

**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES**  
**February 4, 2009 – 3:00 P.M.**  
**Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street**

**A. CALL TO ORDER – THE CHAIR CALLED THE MEETING TO ORDER AT 3:02 P.M.**

1. Board members Tilmon Brown, Tom Karwinski, Harris Oswalt, Barja Wilson, Jim Wagoner, Bunky Ralph, Bradford Ladd and Craig Roberts were present. Staff present were Devereaux Bemis and Keri Coumanis.
2. Bunky Ralph moved to approve the minutes from the January 21, 2008 meeting. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.
3. Tom Karwinski moved to approve the mid month requests. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

**B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED.**

1. **Applicant: Golden Eagle NIS**
  - a. Property Address: 1 S. Royal Street
  - b. Date of Approval: January 15, 2009
  - c. Project: Replace ATM on Royal Street elevation.
2. **Applicant: Bob Schwarz**
  - a. Property Address: 13 N Reed Ave
  - b. Date of Approval: January 13, 2009
  - c. Project: Install a 12x16 foot concrete parking pad at the end of the drive. This updates a COA issued May 15, 1997.
3. **Applicant: Andrews and Atchison Properties**
  - a. Property Address: 213 S Scott Street
  - b. Date of Approval: January 21, 2009
  - c. Project: Repair front porch including replace rotten decking with 5/4” tongue and groove decking; replace spindles with 1” x 1” square spindles; repaint per existing color.
4. **Applicant: David Naman**
  - a. Property Address: 251 Dauphin Street
  - b. Date of Approval: January 22, 2009
  - c. Project: Repaint per submitted colors: “bread basket” or tan for wall; dark kettle black for trim and accent.
5. **Applicant: Tony Moore**
  - a. Property Address: 310 Dauphin Street
  - b. Date of Approval: January 23, 2009
  - c. Project: Install awning/valance to previously approved balcony, between columns. Color: blended green stripe; fabric awning.
6. **Applicant: Wendell Quimby**
  - a. Property Address: 605-07 Dauphin Street
  - b. Date of Approval: January 12, 2009
  - c. Project: Paint the building in the same red and green scheme, matching the existing paint colors.
7. **Applicant: Michael Smith**
  - a. Property Address: 1002 Dauphin Street
  - b. Date of Approval: January 23, 2009
  - c. Project: Repaint per existing colors.
8. **Applicant: Chris Bowen**
  - a. Property Address: 1010 Dauphin Street

- b. Date of Approval: January 26, 2009
- c. Project: Repair windows, window framing and siding, matching the existing in profile dimension and materials. Replace side windows with 1/1 wood frame windows to match the other 1/1 windows on the building. The front windows are to remain casements with transoms above. Repair wood on rear to match the existing in profile, dimension and materials. Paint all repairs to match the existing color scheme. Repair the 6 foot dog eared fence to match the existing.

**9. Applicant: Allen Johnson**

- a. Property Address: 1006 Selma
- b. Date of Approval: January 12, 2009
- c. Project: Repair roof valley on front of house, matching the existing in profile, dimension, color and material.

**10. Applicant: John Grow**

- a. Property Address: 1114 Palmetto
- b. Date of Approval: December 23, 2008
- c. Project: Repair roof, matching existing shingles

**11. Applicant: Charles Holder**

- a. Property Address: 1158 New St Francis
- b. Date of Approval: 01/21/09
- c. Project: Repair/replace rotten siding as needed to match existing in material, dimension and profile; Repair/ replace drip edge as needed to match existing in material, dimension and profile; Repair/replace skirting as needed to match existing in material, dimension and profile.

**C. APPLICATIONS**

1. 011-09: 1 S Royal Street
  - a. Applicant: Harold Dodd
  - b. Project: Signage
  - c. **APPROVED AS AMENDED.**
2. 012-09: 914 Government Street
  - a. Applicant: Harold Dodd
  - b. Project: Signage
  - c. **APPROVED.**
3. 013-09: 31 Lee Street
  - a. Applicant: Wayne Gardner
  - b. Project: Rear Addition
  - c. **APPROVED.**
4. 014-09: 304 State Street
  - a. Applicant: J.L. Bridler
  - b. Project: Extend existing privacy fence; install remote control gate across driveway.
  - c. **DENIED IN PART AND APPROVED IN PART.**
5. 015-09: 1509 Government Street
  - a. Applicant: Wave Net Technologies
  - b. Project: Signage
  - c. **DENIED.**
6. 016-09: 8 North Monterey
  - a. Applicant: Pete Vallas
  - b. Project: Rear and Side Addition
  - c. **APPROVED AS AMENDED.**

7. 017-09: 106 Levert
  - a. Applicant: Pete Vallas
  - b. Project: Rear Addition
  - c. **APPROVED.**
8. 018-09: 2313 Springhill Avenue
  - a. Applicant: Lucy Barr
  - b. Project: Addition
  - c. **TABLED.**

**D. OTHER BUSINESS**

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

**001-11-CA: 1 S Royal Street**  
**Applicant: Harold Dodd / Florida Certified Sign Erectors**  
**Received: 01/14/09**  
**Meeting: 02/04/09**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street  
Classification: Contributing Property  
Zoning: B-4  
Project: Signage

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This multi-floor commercial property was constructed in 1891 and is a fine example of late Victorian commercial architecture.

**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 are sign contractors for Compass Bank. Compass Bank recently merged with BBVA and changed their logo. The applicants propose replacing the existing signage with new signage which illustrates the new logo.
- B. The Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and Government Street, state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. Signs shall be mounted or erected so they do not obscure the architectural features or openings of a building.
  - 2. The overall design of all signage including the 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, Neo-classic, Craftsman, et al., should use signage of the same style. This can be done through the use of similar decorative features such as columns or brackets.
  - 3. The size of the sign shall be in proportion to the building and the neighboring structures and signs.
  - 4. The total maximum allowable sign area for all signs is one and one half square feet per linear front foot of the principal building, not to exceed 64 square feet. A multi-tenant building is also limited to a maximum of 64 square feet.
  - 5. Internally lit signs are prohibited. Lighted signs shall use focused, low intensity illumination.
- C. Scope of Work:
  - 1. Replace existing signage with new signage at exact location as existing signage;
  - 2. New signage includes
    - a. New sign over entryway
      - 1. 2’ x 10’3”
      - 2. aluminum letters with blue painted satin finish

- b. New sign over ATM
  - 1. 2'-3" x 3'-6"
  - 2. white vinyl letters situated within aluminum face pan
  - 3. internally illuminated
- c. Replace existing plaque with new plaque illustrating new logo
  - 1. same as existing in dimension and material
  - 2. area approx. 2 sq. ft.
- d. Total sq. ft. approximately: 31

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

The proposed signage does not exceed the allowable square footage under the sign design guidelines. Furthermore, the proposed signage replaces existing signage and there are minimal changes in the dimensions from the existing to the proposed. In order to incorporate Compass Bank's new logo, the proposed signage has a blue purple color. Staff has suggested the applicants bring a color sample to the ARB meeting for the ARB to review. Barring any concerns over the color of the signage, Staff recommends approval of the sign over the entryway and the plaque. However, the proposed sign over the ATM incorporates internal illumination. Internally illuminated signs are not allowed under the guidelines. Therefore, Staff recommends denial of the internally illuminated panel over the ATM.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Jim Patterson, an employee of Florida Certified Sign Erectors, was present to discuss the application. Mr. Patterson further explained that Compass had been bought by BBVA and was replacing all its signage to reflect the merger. Mr. Patterson indicated that the ATM signage panel would not be internally illuminated, and that if there is a bulb there, they will remove it, and continue to use existing external illumination. Mr. Patterson answered the Board's questions regarding removal of the sign over the doorway and whether or not it would leave a ghost. Mr. Patterson indicated that the stucco would be repaired to match existing.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

## **FINDING OF FACT**

Bunky Ralph 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(1)b(3) to read "externally illuminated."

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

## **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Bunky Ralph 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.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 02/04/10**

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

**001-12-CA: 914 Government Street**  
**Applicant: Harold Dodd / Florida Certified Sign Erectors**  
**Received: 01/14/09**  
**Meeting: 02/04/09**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden District  
Classification: Non-contributing  
Zoning: B-4  
Project: Signage

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This is a one-story, non-contributing commercial building within the Oakleigh Garden District.

**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 are sign contractors for Compass Bank. Compass Bank recently merged with BBVA and changed their logo. The applicants propose replacing the existing signage with new signage which illustrates the new logo.
- B. The Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and Government Street, state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. Signs shall be mounted or erected so they do not obscure the architectural features or openings of a building.
  - 2. The overall design of all signage including the 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, Neo-classic, Craftsman, et al., should use signage of the same style. This can be done through the use of similar decorative features such as columns or brackets.
  - 3. The size of the sign shall be in proportion to the building and the neighboring structures and signs.
  - 4. The total maximum allowable sign area for all signs is one and one half square feet per linear front foot of the principal building, not to exceed 64 square feet. A multi-tenant building is also limited to a maximum of 64 square feet.
  - 5. Internally lit signs are prohibited. Lighted signs shall use focused, low intensity illumination.
- C. Scope of Work:
  - 1. Replace existing signage with new signage at exact location as existing signage;
  - 2. New signage includes
    - a. New monument sign
      - 1. 2’5” x 6’
      - 2. external illumination from existing ground lamps

- b. New wall sign over entryway
  - 1. 1' x 5'1-1/2"
- c. New wall sign on east elevation
  - 1. 2'-3" x 11'8-3/4"
- d. Total square footage approximately 53 sq. ft.

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

The proposed signage replaces existing signage at the same location and with similar dimensions. The amount of signage does not exceed the 64 sq. ft. limit under the guidelines. The monument sign will use existing lighting. In order to incorporate Compass Bank's new logo, the proposed signage has a blue purple color. Staff has suggested the applicants bring a color sample to the ARB meeting for the ARB to review. Barring any concerns over the color of the signage, Staff recommends approval.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Jim Patterson, an employee of Florida Certified Sign Erectors, was present to discuss the application.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

**FINDING OF FACT**

Tom 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 as written.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 02/04/10**



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

**001-13-CA:** 31 Lee Street  
**Applicant:** Wayne Gardner  
**Received:** 01/22/09  
**Meeting:** 02/04/09

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Rear Addition

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This one-story bungalow is a contributing structure within the Old Dauphin Way district.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the change...will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the district...”

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. In November, 2007, Dauphin Way United Methodist sought approval to demolish this home. The ARB denied the request to demolish the property. It has since been sold and is undergoing renovation in order to be sold as a single family residence. The current owner/applicant received a mid-month COA to do in-kind repairs, maintenance and repainting of the building. The applicant also applied for and received a building permit to do interior renovations. The MHDC received a 311 call concerning the extent of the rear renovations to the building and whether an addition had been permitted. Staff visited the site and determined that the work to the rear of the building was beyond the scope of the COA. The work included the construction of a gable-roofed addition to the home where formerly there had been a shed roof addition. Staff further determined that the work was appropriate under the Historic Districts Guidelines. Staff consulted with the ARB at the January 21, 2009 meeting. The ARB determined the applicants needed to submit an application for the gable-roofed addition.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior standards state:
  - 1. “Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.
  - 2. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.
  - 3. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.”
- C. Scope of Work:
  - 1. Rear gable-roofed addition/extension to be placed at location of former shed roof addition

2. Approximately 8'7" long by 27'11" (same width as house)
3. Gable roof will tie into existing gable roof
4. Cornerboards to be placed at end of original home
5. Featuring, three-tab shingles, wood siding and rafter tails to match existing
6. Small gable-roof, bracketed covering over back door stoop.

D. Clarifications needed:

1. Design and material of rear door

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

Prior to the ongoing work, there was a deteriorated shed roof room/enclosed porch attached to the rear of this home. The dimensions of the former room/porch are unavailable. The current addition extends approximately 8'-7" from the original rear wall of the home and across the full extent of the home. Though the applicants received a mid month COA to do repairs, this portion of the property has been rebuilt in its entirety, which extends beyond the scope of the COA. However, the work complies with the Historic District Guidelines. The applicants have distinguished between the original home and the addition with a corner board. The siding matches the existing in dimension, profile and material. The roof and rafter tails match the existing. Upon consideration of the design and material of the rear door, Staff recommends approval.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Wayne Gardner was present to discuss the application. Mr. Gardner explained that once the workers began renovating the existing shed roof addition, they discovered that the structure was too dilapidated to repair. Mr. Gardner explained that he intended to install historic wood doors, build a landing with wood steps, and reuse the original gable window. A photo of the door was provided to both the board and staff.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

## **FINDING OF FACT**

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report as written.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

## **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Bunky Ralph 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.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 02/04/10**

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

**001-14-CA: 304 State Street**  
**Applicant: J.L. Bridler**  
**Received: 01/20/09**  
**Meeting: 02/04/09**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: De Tonti Square  
Classification: Non-Contributing (New Construction)  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Extend existing privacy fence; install remote control gate across driveway.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This new residence was constructed in 2007.

**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 propose removing an existing wood privacy fence, constructing a masonry wall with decorative aluminum work on top of the wall, extending an existing 6’ aluminum fence, installing a 6’ aluminum gate and constructing a new wood privacy fence along the rear property line.
- B. The Mobile Historic Guidelines, 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. The height of solid fences in historic districts is generally restricted to six feet.”
- C. Scope of Work:
  - 1. 55’- 6’ wood privacy fence along north (rear) property line to tie into existing 6’ wood privacy fence along east property line;
  - 2. remove 27’ of 6’ wood privacy fence on west property line and replace with 6’ “old brick” wall with cast iron ornament for 27’
  - 3. install 26’ of 6’ ornamental aluminum fence (to match existing in front of home/south property line) along west property line where brick wall ends
  - 4. follow by 12’ wide, 6’ high ornamental aluminum gate
  - 5. follow by 34’ of 6’ ornamental aluminum fence to tie into new 6’ wood privacy fence at northwest corner of property.

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

The fence proposed in items C(3)-(5) seeks to match an existing fence on the property, previously approved by the ARB even though it is a 6’, aluminum, front yard fence. Therefore, these work items are permissible both under the guidelines and the zoning ordinance and Staff recommends approval of C(3)-(5).

Staff recommends tabling the remainder of the application in order to give the Staff time to consult with the applicant and potentially approve the project on a mid month basis. Item C(1), while permissible under the design guidelines, is not under the zoning code. Likewise, item C(2) presents problems both under the guidelines and the zoning code. Staff further recommends the applicant consider using the 6' aluminum fence for the entire length of the west property line, however, realizes the applicant would like to create a courtyard space; thus, the need to consult with the applicant regarding his options.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

There was no one present to discuss the application. The applicants had contacted the staff and explained that they would be out of town, but wanted the application heard in their absence. Staff explained that they visited the site to ascertain the exact scope of work.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

A discussion ensued between the board and staff. The board questioned when the current 6' aluminum, crimped-top fence was approved. The current fence had been approved by the ARB at the November 20, 2007 meeting. Staff clarified that the applicants wanted to construct a 5' masonry wall in place of the existing 6' privacy fence. Staff clarified that the existing, interior fences (both chain link and wood privacy) would be removed by the applicant as the exterior fences would be constructed. The board discussed how the applicant would need a zoning variance for the wall and the need to comply with the setback for the rear yard privacy fence.

### **FINDING OF FACT**

Jim Wagoner moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report as written.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

### **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Bunky Ralph 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 be issued for items C(3-5), item C(2) be denied and item C(1) be approved if the applicant would agree to comply with the setback.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 2/04/10**

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

**001-15-CA:** 1509 Government Street  
**Applicant:** Advantage Signs  
**Received:** 01/13/09  
**Meeting:** 02/04/09

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Out of District Signage  
Classification: Non-contributing  
Zoning: B-4  
Project: Signage

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This building will be a non-contributing property within the expanded Leinkauf Historic District. Currently, the ARB has the ability to review all signage along Government Street under the Mobile Historic District and Government Street Sign Ordinance.

**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 propose installing a wall sign on the western face of this five story masonry building.
- B. The Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and Government Street, state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. Signs shall be mounted or erected so they do not obscure the architectural features or openings of a building.
  - 2. The overall design of all signage including the 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, Neo-classic, Craftsman, et al., should use signage of the same style. This can be done through the use of similar decorative features such as columns or brackets.
  - 3. The size of the sign shall be in proportion to the building and the neighboring structures and signs.
  - 4. The total maximum allowable sign area for all signs is one and one half square feet per linear front foot of the principal building, not to exceed 64 square feet. A multi-tenant building is also limited to a maximum of 64 square feet.
  - 5. Internally lit signs are prohibited. Lighted signs shall use focused, low intensity illumination.
- C. Scope of Work:
  - 1. Install 3’ x 16’ sign on west face of building approximately 41’ from the ground
  - 2. featuring aluminum faces and returns, reverse lit halo channel letters and neon lighting

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

This multi-tenant, five story, building has a monument sign placed directly before the front entrance of the building. The monument sign is approximately 5'6" high and 8' wide with 6 – 1' x 3' panels on each side. Currently, three panels per side are in use. Thus, there is 18' sq. ft. of signage, though, there is a potential for 36 sq. ft. total signage. Incorporating the proposed wall sign would bring the total potential square footage of signage on the building to 84 sq. ft., which exceeds the allowable 64 sq. ft. Further, the building borders a residential, historic district and though the height and size of the building can accommodate a wall sign, doing so is not appropriate for this district. This is a non-conforming structure within the district and applying a wall sign to this five story commercial building would only highlight the building further. Thus, Staff recommends the applicant's signage be restricted to the existing monument sign. For the above reasons, Staff recommends denial.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Ray Floyd was present to discuss the application. Mr. Floyd indicated that calculated the square footage of the proposed sign as 27'. Staff explained that under the guidelines, the square footage of wall signs were figured as if a box was drawn to encompass all features of the sign. A discussion was held about how the building abuts a residential neighborhood and while there were wall signs in the nearby shopping center, they were at the 2<sup>nd</sup> story level, rather than the fifth. Mr. Floyd questioned how the application could be amended to conform to the guidelines and the Board recommended the signage be within the appropriate square feet and appropriate to the neighborhood.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

## **FINDING OF FACT**

Jim Wagoner moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report as written.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

## **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Jim Wagoner moved that, based upon the facts as determined 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.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

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

**001-16-CA:** 8 North Monterey  
**Applicant:** Pete Vallas  
**Received:** 01/13/09  
**Meeting:** 02/04/09

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Addition to rear and south, side yard elevation

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This is American 4-square was constructed in 1909 and has gone through numerous changes to its east (rear) elevation.

**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 seek approval for a rear, side yard addition on the south elevation and a second story addition on the east elevation above an existing first story addition. The existing first story addition to the rear of the home is a screened porch, added in
- B. The Secretary of the Interior standards state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. “The goal of new construction should be to blend into the historic district, but to avoid creating a false sense of history. . .
  - 2. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment. . .
  - 3. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.”
- C. Scope of Work includes:
  - 1. Addition to southeast corner of home;
    - a. Two-story, 12’ x 22’;
      - 1. 4’ x 15’9” of addition will be porch and side landing
        - a. Railing to match existing front porch.
        - b. Hipped metal roof over 4’ x 15’9” porch/landing
      - 2. note: only 4’ of new west wall will extend beyond existing plane of home and therefore visible from the street because of existing 4’ bump out and chimney along existing south wall
  - 2. Addition to second story east elevation;

- a. One-story over existing first floor screened porch added in 1990s
  - b. 14'6" x 39'6" (includes 12' of addition 1(a))
  - c. New hipped roof ties into existing hipped roof with shingles to match existing
  - d. Pilasters placed to match first floor screened porch columns
3. Features
- a. Wood siding to match existing
  - b. Windows to match existing in profile dimension and design
  - c. Working shutters
- D. Clarifications needed:
- 1. Will any materials (i.e. windows) be recycled?
  - 2. Material and design for new doors

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

The rear of 8 North Monterey has seen several changes over the years, including the enclosure of the original two-story rear stair case. This current modification allows the applicants access to the rear of their home from the existing driveway and provides for utility space. The second floor addition creates two additional bedrooms on the second floor. The proposed first floor, southeast addition incorporates design details from the existing home and replicates the scale of an existing bump out (original to the home) on that elevation. In other words, the addition does not disturb the proportions or rhythm of the existing building. Thus, staff recommends approval. Since, the second floor addition extends over an existing first floor addition and incorporates design elements from the first floor addition, staff believes the new addition will be distinguishable from the old and the scale is appropriate. Therefore, staff recommends approval.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Pete Vallas was present to discuss the application. Mr. Vallas stated that the new windows will be milled to match existing and that existing windows will be reused. Mr. Karwinski commented that he believed the addition significantly altered the massing of the house because it extended beyond the main plain of home. Board members discussed the fact that the addition was at the very rear of the home. Mr. Vallas noted that the addition retained the rhythm of the original home.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

## **FINDING OF FACT**

Bunky Ralph 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 facts C(3)(d) to state that the existing windows will be reused and C(3)(e) to state that the new doors will be wood.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

## **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Jim Wagoner 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. Tom Karwinski voted in opposition. The motion passed.



**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 02/04/10**

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

**001-16-CA: 106 Levert Avenue**  
**Applicant: Pete Vallas**  
**Received: 01/13/09**  
**Meeting: 02/04/09**

**RECUSED: BRADFORD LADD AND TOM KARWINSKI**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Ashland Place  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Addition to rear and north, side yard elevation

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This contributing, one-story masonry residence was constructed in 1935. The existing garage and rear addition were added in 1996.

**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 applicant’s proposed addition for this house has been submitted to the ARB on two prior occasions.

1. The applicants first submitted plans for an addition to the **August 6, 2008** ARB meeting. The application was then sent to a Design Review Committee at the August 20 ARB meeting where, due to the scale of the addition to the original home, it received an unfavorable response from committee members.
  - a. The **August 6, 2008** proposal called for the addition to:
    1. begin 37’6” from the front of the home;
    2. addition achieved full height of roofline A approximately 46’9” from the front of the home;
    3. proposed height of roofline A was 27’9” and Roofline B was 28’3”.
    4. existing height of the main ridgeline of the home is 19’6”; thus, the proposed addition exceeded the existing ridgeline by approximately 8’3” to 8’9”.
2. The applicants returned with a second plan at the **October 1, 2008** ARB meeting. During that meeting, the Board expressed further concerns over the scale of the proposed addition and proposed changes to the original home. The applicants attempted to amend their application

- a. The **October 1, 2008** proposal called for the addition to
  1. begin 36'9" from the front of the house;
  2. addition achieved full height of roofline A approximately 46'3" from the front of the home;
  3. the proposed height of roofline A was 25'9" and Roofline B was 27'3".
  4. the existing height of the main ridgeline of the home is 19'6"; thus, the proposed addition exceeded the existing ridgeline by approximately 6'3" to 7'9".
  
3. The applicants are now submitting **three alternative plans** to the ARB; **however, please note: the applicants prefer and are submitting as their main application Alternate 1 for the Board's consideration at this time.**
  - a. The first set of plans (labeled **Alternate 1**) illustrates the verbal amendments the applicants made during the October 1, 2008 meeting. A key point of the October 1, 2008 discussion was to push the second floor west wall further back (i.e. further from the front of the house) by removing two interior closets. Secondly, the applicants agreed to leave the front and north elevation as is. As such, **Alternate 1** has changed from the October 1 submission in the following respects:
    1. there will be no changes to the front door and two flanking French doors on the west elevation;
    2. no changes to the dining room windows on the north elevation;
    3. the second story, hipped roof addition will be pushed back further so that the addition begins 43'3" from the front of the house as opposed to 36'9" from the front in the October 1 plan;
    4. the addition reaches full height at 51'9" from the front of the home as opposed to 46'3" from the October 1 plan;
    5. however, the height of the addition will remain the same as the October 1 plan (i.e., the proposed height of roofline A is 25'9" and Roofline B is 27'3").
  - b. **Alternate 2** proposes a lower, wider second story hipped roof addition.
    1. The addition begins 41'9" from the front of the house;
    2. the addition reaches full height at 52'6"
    3. the height of the addition is 26'6" or 7' above the existing roofline.
  - c. **Alternate 3** incorporated staff recommendations and illustrates a front-facing, gabled roof addition.
    1. The addition begins 52,6" from the front of the house;
    2. achieves full height 52'6" from the front of the house;
    3. the height of the addition is 26'3" or 6'9" above the existing ridgeline.

B. The Secretary of the Interior standards state, in pertinent part:

1. "The goal of new construction should be to blend into the historic district, but to avoid creating a false sense of history. . .
2. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment. . .
3. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired."

C. Scope of Work includes:

1. One story addition to rear of home connecting existing garage with home, featuring
  - a. lapped siding at hyphen between original home and garage;
  - b. shuttered windows;
  - c. French doors installed on south elevation;
  - d. addition will jut out 3'6" out from existing plane of building to match existing garage along the north wall;
  - e. two recessed areas installed on first floor of garage to mimic windows.
2. Second story addition to existing garage featuring
  - a. Gabled second story 6/6 windows with soldier courses and hipped roofs;
  - b. oriel made of lapped siding with 6/6 windows.
3. For more details, see attached schemes, Alternates 1-3; **however, please note: the applicants prefer and are submitting as their main application Alternate 1 for the Board's consideration at this time.**

### STAFF ANALYSIS

To begin, staff would like recognize that the applicants have made a concerted effort to work with the Architectural Review Board. Furthermore, please note that the applicant will be bringing perspective drawings to the meeting.

As a general rule, staff does not recommend, nor does the ARB typically allow, additions to exceed the existing roofline of a historic structure. Though the roofline of the addition in all three of the attached proposals exceed that of the existing structure, the proposals directly address ARB suggestions from both the August Design Review Committee and the October 1, 2008 meeting, as well as, subsequent meetings with staff. In particular, Alternate 1 illustrates the verbal modification made during the meeting to the October 1, 2008 application. Alternate 1 reduced the addition approximately 2' in height than the original plan and moved it approximately 5' further back from the front of the house than the October 1, 2008 plan.

While the applicants have also submitted two additional proposals, the rooflines in both Alternate 2 (large hip) and Alternate 3 (gable) appear more conspicuous than that of Alternate 1. As drawn, the ridgeline of the larger hip and gable roof shift further south and out of line with the existing east-west ridgeline, which appears, at least on paper, to increase the visibility of the addition.

In conclusion, the applicants have reduced and recessed the proposed addition to the greatest extent possible, given the constraints placed on the site by the height of the existing garage. At this juncture, staff has provided as much information as possible and recommends the Board review the attached application for its appropriateness to the historic structure and district.

### PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Pete Vallas, Banks Ladd and Mary Carol Ladd were present to discuss the application. Mr. Vallas explained the difference between each alternate proposal. Mr. Vallas explained Alternate 1 was preferred because the various components of the roof broke up the massing of the addition and better reflected the original home. Mrs. Ladd explained her perspective drawings, which illustrated Alternate 1 would potentially be the least visible addition from the street. Mr. Ladd estimated the addition is slightly over 1000 sq. ft.

### BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

#### **FINDING OF FACT**

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report as written.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

#### **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the facts as determined 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 to construct an addition per submitted plans for Alternate 1.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 02/04/10**

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

**001-16-CA:** 2313 Springhill Avenue  
**Applicant:** Lucy Barr  
**Received:** 01/13/09  
**Meeting:** 02/04/09

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Ashland Place  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Addition to north elevation

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This contributing, two-story Mediterranean Revival residence was constructed in 1925.

**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 main entrance to this home is on Springhill Avenue; thus, the front façade of the home faces Springhill. However, the home is situated on a corner lot in the Ashland Place subdivision and accordingly the current owner (as well as the prior owner) accesses the home through a circular drive and side entrance from Levert Ave. The applicants propose a northeast addition to this house which would alter the original, historic façade of the home; albeit, the change would only be minimally visible from the Levert Avenue façade.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior standards state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. “The goal of new construction should be to blend into the historic district, but to avoid creating a false sense of history. . .
  - 2. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment. . .
  - 3. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.”
- C. Scope of Work includes:
  - 1. 49’ addition to east wall of home featuring materials and details to match existing building.

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

Staff believes more information is needed in order to properly evaluate this application. Currently, only elevations of the addition were submitted. Staff has requested a full elevation, with dimensions, of the north façade of the building with the proposed addition. Staff has placed a call in to the

architect and may be amending this application prior to the meeting date. Staff realizes the building's orientation has been altered and directed towards Levert Avenue; however Springhill Avenue is a significant historic thoroughfare within the city and staff would like an opportunity to thoroughly review how exactly this addition will impact the main façade and the viewshed along the street.

#### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Lucy Barr was present to discuss the application. A discussion was held about the origination of the design concept, the orientation of the building, the size and scale of the addition and whether the addition could be placed elsewhere on the lot. Ms. Barr was amenable to recommending a Design Review Committee to the clients to discuss all the alternatives.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

#### **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Jim Wagoner moved that, based upon the facts and the discussion, the application be tabled and recommended for a Design Review Committee. The motion passed unanimously.