

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
July 21, 2010 – 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. Cart Blackwell, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
Members Present: Gertrude Baker, Kim Hardin, Thomas Karwinski, Bradford Ladd, Harris Oswald, Craig Roberts, Jim Wagoner, Janetta Whitt-Mitchell, and Barja Wilson.
Members Absent: Carlos Gant and Bill James.
Staff Members Present: Cart Blackwell and Keri Coumanis.
2. Mr. Ladd moved to approve the minutes of the July 7, 2010 meeting.
The motion received a second and passed unanimously.
3. Mr. Oswald moved to approve the midmonth COAs granted by Staff as amended by the Board.
The motion received a second and passed unanimously.

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED

1. **Applicant: Gator Signs**
 - a. Property Address: 1365 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/29/10
 - c. Project: Affix tenant panels to a previously approved monument sign.
2. **Applicant: Vance McCrary**
 - a. Property Address: 1156 Church Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/29/10
 - c. Project: Install a generator to the west of the house, set back in the lot.
3. **Applicant: Advantage Staffing**
 - a. Property Address: 9 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/29/10
 - c. Project: Replace the signage in the overhanging street sign. The sign will fit in the confines of the existing frame measuring 3' by 4'. The sign material will be sandblasted wood.
4. **Applicant: Wrico Signs for Seabulk Towing**
 - a. Property Address: 2 South Water Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/1/10
 - c. Project: Install an aluminum sign face in the previously approved monument sign.
5. **Applicant: Golden Gate Properties**
 - a. Property Address: 125 Garnett Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/1/10
 - c. Project: Repair / replace rotten wood to match existing as needed; replace rotten decking with as necessary.
6. **Applicant: Old Bay Rental**
 - a. Property Address: 363 Michigan Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/2/10
 - c. Project: Reroof with three tab, dark gray.
7. **Applicant: A. R. McMorris Inc.**
 - a. Property Address: 206 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/6/10
 - c. Project: Install new front door, solid wood, dark brown stain, stucco around it to match building.

8. **Applicant: Valerie Blackenship**
 - a. Property Address: 311 North Joachim Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/2/10
 - c. Project: Replace six foot privacy fence per existing.
9. **Applicant: Sara W. Kindt**
 - a. Property Address: 1211 Caroline Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/6/10
 - c. Project: Repair and replace rotten woodwork. Replace the metal door with a wooden door in keeping with the style and period of the house. Install a drip edge to the roof. Repair and replace roofing shingles to match the existing. Replace the porch decking to match the existing. Paint per the submitted Sherwin Williams color scheme: the body will Rosemary; the porch and accents will be Universal Khaki; the trim will be Alabaster; the steps will be black; and the porch ceiling will be Sea Salt.
10. **Applicant: Eddie and Rebecca Dickerson**
 - a. Property Address: 1114 Old Shell Road
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/6/10
 - c. Project: Repair and replace rotten woodwork to match the existing. Replace rotten windows to match the existing. Repair the front steps. Remove the gutters. Repaint per a forthcoming color scheme. Repair the porch roof and add flashing. Install framed, suspended, and recessed skirting between the porch piers. Repair siding and replace the roof on the storage shed.
11. **Applicant: Wrico Signs for Visual Impact Communications**
 - a. Property Address: 1117 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/7/10
 - c. Project: Mount a 1' foot square painted bronze sign plaque beside the building's entrance. Mount a 18" by 18" painted bronze sign plaque to the entrance gates.
12. **Applicant: John L. Dewitt**
 - a. Property Address: 65 Le Moyne Place
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/7/10
 - c. Project: Repaint the house per the existing color scheme.
13. **Applicant: Carolyn Turner**
 - a. Property Address: 1213 Elmira Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/8/10
 - c. Project: Replace the deteriorated wooden windows with wooden replacement windows.
14. **Applicant: Wayne Simon**
 - a. Property Address: 306 N. Joachim Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/8/10
 - c. Project: Reframe existing door and paint to match.
15. **Applicant: Wayne Simon**
 - a. Property Address: 308 N. Joachim Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/8/10
 - c. Project: Reconstruct the balustrade per Mobile Historic Development Commission plans, redeck tongue and groove. Repaint house to match.
16. **Applicant: David Heisy**
 - a. Property Address: 1752 Hunter Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/9/10
 - c. Project: Reroof the house with architectural shingles.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. **2010-53-CA: 112 Beverly Court**
 - a. Applicant: Douglas Burtu Kearley
 - b. Project: Construct a porch. Construct a garden shed/folly. Install two sections of six foot high interior lot iron fencing.
APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
2. **2010-54-CA: 259 North Conception Street**
 - a. Applicant: Nicholas H. Holmes, III for Lott Shipping Agency
 - b. Project: Enclose a side/rear porch.
APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
3. **2010-55-CA: 1851 Government Street**
 - a. Applicant: Russell Holland for Waffle House
 - b. Project: Signage Approval - Construct a monument sign and mount two walls signs.
APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
4. **2010-56-CA: 56 Semmes Avenue**
 - a. Applicant: David and Jahn Paton
 - b. Project: Construct a rear addition.
APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
5. **2010-57-CA: 61 North Ann Street**
 - a. Applicant: Dave and Rosalyn Thurman
 - b. Project: After-the-Fact-Approval - Retain alterations to and extensions of an interior lot privacy/security fence and a deck.
TABLED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
6. **2010-58-CA: 1015 Old Shell Road**
 - a. Applicant: Restore Mobile
 - b. Project: Demolish later rear additions. Construct a small rear addition.
APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Guidelines
2. Discussion

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2010-53-CA: 112 Beverly Court
Applicant: Douglas Burtu Kearley for Nancy Seibt
Received: 7/6/10
Meeting: 7/21/10

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Construct a porch. Construct a garden shed/folly. Install two sections of six foot interior lot iron fencing.

BUILDING HISTORY

This Colonial Revival influenced house was constructed in 1938.

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 Architectural Review Board on April 24, 2006. At that time, the Board approved the construction of a single bay front porch. The applicant’s representative appears before the Board with a submission involving the addition of a porch, construction of a garden shed/folly, and the installation of a interior lot iron fencing.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Rehabilitation state, in pertinent part:
 - 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 forma and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.”
 - 3. “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture...Particular attention should be paid to the handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions and decorative details.”
 - 4. “The materials should blend with style of the building.”
 - 5. “An accessory structure is any construction other than the main building on the property. It includes but is not limited to garages, carports, pergolas, decks, pool covers, sheds and the like. 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.”

6. “Fences “should complement the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and material should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District. The height of solid fences in the historic districts is generally restricted to six feet, however, if a commercial property or multi-family housing adjoins the subject property, an eight foot terrace may be considered. The finished side of the fence should face toward the public view. All variances required by the Board of Adjustment must be obtained prior to issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):

1. Construct a porch off the east elevation (off the old garage).
 - a. The porch will measure 27’ in length and 10’ in depth.
 - b. The porch floor will be laid with concrete with brick inserts.
 - c. A shed roof with two terminating east-facing half gables will surmount the porch.
 - d. The east facing gables will feature louvered circular vents.
 - e. Two larger open and one center louvered bay will comprise the east elevation’s bay system.
 - f. Four sets of paired wooden columns will define the bays of the porch’s east elevation.
 - g. A planter will be located in front of the east elevation’s center louvered bay
 - h. Hardiplank siding will sheathe the gables.
 - i. A single open bay will comprise the porch’s north and south elevations.
 - j. The roof shingles will match those on the body of the house.
 - k. Two pairs of wooden French Doors will comprise the fenestration.
2. Construct a garden shed/folly in the northeast corner of the lot.
 - a. The garden shed/folly will rest on a concrete slab.
 - b. The garden shed/folly will be set back 8’ from the northern and eastern property lines.
 - c. The structure will measure 16’ by 10’ in plan
 - d. A pedimented roof configuration utilizing asphalt shingles will surmount the garden shed/folly.
 - e. Hardiplank and wooden siding will sheath and wooden detailing will articulate the building.
 - f. The 16’ long south elevation will feature a shallow 10’ wide and 3’ deep tetrastyle portico treated in Palladian manner.
 - g. A vinyl clad wooden four-over-four window will be located at the center of the south elevation.
 - h. The pedimented west elevation will feature a recessed entrance accessing a glazed and paneled door.
 - i. The north elevation will feature a pedimented potting and shelving built-in with lattice-filled side bays.
 - j. The east elevation will feature a four light window.
3. Install two sections of 6’ interior lot iron fencing.
 - a. One section of six foot iron fencing will extend 79.5’ along the western lot line, stopping just south of the southwest corner bays southwest corner’s projecting bay. The fence will then extend eastward where it will tie into the house. This stretch of fencing will feature a gate.
 - b. The second section of six foot iron fencing will extend from a point set back from the front plan of the house eastward to the lot line. This section of fencing will feature a single gate to the west and a sliding vehicular gate to the east.
4. Repair the existing rear porch stoop.
 - a. Repoint the bricks.
 - b. Reinstall the railing.

Clarifications

STAFF ANALYSIS

This four part application involves the addition of a rear porch, the construction of a garden shed/folly, the installation of interior lot fencing, and the repair of existing building fabric.

With regard to the proposed porch, the porch will be located on a portion of the house which has been previously altered. The proposed work will not be visible from the street. In addition to complementing the Colonial Revival design of the house, the proposal meets the design and material standards established by the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts.

With regard to the proposed garden shed/folly, the design complements the decorative detailing of the house, namely the front entrance and the gables. The proposed work will not be visible from the public right of way. Both design and the materials meet the standards established by the Guidelines.

The proposed interior lot fencing and repair work meet the design standards established the Guidelines. Both sections of fencing are set back within the lot. The use of iron fencing will provide additional security and privacy without affecting the expansiveness that characterizes the lot.

The minor repairs will neither affect the historical nor the architectural integrity of the house.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-6), Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or the historical character of the building or the district. Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Douglas B. Kearley was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Wagoner asked Mr. Kearley if he had any comments to add or clarifications to make with regard to the Staff Report. Mr. Kearley answered no. Mr. Wagoner asked the Board if they had comments to make or questions to ask Mr. Kearley. No Board members had any remarks or questions. Mr. Wagoner then inquired if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak for against the application. Upon hearing no response, Mr. Wagoner closed the period of public comment.

FINDING OF FACT

Ms. Whitt-Mitchell moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report as written.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Ms. Whitt-Mitchell moved that, based upon the facts as approved 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: 7/21/11

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2010-54-CA: 259 North Conception Street
Applicant: Nicholas H. Holmes, III for Lott Shipping Agency
Received: 7/6/10
Meeting: 7/21/10

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Detonti Square
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Enclose a porch located off the side/rear elevation.

BUILDING HISTORY

With an all encompassing side gable roof extending over a full length front gallery accessed by multiple doorways, this 1835 house constitutes a quintessential Creole cottage.

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 has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The applicant’s representative proposes enclosing a side/rear porch.
- 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 preserved to reflect their period. Particular attention should be paid to the handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions and decorative details.”
 - 2. “The form and shape of the porch and its roof should maintain their historic appearance. The materials should blend with the style of the building.”
 - 3. “Where side and rear porches are to be enclosed, one recommended method is to preserve the original configuration of columns, handrails, and other important architectural features.”
- C. Scope of Work :
 - 1. Enclose a side/rear porch.
 - a. The metal framed light gray tinted glass enclosure will located behind the porch’s columned and railed defined bays. The historic fabric will remain intact.
 - b. The metal framing will feature an intermediate bar that imparts the look of the porch railings, as well as providing additional structural support.
 - c. The existing wooden porch steps will be removed
 - d. A new flight of steps with an intervening stoop will allow for ingress and egress.
 - e. The steps and stoop will feature a railing that matches the existing railing.
 - f. The existing brick paving preceding the porch entry will be reworked as necessary.
 - g. Porch decking will be repaired as necessary.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This side/rear porch is minimally visible from the public right of way. The proposed enclosure meets the design and material standards established by the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts. The porch posts and railings will remain intact. The metal and glass enclosure's vertical supports will establish a regularized bay rhythm that will respect the existing porch bays.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-3), Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or historical character of the building or the district. Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Nicholas H. Holmes, III was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Karwinski recused himself from the discussion and left the room. Mr. Wagoner asked Mr. Holmes if he had any questions to ask or comments to make with regard to the Staff Report. Mr. Holmes answered no. Mr. Wagoner asked the Board if they had any comments or questions for Mr. Holmes. Mr. Ladd inquired about the applicant's company name. Mr. Holmes clarified the name of the company.

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 as written.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the facts as approved 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: 7/21/11

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2010-55-CA: 1851 Government Street
Applicant: Russell Holland for Waffle House
Received: 7/6/10
Meeting: 7/21/10

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Out of District Signage
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Sign Approval – Construct a monument sign and mount two wall signs.

BUILDING HISTORY

A fast food chain erected the existing building in the 1990s.

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 has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The Waffle House chain recently acquired the premises. Though not located in one of the City’s historic districts, due to the Sign Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and Government Street, signage proposals concerning this property are under the review of the Architectural Review Board. The applicants propose removing the existing signage and installing the franchise’s signage.
- B. The Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and Government Street state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “The overall design of the signage including mounting framework shall relate to the design of the principal building on the property. Buildings with a recognizable style such as Greek Revival, Italianate, Victorian, Queen Anne, 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.”
 - 2. “For buildings without a recognizable style, the sign shall adopt the decorative features of the building, utilizing the same materials and colors.”
 - 3. “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.”
 - 4. “The size of the sign shall be determined by measuring the area within each face of a geometric shape enclosing all elements of informational or representational matter including blank masking. Structural supports not bearing information shall not be included in the computation of display area.”

5. “The structural materials of the sign should match the historic materials of the building. Wood, metal, stucco, stone or brick, is allowed. Plastic, vinyl or similar materials are prohibited. Neon, resin to give the appearance of wood, and fabric may be used as appropriate.”
6. “Internally lit signs are prohibited.”
7. “Lighted signs shall use focused, low intensity illumination. Such lighting shall not shine into or create glare at pedestrian or vehicular traffic, nor shall it shine into adjacent areas

C. Scope of Work:

1. Construct a monument sign.
 - a. The monument sign will measure 3’9” in overall height and 7’4” in overall length.
 - b. The sign face will measure 2’ 4” in height and 6’ 9 ¾” in length.
 - c. The body of the monument sign will be made of masonry to match the building.
 - d. The sign face will be metal.
 - e. The name of the franchise will constitute the sign design.
 - f. The sign will be illuminated by ground level spotlights.
2. Mount two wall signs onto the building’s fascia.
 - a. The north facing wall sign will measure 14.5” in height and 12’9.8” in length.
 1. The sign will be made of alumicore, a composite aluminum material.
 2. The sign design will feature the name of the establishment.
 3. The total square footage amounts to 15.49 square feet.
 4. Independent illumination will illuminate the sign.
 - b. The east facing wall sign will measure 14.5” in height and 12’ 9.8” in length
 1. The sign will be made of alumicore, a composite aluminum material.
 2. The sign design will feature the name of the establishment.
 3. The total square footage will amount to 15.49 square feet.
 4. Independent illumination will illuminate the sign.

STAFF ANALYSIS

When reviewing signage applications for non-contributing buildings, size, material, and lighting are taken into account.

With regard to sign size, the overall square footage is below the 64 square set by the office or Urban Development. The monument sign is below the 50 square feet specified by the Sign Guideline’s for Mobile’s Historic Districts and Government Street. Additionally, the height of the proposed sign is under the 5’ height limit established by previous Board rulings.

With regard to materials and lighting, the proposed signage meets the standards established by the Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and Government Street.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-7), Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or historical character of the Government Street corridor or the nearby districts. Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Russell Holland of the Waffle House Corporation Real Estate Division was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Wagoner asked Mr. Holland if he had any comments to add or clarifications to make with regard to the Staff Report. Mr. Holland answered no.

Mr. Wagoner asked the Board if they had any comments to make or questions to ask Mr. Holland. Mr. Karwinski asked Mr. Holland why a site plan showing the placement of the sign on the property was not provided for the Board's Review. Mr. Blackwell explained that when the application was submitted, Mr. Holland had not yet met with Traffic and Engineering regarding the location of the signage. Mr. Holland provided the Board with a site plan showing the location of the proposed signage. Mr. Holland used the site plan to explain the location of the new building and the proposed signage in relation to the new site plan. He told the Board that the curb cuts would remain the same, but the landscaping within the lot would change. Mr. Holland informed the Board that the sign would be located in the northeast corner of the lot.

Mr. Karwinski then asked Mr. Holland where the signs would be located on the building. Mr. Blackwell pointed out that the location was specified in the Staff Report. Mr. Holland explained that the signs would be located on the east and north facing fascias of the new building. Mr. Wagoner asked if any other Board members had comments or clarifications to be addressed. He asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak for or against the application. Upon hearing no response, Mr. Wagoner closed the period of public comment.

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 as written.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the facts as approved by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the nearby districts or the Government Street corridor that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 7/21/11

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2010-56-CA: 56 Semmes Avenue
Applicant: David and Jahn Paton
Received: 7/2/10
Meeting: 7/21/10

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Construct a rear addition.

BUILDING HISTORY

The façade of this hipped roof house features a porch and a bay window. This façade treatment was a popular late 19th-century design solution.

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 Architectural Review Board on April 4, 2009. At that time the Board approved the restoration of the front porch. The current applicants propose the construction of a small rear addition.
- B. The Design Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “New additions, or 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 forma and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
 - 1. Construct a rear addition.
 - a. The addition will consist of a room measuring 15’ in depth and 14’ in length and a porch/deck measuring 14’ in depth and 14’ in length.
 - b. The enclosed portion of the addition will occupy the location of the existing deck.
 - c. A gable roof will cover the whole of the addition.
 - d. Siding matching the existing in profile, dimension, and material will sheath the addition.
 - e. The addition’s roof will match the existing.

- f. Square section porch posts will demarcate the porch bays.
- g. An MHDC stock balustrade will extend between the porch bays.
- h. A flight of wooden steps with railings matching those on the deck will be located off the deck's south elevation.
- i. The French doors opening onto the existing deck will be reused on the additions east elevation.

Clarifications

1. What type decking will be used?

STAFF ANALYSIS

The rear elevation of this house has been previously altered. The proposed small rear addition would not be visible from the public right of way. The size of the addition, both the open and enclosed portions, is less than half the square footage of the existing house. The addition will utilize fenestration removed from the body of the house. The materials and the design meet the standards established by the Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2), Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or the historical character of the house or the district. Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

David and Jahn Paton were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Wagoner asked Mr. and Mrs. Paton if they had any comments to add or clarifications to make with regard to the Staff Report. The applicants answered no.

Mr. Wagoner asked the Board if they had any comments to make or questions to ask the applicants. Mr. Karwinski informed the applicants that detailed elevations are required for applications involving additions or new construction. Ms. Coumanis and Mr. Blackwell explained the circumstances of the application. Mr. Blackwell told the Board that when the applicants submitted their plans Staff initially told them that they could be approved at the midmonth level. Upon consultation of the most recent Staff or midmonth approvals, Staff informed the applicants that the application would have to appear before the Board. Not wanting the applicants to miss the deadline, Staff accepted the plans as submitted. Mr. Blackwell apologized for some of the plans not making into the Board members packets.

The preliminary elevation drawings were distributed among the Board. Ms. Coumanis noted that the addition would not be visible from the street. She told the Board that Mr. Paton was a contractor and that she and Mr. Blackwell had discussed the plans, materials, and treatments with the applicants. Ms. Hardin recommended the use of a recess or corner board on the north elevation. She told the Board and the audience that she utilizes these elements to differentiate old and new construction.

Mr. Wagoner asked the applicants to address the clarification regarding the decking. The applicants answered Mr. Wagoner's query saying that the flooring would be standard decking board. Mr. Roberts

explained to the applicants that while he as an architect was able to visualize the work from the schematic plan and the Staff Report, he understood why others were not.

Mr. Karwinski asked if there would be any fenestration. Ms. Coumanis explained that the small enclosed portion of the addition would function as a kitchen/utility room extension and would thus lack windows. Mr. Blackwell added that the north elevation immediately overlooked a neighbor's yard and fence. A discussion of the addition's treatment ensued.

Mr. Karwinski asked if the east elevation would feature a true pediment like that of the other rear addition or a gable. A discussion of building details ensued.

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, amending facts to allow Staff approval of the addition's detailing.

The motion received a second and was approved. Mr. Karwinski voted in opposition.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Ms. Baker 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 approved. Mr. Karwinski voted in opposition.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 7/21/11

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2010-57-CA: 61 North Ann Street
Applicant: Dave and Rosalyn Thurman
Received: 7/6/10
Meeting: 7/21/10

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: After-the-Fact-Approval – Retain alterations to and extensions of an interior lot, privacy/security fence; Retain a deck.

BUILDING HISTORY

This house was initially constructed circa 1900. In the 1920s, the house was enlarged and the garage was constructed.

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 has never appeared before the Architectural Review. The new/owner applicants constructed the rear deck and extended and altered an interior lot privacy/security fence without receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness. Three Staff members spoke with the applicants prior to the construction of the fence and the deck. One Staff member met with the applicant on site. Staff received a 311 call in May of 2010. A Notice of Violation was issued on May 5th. The applicants appear before the Board with a request to retain the unauthorized work.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Rehabilitation state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. Fences “should complement the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and material should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District. The height of solid fences in the historic districts is generally restricted to six feet, however, if a commercial property or multi-family housing adjoins the subject property, an eight foot terrace may be considered. The finished side of the fence should face toward the public view. All variances required by the Board of Adjustment must be obtained prior to issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness.”
 - 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, or 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

4. “New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential forma and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.”

C. Scope of Work:

1. After-the-Fact-Approval - Retain an alterations to and extensions of an interior lot privacy/security fence.
 - a. Mount a framed wooden lattice top to the existing six foot wooden privacy fencing located west and southern property lines
 - b. Construct a section of interior lot wooden fencing with a matching lattice top from the southeast corner of the house to the southern lot line
 - c. The fencing will not exceed 7' 7" in height.
 - d. The property to the south is utilized as multifamily housing.
2. Retain a deck located of the rear, southwest corner of the house.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application for after-the-fact-approval concerns the heightening and extending of interior lot fencing and the construction of a rear deck. By virtue of being a corner lot property, both the fence and the deck are visible from the street. The fence and the deck are set within the lot though.

With regard to the fence, the house abuts a multi-family dwelling, thus allowing a fence at or below 8' in height. The heightened and newly constructed sections of fencing measure 7'7' in height. As built the design of the fence impairs the architectural integrity of the house and the district. By removing the section of the south lot line fence that extends beyond the termination of the eastern interior lot fence and removing the lattice top surmounting the gate located behind the porte-cochere, the rhythm and visibility of the streetscape would be better preserved.

As to the deck, the design meets the material and design standards appropriate for Mobile's historic districts.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1), Staff believes the placement and design of the fence impair the architectural and historical integrity of the fence. Staff recommends that the applicants remove the section of the south lot line fence that extends beyond the southern termination of the eastern interior lot fence. Staff also recommends the removal of the lattice top that surmounting the double gate located behind the porte-cochere.

Based on B (2-3), Staff does not believe the deck impairs the architectural or the historical character of the house or the district. Staff recommends approval of the deck.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Rosalyn Thurman was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Wagoner asked Ms. Thurman if she had any comments to make or questions to ask with regard to the Staff Report.

Ms. Thurman explained the circumstances behind the construction of the deck and the installation of the decking. Ms. Thurman told the Board that while she had lived in Mobile in the past, prior to moving to this property, she had lived in Florida. She said that she had lived in this house for a year and a half. Ms. Thurman told the Board that prior to purchasing the property, she and her husband had been told many things about what they could and could not do to the house and lot. She said that they had since found out most what they were told was untrue, namely that fences and rear elevation alterations need not appear before the Board.

Ms. Thurman further explained that portions of the work had been done before her and her husband's purchase of the property. She said that they added the lattice top to the existing fencing for reasons of privacy, security, and maintenance. Ms. Thurman noted that the deck had been constructed roughly contemporaneously with the new sections of and extensions to the existing fencing. She said that she drove through other parts of the historic districts and admired other fence designs comparable to the one she constructed on her own property. Ms. Thurman informed the Board that she wanted a more attractive and secure home. She said that she felt that the fencing and the deck abetted those objectives.

Mr. Roberts made two comments. He told Ms. Thurman that upon reading the letter she submitted as part of her application that he was frustrated that she was told neither by her realtor nor city officials that Staff or Review Board approval was required for exterior alterations to buildings within Mobile's historic districts. Secondly, he asked if she felt threatened in her home, why not consider selling it?

Ms. Coumanis told the Board that she spoke with applicant over the phone and meet with her on site. She noted that Mr. Bemis and Mr. Blackwell had also spoken with the applicant as well. Mr. Wagoner asked Ms. Thurman if she had obtained a building permit. Ms. Thurman answered no. Mr. Wagoner explained to the Board that if Mrs. Thurman had applied for a building permit, she would have been required to contact Staff regarding a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Ms. Whitt-Mitchell reminded the Board of a previous meeting in which another applicant newly moved to historic districts applied for approval of unauthorized work. The applicant was told that MAWSS should have followed up with a notification of the Review Board procedure regarding exterior alterations and repairs. Mrs. Whitt-Mitchell asked Staff is the same situation applied to this application. Ms. Coumanis explained that MAWSS is supposed to send a list of properties that either activate or reactivate service to the MHDC. A letter of welcome to the historic district and explanation of the responsibilities thereof is then issued. Ms. Coumanis said that the list is not always sent to Staff.

Mr. Wagoner asked for clarification as to the Staff Recommendation. Mr. Blackwell explained that the Staff Recommendation called for the removal a section of the south lot line fence that extends beyond the juncture of the eastern section of fencing, as well as the removal of the lattice atop the gate running behind the porte-cochere. A discussion of fencing heights ensued.

Ms. Whitt-Mitchell moved to table the application.

The motion received a second and passed unanimously.

It was agreed that the Board would visit the property and resume discussion of the request at the August 4, 2010 meeting.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2010-58-CA: 1015 Old Shell Road

Applicant: Restore Mobile

Received: 7/6/10

Meeting: 7/21/10

Conflict of Interest: This house belongs to Restore Mobile, a committee of the Mobile Historic Development Commission. Keri Coumanis and Devereaux Bemis serve on the Restore Mobile board and did not take part in the staff analysis except to review it.

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way

Classification: Contributing

Zoning: R-1

Project: Demolish a later rear addition. Construct a small rear addition.

BUILDING HISTORY

This three bay cottage with a centrally located pedimented entry stoop was constructed in the 1870s or 1880s.

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 has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. Restore Mobile recently acquired the property. As part of the revolving funds restoration and renovation of the house, their representative appears before the Board with a submission calling for the demolition of a later rear addition and construction of a new addition. Additional repairs and replacements are included in the scope of work.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Rehabilitation state, in pertinent part:
 - 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. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
 - 1. Demolish two later rear additions located off the house’s west elevation.
 - 2. Construct a deck and enclosed hall on the location of northernmost addition to the west elevation.

- a. A double French door surmounted by a transom will provide ingress and egress to the deck.
 - b. Hardiplank will sheath the addition.
 - c. Wood pilings will support, wooden railings will enclose, and treated lumber will floor the deck.
3. Construct a hipped roof addition on the location of the rear elevation's southernmost rear addition.
 - a. GAF shingles will sheath the roof.
 - b. Hardiplank siding will sheath the walls.
 - c. Masonry piers will support the addition.
 - d. The west elevation will feature a small octagonal window and two six-over-six windows.
 - e. The south elevation will feature a pair of double French doors surmounted by a transom.
4. Construct a deck of the new addition.
 - a. Wooden pilings will support, and wooden railings will enclose, and treated lumber will floor the deck.
 - b. A flight wooden steps with railings matching those on the deck will extend eastward from the deck.
5. Replace rotten pickets on the porch.
6. Repair rotten woodwork to match the existing.
7. Install roof flashing.
8. Install a wooden paneled door in the rear elevation's older shed roofed addition's west elevation.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the demolition of later additions and the construction of a new rear addition, as well as basic repairs. The ill thought out roof configuration and shoddy construction of the later rear additions poses problems. The proposed additions, decks, and repairs respect the historical integrity of the house and the district. The work will be minimally visible from the public right of way. The materials meet the standards established by the Guidelines.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2), Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or historical integrity of the building or the district. Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Ms. Coumanis was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Blackwell addressed the Board's questions. Ms. Coumanis clarified the Board's concerns.

Mr. Roberts asked about the treatment of foundation piers. Ms. Coumanis informed the Board that the foundation piers would feature masonry facings. Mr. Karwinski asked Ms. Coumanis about the treatment of the front door. She said that once a historically and stylistically appropriate door was located, another Staff member would be required to approve the door. Ms. Coumanis told the Board that the door surround

was not going to change. Only the hollow frame door would be replaced when a conforming door could be located. She also noted that the octagonal window on the addition's west elevation would be changed to smaller six-over-six window.

A discussion of the detailing of the house and proportions of the plans ensued. Mr. Karwinski called for updated plans with better proportions showing the treatment of the foundation piers, window fenestration, and decorative details.

FINDING OF FACT

Ms. Whitt-Mitchell made a motion to table the application. Ms. Whitt-Mitchell, Ms. Baker, Mr. Roberts, and Mr. Karwinski voted in favor of tabling the application. Ms. Hardin, Ms. Wilson, Mr. Ladd, Mr. Oswalt, and Mr. Wagoner voted against tabling the application.

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 facts to specify the use of masonry-faced piers (C5), the alteration of the west elevation octagonal window to smaller six-over-six window (C3D), the repair and replacement of rotten wooden features (C6).

The motion received a second and was approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

The motion received a second and was approved. Ms. Baker and Ms. Whitt-Mitchell voted in opposition.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 7/21/11