Request: Demolish existing storage building and replace with a one and a half story, 40 x 18 foot garage and storage building.
Approved with Conditions: Storage building referred to design committee.
14. **101-08-CA:** 1805 Dauphin St.
Applicant: Charles Howard and James Wagoner
Request: Construct a concrete courtyard (approx 40 x 27) with 8-foot square basin for water fountain in center; and, construct an 8-foot exterior wall to the south of the courtyard to match the existing wall with a pedestrian gate. All proposed work is interior to and enclosed by an existing 8-foot wall.
Approved: Certified Record attached.
15. **102-08-CA:** 101 Bradford
Applicant: Michael & Danica Zanetti
Request: Construct a six-foot, dog-eared privacy fence.
Approved: Certified Record attached.
16. **102-08-CA:** 208 Dauphin St.
Applicant: WRICO Signs on behalf of Max Morey
Request: Install two signs.
Approved: Certified Record attached.

E. OTHER BUSINESS and ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Guidelines: The guidelines were discussed. It was determined that there would be an opportunity for more discussion at the Board Retreat.
2. Luncheons: Craig Roberts and Jim Wagoner had lunch with Connie Hudson. Tilmon Brown and Mike Mayberry had lunch with Gina Gregory. Other luncheons would be arranged.
3. Retreat: The Chair repeated that there would be a Board Retreat on Saturday, August 09, 2008, at 9:00 a.m. at the Five Rivers Facility on the Cochran Causeway. It will be open to the public.
4. Councilman Carroll was present and suggested a full-time enforcement officer was needed.

F. ADJOURNMENT

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

088-08-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.
- 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 Secretary of the Interior standards say: “
 - 1. 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.
 - 2. 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.
 - 1. The connector will bump out closer to the front of the house and with the fireplace expand slightly beyond the current line of the garage.
 - 2. The connector will expand to the south the distance to the wall of the house.
 - 3. There will be a rear porch to the south of the garage and at the back of the house.

4. 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.
5. Soldier courses will be added over the windows and doors of the front.
6. The main double French door will be replaced.
7. The south side elevation will remain except where the connector, garage and porch will be altered or added.
8. The rear elevation will be altered with the porch, garage and connector.
9. The rear door will be altered and relocated.
10. Major alterations will occur with the addition of a second story to the connector and the garage.
11. The two story additions will be under cross-hipped roofs that step up from the original roofline.
12. Inset shed roof dormers will be placed on the south and east elevations.
13. Inset she roof dormers will be placed on the north side elevation with a double windowed oriel under an extension of the main roof,
14. The oriel would appear to be made of lapped siding.
15. The dormers will be roofed with metal.

D. Clarifications

1. Will soldier courses be put over the original windows on the south and rear elevations?
2. Are rowlock sills planned for all windows or just the new ones?
3. What are the materials of the addition, the windows, the doors, and the oriel?
4. Will a setback variance be required for the fireplace and the oriel?
5. The fireplace does not appear on any of the elevations.
6. What are the roofing materials for the main roof and the dormers?

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. There are no dimensions on the plans but new roofs appear to be quite a bit higher than the original roof and would appear to impair the historic integrity of the original house. This is particularly evident from the front where the extension to the left (north side) dominates the original roofline.

The massive addition to 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. Unless this is a later alteration, staff believes the original door should remain.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. and Mrs. Banks Ladd and their architect Pete Vallas were present to discuss the application. Mr. Vallas stated he was third designer the Ladds had spoken with to design an addition. They had considered placing the addition in the side yard (to the south) but had decided to go up in the back to save yard space. They also felt it would be less conspicuous.

Mrs. Ladd stated that she believed the left gable would conceal the addition. The new ridgeline will be 27½ feet high. However, she brought a diagram showing someone standing in front of the gable would not be able to see the addition of the peak of the front left roof line.

Mr. Vallas compared this house to that of the Peebles, but noted that this house had only 8 feet to the property line with ample plantings.

Mr. Ladd explained that they needed the space. The house is only 2,400 square feet and is not sufficient for a family of four, two adults and two children.

Mr. Vallas stated that the decorative soldier courses were not used in this house but was used in others and could have been used in this.

Mrs. Ladd noted that they did not care too much about the decorative changes that they were the architect's idea.

Mr. Ladd pointed out that they wanted to change the main entrance to the far left. But they would just remove the original door and decorations.

There would be soldier course lintels and rowlock sills at all of the windows and doors (lintels). The materials would match those of the house being painted brick, wood windows, and there would be wood on the dormers and the oriel. The roofing would be a dimensional asphalt shingle and the fireplace is being deleted from the plan.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Board discussion occurred concurrently with the beginning of and during the public hearing. The Board noted that the roof of the addition would be considerably higher than the original roof and that it would be visible to anyone not directly in front of the left gable. The Board pointed out that fact six was reversed.

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 Six to read, "The main single door will be replaced with a double French door.. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswalt and unanimously approved.

Decision on the Application

Tom Karwinski moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does impair the historic integrity of the district and the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be denied. The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph and passed five to three.

At the conclusion of the vote Mr. Ladd objected to Board's process. He believed that since the applicants did not receive the staff report seven days before the meeting the process was flawed and the decision of the Board was not valid.

City attorney John Lawler pointed out that an objection to the process had to be made before the hearing or was inappropriate. The applicants how they were harmed and what they would like to do. They replied that they did not have sufficient time to prepare an answer to the staff report and would have had other information available for the Board.

The City attorney explained to the Board they could allow more information to be presented if they chose to do so. Bunky Ralph moved that based on the request of the applicants and the lateness of the staff report that the previous decision of the Board be rescinded and a new hearing be scheduled for the August 20 meeting to present additional information. The motion was seconded by Craig Roberts and passed unanimously.

The request will be placed on the agenda for the August 20 meeting for presentation of additional information by the applicants.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

089-08-CA: 223 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Bill and Mary Monahan
Received: 07/08/08
Meeting: 08/06/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Remove the Carrara Glass and stucco the transom area.

BUILDING HISTORY

Architect W.H. Hammond designed this three-story masonry commercial building circa 1899. The first floor façade was significantly altered, probably in the 1930s with the addition of the Carrara glass. The Board originally required that the Carrara glass be saved. Later a request by the owner led the Board to approve its removal from the sides and it be retained at the transom level.

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 three-story 19th century building that is part of the same building as the brewery next door. The building has gone through a number of changes and the owner wishes to repair the property.
- B. The Guidelines state, “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. The Secretary of the Interior’s standards state “
 - 1. Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.
 - 2. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved.
 - 3. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture and other visual qualities and where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.
- C. The applicant is proposing to remove Carrara Glass stucco the area.
 - 1. The Carrara Glass has achieved significance over time.
 - 2. There is no historic substantiation for the stucco design.
 - 3. Transoms were original to the building.
 - 4. A design exists that shows transoms similar to those removed from the Brewery.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This is a contributing commercial building in the Lower Dauphin Street Historic District. The owner has no desire to retain or repair the fragile Carrara glass. However the stucco request does not match an appropriate historic treatment to what would have been a transom area. Staff has two suggestions. If the Board wishes to retain the Carrara, spandrel glass could be installed to match the damaged or destroyed glass. If the Board and owner are in agreement to the impracticality of retaining the spandrel glass, a new design could be considered that returned the transom to the front of the building.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Bill Monahan was present to discuss the application. He stated that he had been unable to find replacement glass for the transom and that the two pieces that were broken were not repairable. He also stated he had been unable to salvage the glass from the sides. His plan is to retain the two horizontal elements at the top and bottom of the transom and stucco in between.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board noted that they had been trying to save the glass for two years and apparently it was impossible to do so.

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 was seconded by Mary Couser and unanimously approved.

Decision on the Application

Craig Roberts 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 was seconded by Harris Oswald and approved with one dissenting vote.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 8/06/09.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

090-08-CA: 1114 Palmetto
Applicant: John Grow
Received: 07/11/08
Meeting: 08/06/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Expand the rear deck by 3 feet.

BUILDING HISTORY

This is a transitional Victorian house attributed to E.D. Laurendine in 1913. It is a twin to the house next door.

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 across the street from the Oakleigh Complex on one of the most traveled streets in the District.
- B. The guidelines state, “The structure should complement the design and scale of the main building.”
- C. The applicant is proposing to expand the deck.
 - 1. The deck is in the rear of the property and not visible to the public.
 - 2. A rear deck already exists.
 - 3. Rear decks are generally accepted in the historic district.
- D. Clarifications
 - a. What is the design of the deck?
 - b. What is the roof and how will it be attached.
 - c. Is there a railing?

STAFF ANALYSIS

Generally when a deck is roofed and has a balustrade it is considered a rear porch, and is required to meet the standards of a porch and not a deck. The design needs to be understood before a decision is made.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Grow was present to discuss the application. He stated he would use a new and extended awning to cover the deck.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board noted that the deck would have to use an awning or a porch design would be needed.

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 as amended to add a number 4. The roof of the deck will be a canvas awning." The motion was seconded by Harris Oswald and unanimously approved.

Decision on the Application

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the facts as amended 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 was seconded by Jim Wagoner and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 8/06/09.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

091-08-CA: 112 Government Street/62 S. Royal
Applicant: WRICO Signs for Hampton Inn and Suites
Received: 07/11/08
Meeting: 08/06/08



INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Install a parking lot sign.

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

- E. This will be a monument sign placed near the corner of Royal and Government.
- F. The guidelines state, “The total allowable square footage for the display area of a monument sign is (50) fifty square feet, for pole signs 40 square feet, and for projecting signs 40 square feet.
- G. The applicant is proposing to construct a pole sign.
 - 1. The sign will be located on the SE corner of the property facing Royal St.
 - 2. The sign will be on a 4” thick concrete base, 3 feet wide.
 - 3. The aluminum cabinet will be 4’1” wide and 5’8½” tall.
 - 4. The cabinet will be a blue background with red border and white lettering.
 - 5. The sign will be single faced.
 - 6. The total height of the sign will be five feet.
 - 7. The sign will be externally illuminated.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This sign will be inconspicuously placed on Royal Street and meets the Board’s guidelines. Staff sees no problem with approval.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF COMMENTS

092-08-CA: 1055 Selma
Applicant: Brian A. McNab
Received: 07/17/08
Meeting: 08/06/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Add wood handrail to front steps to match existing porch rail. Move existing E window 12 feet toward rear of house to meet code for window in a bedroom. Add slightly shorter window to E elevation 2'9" north of location of existing window. Window to be wood frame to match. Move window on west elevation to match east elevation. Move back door to center of rear elevation. Install 6-foot privacy fence around back yard and E side tapering to 3-foot white picket around front yard.

BUILDING HISTORY

This is a modest, one story side hall Victorian cottage from around the turn of the century.

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 modest cottage is having some finishing touches done as part of the overall renovation.
- 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.
- C. The applicant is proposing to alter the openings.
 - 1. Add a handrail to the front steps to match the new rail added to the house.
 - 2. Move existing E window 12 feet toward rear of house to meet code for window in a bedroom.
 - 3. Add slightly shorter window to E elevation 2'9" north of location of existing window.
 - 4. Move window on west elevation to match east elevation.
 - 5. Install 6-foot privacy fence around back yard and E side tapering to 3-foot white picket around front yard.
- D. Clarifications
 - 1. Where will the fences go and what will be their design?

STAFF ANALYSIS

The railing appears to be appropriate to the house. Fences are generally approved by the ARB and if the site plan and style are acceptable, staff sees no problem with the request. The moving

of the windows is more problematic. Staff would recommend the adding of windows where necessary rather than the alteration of the side elevations unnecessarily.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. McNab was present to discuss the application. He explained that the large window on the east side would be reused in the back room and the small window would match the materials and design of the original windows. The moving of the other windows was withdrawn from the application. However the applicant requested that wood steps be allowed to replace the concrete steps. Also, the privacy fence would be taken to the 25 foot line setback line.

BOARD DISCUSSION

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

FINDING OF FACT

Jim Wagoner moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion the Board amends the facts in the Staff report deleting facts 2 & 4 and add the fact that a set of wooden stairs would replace the front concrete steps. The motion was seconded by Tom Karwinski and unanimously approved.

Decision on the Application

Jim Wagoner 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 was seconded by Bunky Ralph and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 8/06/09.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

093-08-CA: 1102 Savannah
Applicant: Ben Cummings for Mr. and Mrs. Charles Ingram
Received: 07/18/08
Meeting: 08/06/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Repair to roof and install windows in the gable end. Remove three chimneys.

BUILDING HISTORY

This house was constructed about 1912 and is transitional in style with a Victorian plan but classical revival porch.

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 on the section of Savannah Street that leads to the Oakleigh complex. It has had several changes through the years but the overall main front of the house is original in appearance with the exception of the doorway. There has been a significant addition to the side and additions to the rear.
- 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.”
- C. The applicant is proposing to reroof the house and make some alterations
 - 1. The front of the house will altered with a change in the front slope of the hip and an elongation of the gable. A pair of windows will be placed in the front gable.
 - 2. Three chimneys will be removed.
 - 3. The 3 chimneys are highly visible.
 - 4. The rear right addition will be reroofed to become part of the overall roof structure.
 - 5. The addition on the left will have a new roofing system.
 - 6. All other work will be repairs and match the existing.
- H. Clarifications
 - 1. Will there be any alterations to the roof over the addition on the left?
 - 2. What will be the roofing material?

STAFF ANALYSIS

This contributing building is an excellent example of the transition from the Victorian to the classical revival after the turn of the 20th century. The alteration to the front of the building alters the original character of the front of the house. The Board generally does not approve the removal of chimneys. Staff suggests the use of dormers on the sides and rear would be a more appropriate manner of adding living space to the attic and is

more in keeping with the previous rulings of the ARB. Staff sees no problem with the remaining work provided the clarified issues are appropriate.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. and Mrs. Ingram and Ben Cummings were present to discuss the application. Mr. Cummings pointed out that there are numerous examples of this type of configuration throughout the district. The roof will be charcoal gray Timberline.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion occurred concurrently with the public hearing. It was noted by Michael Mayberry the double window was not in proportion to the opening and that a single window with shutters would fit the gable more appropriately. The Board also noted that the chimneys were an important part of the roofline and their removal would not be appropriate. The owners agreed with both suggestions of the Board.

FINDING OF FACT

Jim Wagoner moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion the Board amend the facts in the Staff report: C.1. A single 2/2 window will be placed in the front gable with shutters; and C.2. Three chimneys will be maintained. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswald and unanimously approved.

Decision on the Application

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the facts as amended 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 was seconded by Harris Oswald and approved five votes to three.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 8/06/09.

START HERE

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

094-08-CA: 159 & 161 Dauphin St.
Applicant: Ben Cummings for Sean Coley.
Received: 07/18/08
Meeting: 08/06/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Ashland Place
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 time. 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.

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 request 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 a 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.

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. However, the question of impairment with what has been done is now more difficult to determine. Since the questionable area is on the second floor and the balcony partially obscures the French doors, staff would suggest the awnings be reconsidered with a more modern design; and that if the doors ever need replacing something more in character with the marble panel be considered.

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

Following the request by Mr. and Mrs. Banks Ladd for a rehearing on August 20 to present additional information, Mr. Cummings requested that this application be held over to the August 20 meeting so he could better prepare a response to the staff analysis.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

095-08-CA: 159 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Victor Sign Co. for Edward Jones
Received: 07/22/08
Meeting: 08/06/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Install signage.

BUILDING HISTORY

The building may date back to the 1860s but has a new façade.

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 building has just been before the Review Board for alterations.
- B. The sign guidelines state, “Signs shall be mounted or erected so they do not obscure the architectural features or openings of a building. The overall design of all signage including the mounting framework shall relate to the design of the principal building on the property.”
- C. The applicant is proposing to install two signs.
 - 1. The wall sign will be 120” x 20” or 16.67 sq. ft.; it will be sand blasted redwood panel have a green background with white lettering and a one inch white border. It will be mounted slight right of center below the balcony.
 - 2. The door sign will be appears to be 15x15 or 1.56 sq. ft.; it will be mounted on the recessed door.
 - 3. The third sign will also be located on the same door and appears to be roughly the same size and will be white vinyl letters.
 - 4. Total square footage of signage will be about 19.79 sq. ft.
 - 5. The front of the building is approximately 17.5 linear feet allowing for 26.25 sq. ft. of signage on the building.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The signage fits within the allotted amount for the building. However, any future tenants will be restricted to a total of 6.5 sq. ft. of signage. Also, the placement of the wall sign seems awkward and does not relate to the building. Staff recommends approval of the sign package but with the wall sign centered and with the owner made aware of the limited signage remaining. There are several casual signs in the window that should be removed

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Clint Martin the owner of the business was present to discuss the application. He stated the business was open and he would like to get the signs up as soon as possible. He was warned that

there was a possibility of a balcony being installed and interfering with the wall sign. He was also told that his signage would result in any additional tenants having only 6.5 sq. ft. of signage.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed that the off center sign did not relate to the building and should be centered. Mr. Martin agreed. The Board also reiterated concern about the lack of additional signage available for any additional tenants. However, it was noted that signage allocation is the responsibility of the property owner and the tenants to determine.

FINDING OF FACT

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion the Board amends fact C.1. to indicate that the sign will be centered on wall and adopt this as all the facts in the Staff report. The motion was seconded by Jim Wagoner and 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 was seconded by Jim Wagoner and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 8/06/09.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

096-08-CA: 263 N. Conception St.
Applicant: John and Nancy Lee
Received: 07/21/08
Meeting: 08/06/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: DeTonti Square
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: RB
Project: Do general repairs. Install a set of covered, French doors with landing and steps; alter a window; and install a handicap access ramp.

BUILDING HISTORY

The building dates back to the 1830s but has had numerous changes through the years, including an added Victorian half story that was removed in recent times.

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 a small Greek Revival cottage from the 1830s. It has had several alterations to it including a major renovation in the 1980s. The plan shows a two-room house with central hall and may have had rear cabinets and an inset porch. A two-room wing with porch leads off the rear.
- B. The guidelines state, “Often one of the most important decorative features of a house, doorways reflect the age and style of a building... Replacements should respect the age and style of the building.”
- C. The applicant is proposing to do general repairs and install a side door and porch and a rear handicap ramp.
 - 1. A pair of French doors will be placed on the north side with a porch deck and steps covered with a gabled roof held by columns separated by railings, all matching the details on the front porch. Roof will match the main roof of the house.
 - 2. Handicap ramp will go across the west (rear of the building) to form a landing in front of the existing rear porch. All details to match the existing.
 - 3. All details including lattice, piers, cornices, porches, and ramp will match the existing details on the house.
 - 4. General repairs will be to siding and details and will match the existing in profile dimension, color and material.
 - 5. Paint the house in the following colors:
- D. Clarifications
 - a. Roofing materials?
 - b. How will the rear window be shortened?

STAFF ANALYSIS

This is a significant building to the neighborhood. The request to install handicap ramps is not unusual and the Board has often approved them. The side porch and French doors are somewhat unusual, however, staff does not believe they significantly impair the property. The maintenance items are routine.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

John and Nancy Lee were present to discuss the application. They stated the roofing materials would match the existing and that the proposed shortened window would not be done.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the project and the visual impact on the 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. The motion was seconded by Tom Karwinski and 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 was seconded by Mary Couser and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 8/06/09.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

097-08-CA: 306 George
Applicant: Britney Jara for James Shelton
Received: 07/18/08
Meeting: 08/06/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden District
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Install a 6-foot privacy fence.

BUILDING HISTORY

This is a one story, English Cottage Revival (Gumby) house probably from the 30s or 40s. It is being considered in the updated neighborhood nomination as a contributing building.

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 presents a gable to the side with a centered door with minimal porch. The main body of the house is cross gabled and runs perpendicular to the front wing.
- B. The guidelines state, “These 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... The finished side of the fence should face toward public view.”
- C. The applicant is proposing to replace the existing chain link fence with a privacy fence.
 - 1. The fence will be 6-foot, treated pine, dog-eared.
 - 2. There will be a 12-foot wide gate at the rear of the house.
 - 3. The fence will run along the sides of the property per the submitted plan.
 - 4. A 4-foot privacy fence will run along the south side of the drive to the street.
- I. Clarifications
 - 1. On the south side, where does the 4 foot fence begin and the 6 foot end?
 - 2. What is the design for the 4-foot fence?

STAFF ANALYSIS

The replacement of the chain link and installation of a 6-foot fence are routinely approved by the Board. The 4-foot fence may need a variance.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Ms. Jara was present to discuss the application. She agreed to reduce the size of the short fence to 3 feet.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Craig Roberts pointed out that he believes the use of all the privacy fences, particularly in front yards is creating a visual impairment to the districts. He argued that the picket fence would be much more historically accurate than a short dog-eared privacy fence. Ms. Jara agreed to a 3-foot picket fence, but wants the option of leaving it natural.

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 amend C.4. to a 3-foot picket fence. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswald and unanimously approved.

Decision on the Application

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the facts as amended 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 was seconded by Tom Karwinski and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 8/06/09.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

098-08-CA: 244 S. Warren St.
Applicant: Emanuel & Belinda Roberts
Received: 07/17/08
Meeting: 08/06/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Screen rear porch similar to photograph. Erect 12 x 14 storage building.

BUILDING HISTORY

This is a new house in south Church Street.

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 a new two-story brick home in south Church Street.
- B. The appropriateness should be determined based on the request’s impact on the neighborhood.
- C. The applicant is proposing to screen the patio.
 - 1. The screening will be done in a manner similar to the submitted photograph.
 - 2. The wood will be painted white.
 - 3. There was no submission for the storage building.

STAFF ANALYSIS

Staff sees no problem with screening the rear porch on this non-contributing building. The storage unit should be denied for lack of information.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Roberts was present to discuss the application. He asked to amend his application to add the construction of a storage building. He presented a photograph of what he wanted to build and described the building.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the application. There was general consensus on the screening and some clarifications on the shed.

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 with the following amendments:

- 3. The storage building would match the building in the photograph provided.

4. It would be 12 x 14 with aluminum clad windows and a hipped roof with shingles to match the house.
5. It would be either brick to match the house or lapped siding.

The motion was seconded by Tom Karwinski and unanimously approved.

Decision on the Application

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the facts as amended 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 was seconded by Tom Karwinski and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 8/06/09.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

099-08-CA: 254 St. Anthony
Applicant: Tommy Latham for the Society of 1868 c/o Zeb Inge
Received: 07/18/08
Meeting: 08/06/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: DeTonti Square
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: RB
Project: General repairs and add a handicap accessibility.
Conflicts of Interest: Mary Cousar stated she had a possible conflict and recused herself.

BUILDING HISTORY

This is a significant Italianate townhouse from 1867.

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 a significant structure built shortly after the Civil War. It is the home of one of the City's mystic societies. Besides the exterior work, significant interior work is planned for the structure.
- B. The guidelines state, “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. The form and shape of the porch and its roof should maintain their historic appearance. The materials should blend with the style of the building. The balustrade of the stairs should match the design and materials of the porch. Enclosing the front porch is generally prohibited. Where rear or side porches are to be enclosed, one recommended method is to preserve the original con-figuration of columns, handrails, and other important architectural features.
- C. The applicant is proposing to install a handicap ramp, open up a partially enclosed first floor porch, enclose several bays of the second story porch, widen the northernmost door on the rear porch, and do repairs.
 - a. Demolish fire damaged siding and install new fixed non-operable shutters and railing to match the existing siding.
 - b. Provide new open porch and provide new exterior doors to match existing.
 - c. Replace new plenum cast iron grills to match existing.
 - d. Provide new exterior shutters where missing and replace all deteriorated exterior shutters. Paint all to match existing.
 - e. Repair existing cornice damage.
 - f. Install new handicap ramp on the very rear to wrap around to the wing's porch. Extend a roof over the ramp.
 - g. Install new cornice pediment to match existing (lintels).
 - h. Install new scupper and downspouts where missing to match the existing.
 - i. Install new wood canopy over open porch to match existing.
 - j. Install new wrought iron railing where missing on front porch balcony.
 - k. Install new brick steps at new open porch.

- l. Paint exterior of building to match existing color scheme.
- m. Repair all exterior doors and screen doors.
- n. Repair cracked exterior brick siding.
- o. Open the rear porch on first floor using fixed shutters on the west side.
- p. Demolish a small section of wall to enlarge the rear door for elevator access.
- q. Enclose the second story rear porch across the back and two bays of the wing with shutters (all these areas are already enclosed, either with shutters or siding).

STAFF ANALYSIS

Most of the work is repairs to match existing or altering previous changes to be consistent. Opening the gallery on the ground floor is appropriate. The Board generally approves handicap ramps and the widening of the door would naturally follow. The use of shutters as porch enclosures is a traditional method and is more in keeping with the house than the current siding. The brick steps leading up the rear porch are unusual and rather massive. Wood steps would be more easily reversed but would require more maintenance.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Tommy Latham was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the application. Tilmon Brown asked if the shutters would be operable and was assured they would be.

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 was seconded by Bunky Ralph and unanimously approved.

Decision on the Application

Craig Roberts 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 was seconded by Bunky Ralph and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 8/06/09.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

100-08-CA: 1555 Monroe
Applicant: Lynette Botha Miller
Received: 06/21/08
Meeting: 08/06/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Leinkauf
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Demolish existing carport and shed. Construct new 2-car garage with storage. Replace chain link fence with wood privacy fence.

BUILDING HISTORY

This is a traditional bungalow probably from the mid 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 bungalow is situated on a 50-foot lot that is approximately 170 feet deep.
- 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 replace an existing outbuilding.
 - 1. The proposed structure will be set toward the rear of the property and be 18 x 40 x 18 and serve as a double garage and storage building.
 - 2. The siding will be 5/8” grooved cedar textured or 3/8” Smartside siding.
 - 3. Roof will be fiberglass shingle to match the house.
 - 4. Building will be painted to match the house.
 - 5. There will be one window on the right side and one on the left.
 - 6. There will be two garage doors, a double door and window on the front.
 - 7. There will side windows on the second floor to correspond with those on the first.
 - 8. The building will have a gambrel roof to the side.
 - 9. Aluminum windows & screens. Door material not specified.
 - 10. On advice of staff, the applicant submitted a gable roof plan with half story.
 - 11. The lot is heavily wooded.
- D. Clarifications
 - a. Materials for windows and doors.
 - b. Design and site plan for fence.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This is a massive building and needs serious consideration for placement in the historic neighborhood. Centered on the lot, there would only be 5 feet to either side to the property lines. Though the illustration of the gambrel roof is fairly self-explanatory, it

has no relation to the neighborhood or the house. The sketch of the gable roofed alternative is insufficient to judge fairly. However, the Board generally requires that these buildings follow the standard pattern or relate to the house in some manner. Neither of these proposals relate to the neighborhood or the house. Though the yard is heavily landscaped, the Board generally does not accept this as a reason for inappropriate design since the house may one day sell and the new owner would inherit an inappropriate structure; or the landscaping could be removed resulting in the building being visible to numerous people. Staff believes the whole concept needs to be rethought by the owner. There is no design or site plan for the fence though two gates are shown.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mrs. Miller was present to discuss the application. She stated she needed the storage space and that her back yard was large and unused. The site plan for the fence was provided in the application and it would be a 6-foot dog-eared privacy fence with gate on either side.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the request. No one objected to the fence or the demolition of the garage. However, several Board members expressed concern that the proposed outbuilding building had no relationship to the house or the neighborhood. There was also concern about the size of the building in relation to the buildings surrounding it. It was felt that the design problems were too extensive to be handled in the meeting and that a design committee should be formed.

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. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswald and unanimously approved.

Decision on the Application

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does impair the historic integrity of the district and the house and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued for a 6-foot privacy fence and for demolition of the garage, and that the owner be referred to a design committee for the new garage. The motion was seconded by Mike Mayberry and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 8/06/09.

A design committee will be set up by the staff next week.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

101-08-CA: 1805 Dauphin
Applicant: Charles Howard & James Wagoner
Received: 07/28/08
Meeting: 08/06/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Construct concrete courtyard (approximately 40 x 27) with 8-foot square basin for water fountain in center; construct 8-foot exterior wall to the south of the courtyard to match the existing wall with a pedestrian gate.
Conflicts of Interest: Jim Wagoner stated he had a conflict and recused himself.

BUILDING HISTORY

This is a beautifully maintained two-story house built in 1910.

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 a fairly large house located where Kenneth Street dead-ends into Dauphin. Because of this the Board allowed the owners to construct an 8-foot wall around the house. Through the years the artificial siding has been removed the rear garage has been improved, and a new drive has been installed.
- 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 install a patio and water feature with a privacy wall.
 - 1. The concrete will be a 40 x 27 pad.
 - 2. An 8-foot square basin will be centered in the patio.
 - 3. It will be located on the east side of the house.
 - 4. An 8-foot wall will be placed at the back edge of the house.
- D. Clarifications
 - a. Will the concrete be patterned?

STAFF ANALYSIS

The concrete will be at grade and have negligible effect on the house or the neighborhood. The wall will be behind the already existing wall and will have very little impact on the neighborhood.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Charles Howard was present to discuss the application. He stated there would be a gate in the rear wall, but it had not yet been selected. He also stated that the concrete would not be patterned and that the center would be a fountain which had not yet been selected. He did not that the fountain would be removable.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no further discussion by the Board.

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. The motion was seconded by Tom Karwinski and 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 was seconded by Tom Karwinski and unanimously approved. The gate will be presented to the staff for review.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 8/06/09.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

102-08-CA: 101 Bradford
Applicant: Michael & Danica Zanetti
Received: 07/28/08
Meeting: 08/06/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Install a fence.

BUILDING HISTORY

This is a one and a half story bungalow probably built in 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 is a bungalow that has seen considerable improvement over the last few years. It is characterized by the pop-up centered on the roof.
- B. The guidelines state, “These 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. The applicant is proposing to erect a privacy fence.
 - 1. The fence will be a six-foot, dog-eared left natural.
 - 2. A fence already exists on the south side of the property.
 - 3. The fence will connect to the house at the front south corner (behind the porch) and extend across the rear property line to a point equal to the NW corner of the house to which it will connect.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This type of fence is generally approved by the Board.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Zanetti was present to discuss the application. In response to the Board, he stated there would be a gate in the side that would match the fence.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no further Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

Harris Oswalt 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 was seconded by Mary Couser and unanimously approved.

Decision on the Application

Harris Oswald 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 was seconded by Bunky Ralph and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 8/06/09.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

103-08-CA: 208 Dauphin Street
Applicant: WRICO Signs for Max Morey
Received: 07/28/08
Meeting: 08/06/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street Commercial District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Install two signs.

BUILDING HISTORY

This is a two story commercial building that was badly damaged by fire. It is being renovated as a movie house and apartments.

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 basically a new building constructed within the footprint of a historic structure that burned.
- B. The sign guidelines state, “Signs shall be mounted or erected so they do not obscure the architectural features or openings of a building.”
- C. The applicant is proposing to install two signs.
 - 1. The signs shall be 32 by 48 inches single faced aluminum per the submitted plan.
 - 2. They will be centered on the south and east fascia of the balcony.
 - 3. They will not be illuminated.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The signs appear to meet the guidelines. .

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Morey had been present to discuss the application but had left to get back to the job site for the installation of the theater seats.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed whether the sign would be better placed on the west side rather than the east. They also asked about the possible marquee sign under the balcony.

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 C.3. to read, “The two signs will be centered on the south and on either the east or west fascia of the balcony.” The motion was seconded by Harris Oswald and unanimously approved.

Decision on the Application

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the facts as amended 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 was seconded by Mary Couser and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 8/06/09.