

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES

July 1, 2009 – 3:00 P.M.

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

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Jim Wagoner, called the meeting to order at 3:00. Gertrude Baker, Bill James, Tom Karwinski, Bradford Ladd, Harris Oswalt, Craig Roberts, and Janetta Whitt-Mitchell were in attendance
2. Craig Roberts moved to approve the minutes of the June 3, 2009 meeting. The motion passed unanimously.
3. Tom Karwinski moved to approve the mid month COAs granted by Staff. The motion passed unanimously.

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED

1. **Applicant: Susan Colson**
 - a. Property Address: 273 Dauphin St.
 - b. Date of Approval: 06/11/09
 - c. Project: Reroof using same materials.
2. **Applicant: Barbara Hamilton**
 - a. Property Address: 1110 Savannah St.
 - b. Date of Approval: 06/09/09
 - c. Project: Install automatic gate in driveway to match existing fencing. Construct handicap ramp leading from back door to driveway. Paint handicap ramp black to match trim on house.
3. **Applicant: Bill Host**
 - a. Property Address: 1661 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 06/08/09
 - c. Project: Install temporary wheelchair ramp. Ramp approved for ninety day. Ramp sits on boots so easily removed.
4. **Applicant: Montdrakgo Caldwell**
 - a. Property Address: 1064 Palmetto Street.
 - b. Date of Approval: 06/11/09
 - c. Project: Remove deteriorated portions of wood soffit. Repair and Replacement to match existing in profile, scale, dimension, and material (Painting approval granted in an April 1, 2009 COA. See April 15, 2009 Agenda).
5. **Applicant: Ryan Jensen**
 - a. Property Address: 1413 Monroe Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 06/09/09
 - c. Project: Repaint body of house sage green. Repaint trim white.
6. **Applicant: Douglas Kearley for Martha Locicero**
 - a. Property Address: 1155 Church St.
 - b. Date of Approval: 06/10/09
 - c. Project: Install two iron handrails to either side of front steps.
7. **Applicant: William Weekley**
 - a. Property Address: 1155 Church Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 06/16/09
 - c. Project: Replace siding in kind. Repaint per existing color scheme.

8. **Applicant: Barry Wiseman**
 - a. Property Address: 12 Common St.
 - b. Date of Approval: 06/16/09
 - c. Project: Remove existing siding. Replace siding with Hardiplank. Paint house white. Replace roofing with 3-tab onyx shingles.
9. **Applicant: Bill Demouy**
 - a. Property Address: 105 Levert Ave.
 - b. Date of Approval: 06/15/09
 - c. Project: Replace rotten wood. Paint to match existing color scheme.
10. **Applicant: Katherine Morrisette**
 - a. Property Address: 12 Common St.
 - b. Date of Approval: 06/17/09
 - c. Project: Paint body of house per existing color scheme.
11. **Applicant: Katherine Morrisette**
 - a. Property Address: 12 Common St.
 - b. Date of Approval: 06/0017/09
 - c. Project: Paint house body house either Fire on the Mountain, Amaretto, Rough Terrain, or Desert Rouge..
12. **Applicant: Jim Alston for Cecily Kaffer**
 - a. Property Address: 1559 Fearnway
 - b. Date of Approval: 06/18/09
 - c. Project: Construct 4' wood picket interior lot privacy fence.
13. **Applicant: Devereaux Bemis**
 - a. Property Address: 167 State St.
 - b. Date of Approval: 06/17/09
 - c. Project: Paint rear stair with Behr solid stain, Sunset Gray. Paint the rear wing doors green to match windows.
14. **Applicant: Terry Mannion**
 - a. Property Address: 11 North Dearborn St.
 - b. Date of Approval: 06/18/09
 - c. Project: Replace trim and carpentry to match existing. Prim and caulk exterior woodwork. Replace porch columns to match existing.
15. **Applicant: Cameron Pfeiffer**
 - a. Property Address: 204 Michigan Ave.
 - b. Date of Approval: 06/19/09
 - c. Project: Remove and replace rotten wood, all replacements in kind. Work to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Remove later wood balustrade. Repaint per existing color scheme.
16. **Applicant: Tony W. Havard**
 - a. Property Address: 263 South Monterey St.
 - b. Date of Approval: 06/22/09
 - c. Project: Replace rotten boards around base of house. Repair columns. Replace rotten fascia boards. All repair and replacement is to match existing in profile dimension and material. Paint house per existing color scheme.
17. **Applicant: Michael and Danica Zanetti**
 - a. Property Address: 101 Bradford Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 06/24/09
 - c. Project: Construct pergola in back yard. Pergola to be 9' in height in site atop brick paved surface measuring 14' by 14'.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 062-09: 114 St. Emanuel St.
 - a. Applicant: Nicholas H. Holmes, II
 - b. Project: Install railing on front portico. Install lighting fixtures across site.
APPROVED AS AMENED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
2. 063-09: 607 Saint Francis Street
 - a. Applicant: Katina Collins
 - b. Project: Replace front door. Rear Deck Approval.
APPROVED IN PART. DENIED IN PART. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
3. 064-09: 1160 New Saint. Francis St.
 - a. Applicant: Marvin L. Pryor
 - b. Project: Remove tongue and groove decking. Replace decking with 5 ¾" treated decking.
DENIED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
4. 065-09: Leinkauf Historic District.
 - a. Applicant: Melissa M. Thomas for the Leinkauf Neighborhood Association
 - b. Project: Sign Approval.
APPROVED AS AMENED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED
5. 066-09: 1562 Blair Avenue.
 - a. Applicant: Greg Dreaper
 - b. Project: Amend COA to allow fiberglass front door, alternate garage doors, and vinyl windows.
DENIED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Guidelines
2. Election of a Vice-Chair
Harris Oswald was elected Vice-Chair
3. Discussion

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

062-09-CA: 114 Saint Emanuel St.
Applicant: Nicholas H. Holmes, II for Christ Church
Received: 06/03/09
Meeting: 07/01/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Install railing on front portico. Install lighting fixtures across site.

BUILDING HISTORY

The building is one of the most significant structures in the City. Built between 1838-1840, the church reflects the influence of the mature Greek Revival style. The building suffered severe damage in the 1906 hurricane. The exterior restoration and reconstruction were carried out in a manner in keeping with original design.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property last appeared before the Board on April 15, 2009. The applicant submitted fencing and landscape proposals. The Board granted approval both submissions. The landscaping plan has been executed. The applicant returns to the Board with a lighting plan and a railing proposal.
- B. The state Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts in pertinent part:
 - 1. “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture. Historic porches should be maintained and repaired to reflect their period. Particular attention should be paid to the handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions and decorative details.”
 - 2. “Lighting can be an important element in the historic districts. Therefore, where lighting impacts the exterior appearance of a building or of the district in which the building is located, it shall be reviewed for appropriateness any other element.”
 - 3. “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plan):
 - 1. East Elevation
 - A. Remove flagstone pavers in walkway adjacent to front steps
 - B. Install two iron handrails
 - 1. excavate substrate and pour concrete in walkway before portico (location of removed pavers) to secure lower iron pickets to ground
 - 2. secure intermediate iron pickets to treads of portico steps (one in the third step and two in the sixth step)

- a. drill holes to be 4” in depth
 - b. pour an epoxy to secure pickets within holes
 - 3. screw handrail brackets to either side of two portico columns to secure upper portion of railings
 - C. Reset flagstone pavers before the front steps
 - D. Attempt to repair flagstone pavers in walkway (those not adjacent to the portico)
 - E. Install 2 can lights in portico roof
- 2. South Elevation
 - A. Install seven 6’ tall brass upright poles with 100W-MH bulbs before each window
 - B. Mount one 50W MH mini flood light to chancel window
- 3. North Elevation
 - A. Install two 6’ tall brass upright poles with 100W-MH bulbs before the two northwest windows of the nave
 - B. Set three 3’ tall brass upright poles in concrete within sills of the three northeast windows of the elevation
 - C. Mount one 100W MH mini flood light above canopy of handicap entrance
 - D. Place one Can STK 4-sided SHLD to side north of handicap ramp
- 5. Lighting on grounds
 - A. Place seven 175W MV R40-down lights in trees
 - B. Place one 70W MH R40-down light in tree

STAFF ANALYSIS

Christ Church is not only one of the most important Greek Revival buildings in Mobile, but also one of the most significant buildings in the state. The front portico has two existing railings, one affixed to each of the flanking ante podia. The proposed railings would require invasive drilling into the columns. Staff does not recommend approval of the proposed railings.

The proposed lighting program is intended to provide illumination of the church’s remarkable stained stain glass windows and recently landscaped grounds. According to the applicant, the upright poles are the most satisfactory means to accomplish those ends while at the same time avoiding drastic intervention with the historic building fabric. While this objective is commendable the proposed plans do not fully accomplish the desired objective.

Staff recommends denial of both the upright poles to be set in the window sills, since their installation would harm the historic building materials, and the 6’ upright poles to be set in the ground, for their height would impair the architectural and historical character of the building. Staff advises the applicants to develop alternative plans to for those submissions. The remainder the lighting proposal, the lighting to be suspended from the trees, the floodlight to be located below the chancel window, and the floodlight to be located above handicap access entrance, do not impair the character of the building or district. Staff recommends their approval.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Nicholas H. Holmes, II and the Reverend Canon Beverly Gibson were present to discuss the application. The Reverend Gibson addressed the motivations behind the railing and lighting requests. She said that regardless of the time of day and the nature of the service, concerns for safety were paramount. The Reverend mentioned that numerous requests for additional railings had been made. Some falls had occurred. She said additional railings would better accommodate the crowds who attend regular services, funerals, and weddings.

The Reverend then went on to explain the lighting request. Concern for safety and desire for visibility were the genesis of the overall proposal. The Reverend Gibson informed the Board that the Church had an ongoing landscape plan. As resources allow, a master landscape plan is gradually being carried to completion. Eventual landscaping or fencing around the proposed uprights would be a part of the ongoing project. The Reverend closed by saying it is the Church's and the congregations wish to make the Cathedral campus more attractive and safe for foot traffic.

Mr. Nicholas H. Holmes, II then addressed the Board. Mr. Holmes stated that the stairs were not only uneven, but they also violated code. He stated that railings had to be along the most direct paths of ingress and egress. Mr. Holmes told the Board that drill holes would be filled with an epoxy. He cited an international standard that listed epoxies as the most effective and least invasive means of intervening with historic building fabric. He then told the Board that a similar method was used in the recent installation of the church's canopy.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Karwinski said that the proposed work did not compromise the integrity of the building or threaten its materials. Mr. Roberts asked Mr. Holmes the extent of the church's plans. He asked if they planned to reconstruct the steeple and spire lost in the 1906 hurricane. Mr. Holmes answered yes. Mr. Roberts then asked if the Church would consider removing the side railings. Mr. Holmes answered no. He said the issue was a matter of safety. He mentioned and provided photographs three downtown churches with railings on their front portico columns.

Mr. Wagoner asked Mr. Holmes about the lighting proposal. Mr. Holmes informed the Board that the section of the Staff's scope of work addressing the lighting proposal was inaccurate to some degree. The lighting off the south elevation was understood correctly. The lighting off the north elevation would not require drilling into the sills. The uprights would be secured into the ground level or handicap platform concrete and in one case the foundation. Mr. Roberts asked Mr. Holmes and the Reverend Gibson about lighting design. He asked them if they considered using interior spotlights. Mr. Holmes informed the Board that the lighting proposal was the work of another architect.

Mr. Holmes and the Reverend Gibson addressed Staff's concern over the location and height of the lighting on the south elevation by reiterating the ongoing landscape work which will obscure the uprights. The Reverend mentioned that the unfolding plan might call for a fence to obscure the existing utility units. The Church she said had its eye on the past and the future. Mr. Holmes closed by citing a pertinent section of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards which states that "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 will be intact."

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, amending fact 1 (B) 3 to include drill holes of 8" into the column shafts and fact 3 (B) to read install three brass upright poles on the concrete paving and foundation.

The motion received a second. Mr. James voted against.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 07/01/10

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

063-09-CA: 607 Saint Francis St.
Applicant: Katina Collins
Received: 04/20/09 revised 06/11/09
Meeting: 07/01/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Replace front and Rear doors; replace rear and front porch decking; replace rear porch with a deck; Replace siding; construct new rear porch steps.

BUILDING HISTORY

The 1886, 1891, and 1904 Sanborn Maps all indicate a frame house occupying this lot. The structure occupied the same position and adopted the same street orientation as the present dwelling. This house was either demolished or substantially remodeled between 1906 and 1908 when the property's tax assessment increased dramatically. Therefore, this house with its overhanging eaves and broad porch should be seen as an early example of the Arts and Crafts approach to architectural design, not a late Victorian era house.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. Staff issued a Certificate of Appropriateness for this property on October 15, 1999. The approved scope of work allowed the then applicant to "replace and install footings and foundation piers as needed, all foundation piers which are visible from the exterior to be brick; replace all rotten wood on exterior to match the existing in dimension and profile; replace rear steps with pressure treated wood and install black pipe handrail; install two white storm doors; replace decking as need." The work was only carried out March of 2009. Not only had the Certificate of Appropriateness expired, but the foundation piers were not face with brick, the rear handrail was not the specified type, and the doors did not comply with guidelines. A Notice of Violation was issued on March 24, 2009 for the unapproved work.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. "A building's base or foundation, gives the building a sense of strength and solidity, and serves to "tie" the structure to the ground. Traditionally, residential buildings were raised on piers."
 - 2. "Original doors and openings should be retained along with any moldings, transoms or sidelights. Replacement should respect the age of the building."
 - 3. "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 the handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions and decorative details.”

4. “The form and shape of the porch and its roof should maintain their historic appearance.”
5. “The balustrade of the stairs should match the design and materials of the porch.”

C. Scope of Work:

1. North Elevation
 - A. replace front door with mahogany finished door with oval glazed panel above two solid panels
 - B. replace tongue and groove porch decking in kind
2. West Elevation
 - A. remove deteriorated siding within and around window infill
 - B. replace siding in kind
3. South Elevation
 - A. replace porch with wood deck
 1. deck to project roughly 3’ beyond the plane of the house
 2. deck to be supported by wood pilings and trusses
 3. treated boards to cover deck
 4. wood steps with matching decking and railings to be located off east side of deck
 - B. replace door with laminated four paneled door encompassing a glazed fanlight
 - C. replace brick foundation piers with concrete blocks

STAFF ANALYSIS

The scope of work stems from and deviates from an expired Certificate of Appropriateness issued in 1999. Some of the executed work complies with the Guidelines, will some does not. The Guidelines require that original doors should be maintained. The replacement door is not appropriate to the style or date of the house, thus impairing the integrity of the house. Staff recommends that the front door be removed. The original door or one comparable to the appearance and age of the house should be used.

The in kind replacement of the front porch decking and west elevation siding is in compliance with the Guidelines. The concrete block foundation piers on the south elevation should be faced with stucco to match the foundation piers on the house’s west elevation.

Staff does not have documentation indicating the original configuration and appearance of the back porch. Staff recommends that the applicant be keep the decking and railing, but replace the wood pilings with stuccoed concrete piers like those on the north elevation.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Katina and Geraldine Collins were present to discuss the application. Ms. Katina Collins explained that she inherited the house from her grandmother. She was unaware that she had to make an application to make changes to her house.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Wagoner asked Ms. Katina Collins if she read the Staff Report. Ms. Collins answered yes. Ms. Baker asked Ms. Collins if the old door was salvageable. She answered no.

Mr. Wagoner stated that the two replacement doors were a problem. He said they took away from integrity of this contributing house. Mr. Bemis suggested that the applicant might be able to remove the beveled and leaded glass panel from the front door thereby making it more in keeping with the style of the house. He added that the applicant's contractor failed to obtain a building permit before commencing work on the house. If the contractor had obtained a permit he would have been informed that all exterior work on buildings within the historic districts required approval from Staff or the Board. Returning to the door, Bemis said while one can visualize a Victorian influenced door on this house, this particular example was not appropriate. A simpler glazed panel with an altered top might work. The Board then discussed the replacement door on the rear elevation. The Guidelines do not allow metal doors. Mr. Ladd recommended the use of screening to obscure the door, but it was noted the metal door is not allowed.

Mr. Roberts asked Staff about the recommendation for the foundation piers. Mr. Bemis said the aim was to make the rear elevation piers match those on the west elevation. He said the Board has never permitted wood piers. Mr. Karwinski noted that the transom lintel of the front door appeared to be altered. Ms. Baker asked Mr. Bemis how new residents to the historic districts were notified of the Review Board process. Mr. Bemis said after water is turned on a building the resident receives a letter informing them of the responsibilities of owning or renting property in the districts. At closing, most of the real estate companies inform a property owner of the historic restrictions.

Ms. Katina Collins stated she had spent all her savings repairing the house, but she also lost her job. Mr. Wagoner told Ms. Collins that unfortunately the Board cannot consider the financial aspect of work done on the properties under its jurisdiction. Mr. Roberts asked Staff if work stopped after the issue of the Stop Work Order. Staff answered yes. Mr. James asked Staff about the decks wood piers. Mr. Bemis reiterated that the Board had never approved wood piers. Mr. Wagoner told Ms. Collins that her contractor's failure to obtain a building permit could work to her favor. Mr. Roberts agreed saying there are penalties for not doing so.

FINDING OF FACT

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Oswalt moved that, based upon the facts as amended by the Board, the repair and replacement of wood siding and decking do not impair does not impair the integrity of the building and the district and a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued." Mr. Oswalt moved that door and foundation pier submissions do impair the historic integrity of the building and the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be subject to Staff approval of the doors. Ms. Whitt-Mitchell and Ms. Baker voted in opposition. The applicant has thirty days to submit a plan to replace the doors. She should use the thirty days to contact the contractor and Staff.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 07/01/10

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

064-09-CA: 1160 New Saint Francis St.
Applicant: Marvin L. Pryor
Received: 06/02/09
Meeting: 07/01/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Replace tongue-and-groove porch decking with treated decking.

BUILDING HISTORY

This side hall house with prominent gable on hip roof was constructed was built circa 1909.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. On June 1, 2009, Staff was notified of a 311 call regarding this property. Upon visiting site visit, Staff issued a Stop Work Order for work done without a Certificate of Appropriateness. At that time half of the tongue-and-groove porch decking was replaced with treated wood decking.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture. Historic porches should be maintained and repaired to reflect their period. Particular attention should be paid to the handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions and decorative details.”
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. Remove tongue-and-groove decking from front porch
 - 2. Replace tongue-and-groove decking with treated wood decking

STAFF ANALYSIS

The Guidelines clearly state the porches should be maintained and repaired. When materials such as porch decking cannot be repaired, they should be replaced in kind. The replacement decking is not appropriate to the age and style of this house, thus constitutes a historical and architectural impairment. Staff recommends that applicant remove the decking and replace it with tongue-and-groove decking matching that which was removed.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Marvin Pryor and Josh Hoppe were present to discuss the application. Mr. Hoppe informed the Board that he has replaced the tongue-and-groove porch decking several times since taking ownership of the

house. Each time rain water has collected causing the in kind replacement decking to rot. Mr. Pryor referenced several houses on the street with similar replacement decking.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Wagoner told the applicants that the Board did not approve the work on the properties he referenced. Mr. Roberts asked Mr. Bemis how long the Review had overseen the area. He told Mr. Pryor that the Review Board was charged by city law to regulate renovations in the historic districts and had done so since 1979, thirty years. Mr. James asked Staff if the steps were altered. Staff answered no.

FINDING OF FACT

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Oswalt moved that, based upon the facts as amended by the Board, the application does 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 passed with three dissenting votes.

DENIED

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

066-09-CA: Leinkauf Historic District
Applicant: Melissa M. Thomas Leinkauf Neighborhood Association
Received: 06//09
Meeting: 07/01/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Leinkauf
Classification: National Register Historic District
Zoning: various
Project: Sign Approval.

DISTRICT HISTORY

Leinkauf is one of the City of Mobile's nine historic districts. The District was listed on the National Register in 1987.

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 May of 2009, Leinkauf Historic District was expanded to encompass the blocks bound by Virginia, Houston, Government, and Pennsylvania Streets.
- B. The Design Guidelines for Mobile's historic districts, state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. "Signs may not be located in the right-of-way except for sandwich board signs in the Henry Aaron Loop."
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. Suspend double-faced metal signage from various street signs bounding the district (see submitted design).
 - A. signs to be 22" in width and 19" in height in width
 - B. distance from ground to top of signs to be approximately 8' 6" height
 - C. distance from ground to bottom to signs to be approximately 6'9" in height
 - D. signs to be placed throughout the historic district

STAFF ANALYSIS

Freestanding signage or signage affixed to utility poles demarcates Mobile's historic districts. Leinkauf's existing signage falls into both categories. The Leinkauf Neighborhood Association proposal calls for subsequent signage that would be suspended from the street signs both bordering and within the District. The signs would be put in place as funds allowed. Staff does not believe the proposed signage will impair the character of the district, therefore recommends approval pending approval from the Board of Adjustment.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Melissa Thomas and Jane Farley were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswald asked Ms. Thomas why the Neighborhood Association was contemplating changing the district's signage. Ms. Thomas informed the Board that they wanted a streamline design that was more about the district as a whole. She said the proposed sign simplified and abstracted the current sign design. The existing sign referred to the school, not the larger district. The Beautification Committee of the Association wanted a design that was more inclusive to the larger district.

Ms. Thomas told the Board that she had meet with Mr. Metzger of Department of Traffic and Engineering regarding their proposal. They have \$3,700 in funds allotted signage. Each sign will cost \$65.00. The signs will not be suspended from street signs, but will be located on posts set in the right-of-way. Ms. Thomas said that portion of the project would require approval from Traffic and Engineering. Ms. Farley said that Beautification was the aim of the Committee and the genesis of the proposal. She said plantings would accompany the signs. Ms. Whitt-Mitchell stated that not all the right-of-ways were beautiful. She said that plantings, however well-intended, had been unsuccessful in other locations. Mr. Roberts agreed.

Ms. Whitt-Mitchell asked how and where the signs would be erected. Ms. Thomas answered that the signs would be erected gradually and would be paid for by the street. Mr. Bemis said that the existing signs were erected by the Commission to notify people that they were entering the Leinkauf Historic District. He suggested that the first signs be placed about the entrances to the district. Internal signs could come later. Mr. Oswald asked Mr. Bemis if there was a benefit to having the National Trust designation on signage. Mr. Ladd recommended a phased plan of sign implementation. Mr. Karwinski noted that, with the exception of the Old Dauphin Way Historic District, the existing signage of the other historic districts was vertical in design. He said that a vertical format better withstands weather, wear, and abuse.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Ladd moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, removing 1(A), 1(B), and 1(C) from the scope of work.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 7/01/10

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF COMMENTS

065-09-CA: 1562 Blair Avenue
Applicant: Greg Dreaper
Received: 06/15/09
Meeting: 07/01/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Amend COA to allow fiberglass door, alternate garage door, and vinyl windows.

BUILDING HISTORY

This house, which is soon to be constructed, occupies the site of a single-story bungalow that burned in 2006.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property last appeared before the Board on January 7, 2009. The Board granted approval for the construction of the present house. The applicants would like to make substitutions in their approved plans.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for New Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “In new buildings, exterior materials – both traditional and modern can use surrounding historic examples as a guide.”
 - 2. “Often one of the most important decorative features, doorways reflect the architectural style of a building. The design of doors and doorways can help establish the character of a building and compatibility with adjacent facades.
 - 3. “The type, size and dividing lights of windows, and their location and configuration (rhythm) help establish the character of a building and compatibility with adjacent structures. Traditionally designed window openings generally are recessed on masonry buildings and have a raised surround on frame buildings.”
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. Amend COA to allow Prairie 6-Lite 2300 Series vinyl Coastal Windows instead of wood Craftsman Style Single Hung Windows
 - 2. Amend COA to allow fiberglass door with Wright-inspired glazing instead of wood Craftsman door with plain glazing
 - 3. Amend COA to allow Wayne Dalton Colonial steel fronted 16-paneled garage door with wood grain texture instead of paneled and glazed garage door.

STAFF ANALYSIS

While the proposed window substitutions are identical in design to the previously approved wooden windows, vinyl windows are not allowed in Mobile's historic districts. Staff does not recommend approval of the windows. The alternate garage door and front door are in keeping with the Arts and Crafts inspired design of this 21st Century bungalow. Staff does not believe these two submissions impair the architectural or historical integrity of the district, therefore recommends approval of those two substitutions.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Greg Dreaper was present to discuss the application. Mr. Dreaper informed the Board that he believed the design of his home had gone far and beyond other proposals for new residential construction. He said his submission for an amendment to his COA was motivated by the need to make his approved design more affordable. Mr. Dreaper cited several recently built houses on Monroe Street that have vinyl windows. The Board did not approve those windows.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Wagoner explained to the applicant that the Guidelines prohibit vinyl windows. Mr. Roberts asked Mr. Dreaper to clarify the treatment of the garage doors. Mr. Karwinski asked Mr. Draper if he had contemplated not building the garage. Mr. Dreaper answered he had considered this option, but the cost difference was not great. Mr. Roberts asked Mr. Dreaper if had any other cost estimates. Mr. Dreaper said he had two other estimates. Mr. Bemis asked Mr. Dreaper if he had given any thought to simplifying the window design. Mr. Draeper said the price was the same regardless of design.

FINDING OF FACT

Bill James 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 3 to allow a 32 panel door.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Oswalt moved that, based upon the facts as amended by the Board, that the portion of this application requesting vinyl windows does impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness not be issued for the substitution windows. Mr. Oswalt moved, based upon the facts as amended by the Board, Oswalt the remainder of this application does not impair the integrity of the district and a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 7/01/10