

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES

July 2, 2008 – 3:00 P.M.

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

A. CALL TO ORDER – Chair

The meeting was called to order by the chair Tilmon Brown at 3:03.

The Introductory Statement was read by the staff.

The members present were Tilmon Brown, Carlos Gant, Tom Karwinski, Cameron Pfeiffer, Bunky Ralph, Craig Roberts, Jim Wagoner, and Barja Wilson.

Staff present was: Devereaux Bemis and Gabriel Jones (Intern).

Jim Wagoner moved that the Minutes of the June 18 meeting be approved as written. Cameron Pfeiffer seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

Bunky Ralph moved that the Minutes of the June 14 meeting be approved as written. Tom Karwinski seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

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

B. MID-MONTH APPROVALS

1. **Applicant's Name:** William Carroll

Property Address: 404 Chatham

Date of Approval: June 16, 2008

Repair building to match the existing in materials, profile and dimension. No work shall be undertaken that does not match the existing. Repair the roof including structural members and decking. The roof should match the original in size, form, pitch and overhang. Three tab, 25 year (or better) black shingles will be use. Any work requiring alterations to the building will be placed before the Architectural Review Board.

2. **Applicant's Name:** David Naman

Property Address: 108 Dauphin Street

Date of Approval: June 5, 2008

Tuck point the brick on the front and back walls of the building. Mortar will match the original in color, composition and strike.

3. **Applicant's Name:** Grace Susits

Property Address: 8 S. Monterey Street

Date of Approval: June 12, 2008

Repaint house in existing color scheme: Body: Mint Green, Trim: Cream and Foundation and porch deck: Deep Green.

4. **Applicant's Name:** Bill Sisson

Property Address: 109 Beverly Court

Date of Approval: June 13, 2008

THIS COA IS A REPLACE COA OF JUNE 12, 2007:

Add a shed roof dormer on the rear elevation of the residence per plans approved by the ARB:

All new materials will match existing materials to include the wood lap siding, wood trim, wood corner boards and shingle roof.

The windows will be 3/1 wood double-hung sashes with true divided lights.

5. **Applicant's Name:** Murray Thames Contractor, Inc.

Property Address: 201 Lanier Avenue

Date of Approval: June 9, 2008

Repair rotten wood on front porch with materials to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Paint front porch to match existing color scheme

6. **Applicant's Name:** Susan Gianelloni

Property Address: 208 S. Cedar

Date of Approval: June 12, 2008

Paint house in the following color scheme:

Trim: White

Porch floor, shutters and top of handrails: Bellingrath Green

Porch ceiling: Robin's egg blue

Body: Downing Earth or Renwick Heather or Brunswick Green

C. OLD BUSINESS

1. **038-08-CA:** 2250 De Leon Avenue

Applicant: Lucy Barr for Tom Warren

Request: Two story addition to rear for kitchen, laundry, master bedroom suite and screened porch.

Approved

D. NEW BUSINESS

1. **072-08-CA:** 308 St. Louis St.

Applicant: Steven Barr for Renaissance Development Company

Request: Add six (6) faux shutters to the exterior of the building along St. Louis St. The faux shutters will be made of wood and painted.

Withdrawn

2. **073-08-CA:** 404 Chatham

Applicant: William C. Carroll

Request: Enclose rear porch using matching materials; level existing roof, replacing all windows on south side with 1/1 windows to match the existing; rework front columns for scale & mass; masonry steps & skirt wall repair to match existing.

Approved with conditions

3. **074-08-CA:** 1705 Conti St.
Applicant: Volkert & Associates for Marion C. Forrest
Request: Install an 8 x 8 concrete sided building behind the previously approved pumping station.
Approved

4. **075-08-CA:** 102 LeVert Ave.
Applicant: Mr. & Mrs. English Parks Moore
Request: Construct an addition at the SE corner to the east wing reusing the stone from the fence. The owners plan to build the fence and drive approved in March 2007.
Approved with alteration to request

5. **077-08-CA:** 1104 Old Shell Road
Applicant: Douglas Kearley for Steve May
Request: Remove dilapidated porch, "square-in" rear of the house for kitchen laundry & half bath. All to match the existing.
Approved

6. **078-08-CA:** 119 N. Julia Street
Applicant: Bradley A. Roe
Request: Construct a 16 x 30 garage and storage building.
Approved

7. **079-08-CA:** 200 Dauphin Street
Applicant: CRS Construction for Woodlands Bank
Request: Remove two glass panels from Dauphin Street façade and install with an ATM and a night deposit.
Tabled

8. **080-08-CA** 16 Oakland Terrace
Applicant: Angela Graham for Gloria Ellison
Request: Furnish and install 24 feet of aluminum fence from the corner of the house on the north side to the sidewalk.
Approved

9. **081-08-CA** 501 Government Street
Applicant: Pope Building & Renovation for Jay P. Altmayer II
Request: Install two handrails on the front steps, using the fence as a model.
Approved with conditions

E. OTHER BUSINESS and ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. National Alliance of Preservation Commissions. The Board discussed the upcoming trip to the NAPC.

2. The Board discussed the recent amendment to the Preservation Ordinance.

F. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned and 5:15.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

038-08-CA: 2250 DeLeon
Applicant: Lucy Barr Designs for Tom Warren
Received: 06/16/08
Meeting: 07/02/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Ashland Place
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Construct a two-story addition to the rear (kitchen, laundry and master bedroom suite and screened porch).

BUILDING HISTORY

The building was constructed in 1921 by Bernard Wood.

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. An application was heard in April on an addition to this building. The Board had concerns about the size and linearity of the addition. The project was referred to a design committee.
- B. The Secretary of Interior standards state: “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.”
- C. Request to construct a rear addition.
 - 1. It will sit on a continuous brick foundation with metal vents (the original house is situated like this but appears to have a basement with window in some areas and vents in other areas).
 - 2. Material will be wood lapped siding, trim and shutters to match the existing.
 - 3. The windows will be wood, true divided light to match existing. There will be a mix of 6/6 with several full length and several shortened with panels below.
 - 4. Wood shutters will match the existing on the house.
 - 5. The addition will be two story with a one-story extension.
 - 6. The west side will have a screened porch with a solid end wall with a fireplace.
 - 7. Brick steps with an iron rail will lead from a small open porch at the end of the addition outside the screened porch and in line with and part of the one story addition.
 - 8. A separate set of steps with a double screen door will lead from the screened porch.
 - 9. A door will lead from the open porch into the utility room.
 - 10. Two sets of French doors will lead from the screened porch into the kitchen.
 - 11. A single door will lead from the open porch to the screened porch.
- D. Clarifications
 - 1. The materials and design of the French doors and the porch to porch door.
 - 2. Design for the step rails.
 - 3. Assurance that the windows are wood true divided light.

4. What is the current rear door that will be relocated to the utility room?

STAFF ANALYSIS

This is a very large addition. However, the design is in keeping with the suggestions of the Board and blends well with the original building. The use of two stories and setbacks breaks up the linearity of the original design. It also maintains the large yard, which is a major historic aspect of the neighborhood. Staff believes this is compatible with the massing, size, scale and architectural features of the original.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Lucy Barr was present to discuss the application. She stated: the doors from the house to the porch would be multi-light $\frac{3}{4}$ French doors, wood; the rear step rails would match the rails on the front of the house; the windows would be wood, true divided light; and the current rear door that would be reused matched the other doors on the house.

BOARD DISCUSSION

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

FINDING OF FACT

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 7/02/09.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

072-08-CA: 308 St. Louis Street
Applicant: Renaissance Development Company, LLC
Received: 06/11/08
Meeting: 07/02/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: DeTonti Square
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Add six sets of faux shutters to the exterior of the building along St. Louis.

BUILDING HISTORY

There is no research on the building, but it would appear to be a turn of the 20th century building with Queen Anne influence. However, it has been heavily modified, probably in the 1920s. It has served a number of purposes through the years.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This is a warehouse and card dealership that has gone through a number of changes and additions. The building was recently renovated as condominiums.
- B. The Guidelines state: “Operable units, hung with appropriate hinges are encouraged. Where blinds or shutters must be fixed, they should be hung on the window casing in a manner to replicate those that are operable. Decorative shutters are appropriate on some 20th Century buildings. Evidence must be presented of their original use when requested.
- C. Request to install six sets of shutters.
 - a. The shutters will be placed along the St. Louis Street façade of the one story wing.
 - b. Material will be wood painted Bellingrath Green.
 - c. The design will be board with cross framing.

STAFF ANALYSIS

Though the building is non-contributing, this is along a face of the structure that faces well-traveled St. Louis St. The use of the faux shutters seems excessive. More importantly, the board shutters with cross bracing are not typical in the district or neighborhood. Since the windows in the building are not wood, it is incongruous to make the only wood items a faux element. The building was a warehouse and though staff would not object to windows piercing the building, the use of faux shutters would appear to be out of place in this context.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

No one was present to discuss the application. The owner had telephoned that he would be unable to attend the meeting. He understood that the Board might not approve the request and

asked that if that were the case the application be withdrawn until he could attend the meeting. There was no one else present to speak to the matter.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed that the shutters would simply be attached to the wall. Since windows had originally been placed in the walls, the Board believed the openings should be recreated if the shutters were desired so there would be a place for the shutters to be placed. The Board also indicated that the design for the shutters were not appropriate to the age and style of the building. Getting a consensus of the Board that the application was deemed inappropriate, the staff withdrew the application on behalf of the owner.

WITHDRAWN

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

073-08-CA: 404 Chatham
Applicant: William C. Carroll
Received: 06/16/08
Meeting: 07/02/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: General renovations to the building

BUILDING HISTORY

The house was built by Ellen McDonald in 1907.

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 cottage has been altered through times. It currently has a solid wall foundation on the front porch that extends as a solid balustrade for the concrete porch. The original supports for the porch have been replaced with square posts on raised brick piers.
- B. The Guidelines state: “Historic porches should be maintained and repaired to reflect their period. Particular attention should be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts, columns, proportions and decorative details...Traditionally, residential buildings were raised on piers...Solid infill should be recessed and screened.”
- C. General renovations to the building
 - a. Enclose the rear porch using matching materials.
 - b. Level the existing roof.
 - c. Replace aluminum windows on south side with 1//1 windows to match existing.
 - d. Rework front columns for scale & massing.
 - e. Open up the front porch.
 - f. Repair masonry piers and skirt wall to match existing.
- D. Clarifications
 - a. A design for the front is needed.
 - b. A design for the columns
 - c. Rails design for back steps.
 - d. Back door material/design.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This is a contributing building undergoing a much-needed renovation. The rear enclosure is somewhat awkward appearing in plan, however, the retention of the corner boards is a preferred method to allow the original plan of the building to be visible. Staff sees no problems with the rear enclosure. Staff has insufficient information to judge the front.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

William Carroll was present to discuss the application. He had faxed a new design to the office for the front and rear earlier in the day; the new designs were incorporated into the power point presentation.

The new designs included a design for the front of the building. Staff noted that there were no details of the columns or the balustrades.

Mr. Carroll stated that they were rebuilding the original windows and replacing the glass where necessary. He also noted that the foundation would be a sand finished stucco, scored to look like blocks around the front porch.

The Board asked about the designs for the front columns and rails. He stated he did not know what the columns would be other than boxed and the rail would be his standard rail. He did not have a design for the rail. Board members pointed out that they could not approve something when they did not know what it would be. Mr. Carroll suggested they deny his application and that he would all right with a denial.

The Board pointed out that there was no problem with the rear of the house or the sides; the question was simply the design of the columns and rail. It was suggested that staff could approve these on a mid-month basis, but staff declined.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the possible ways to approve the request. It was the general opinion of the Board that the porch could not be approved until a design for the columns and rails was submitted.

FINDING OF FACT

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued with the condition that a design for the front columns and railing be submitted to the Board. The motion was seconded by Cameron Pfeiffer and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 7/02/09.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

074-08-CA: 1705 Conti Street
Applicant: Volkert and Associates for Marion C. Forrest
Received: 06/16/08
Meeting: 07/02/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Construct an 8 x 8 foot building on the previously approved plan and extend the fence to surround the entirety.

BUILDING HISTORY

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

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This is an amendment to the plan approved in February. At that time the Board approved a lift station with a 6-foot fence surrounding a 30 x 40 foot area. At this stage nothing has been done to the property.
- B. The Guidelines state for accessory structures: “The structure should complement the design and scale of the main building.” And for fences: “Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District.”
- C. Request to construct an accessory electrical building.
 - a. The building will be 8 x 8 feet.
 - b. The material will be concrete to give a lapped wood appearance.
 - c. There will be a front door; faux shutters on the right side an A/C unit on the left and a panel on the rear.
 - d. It will have a gable to the front with a 1 foot overhang and will be approximately 11 feet high
 - e. It will be located in the fence near the rear of the property.
 - f. The gravel drive will be installed to the north side of the fence boundary and not on the eastern portion as submitted in the original application.
 - g. The access gate will be located on the Conti Street side.
 - h. The revisions were made for operational purposes.
 - i. The proposed landscaping will not be installed in the access gate area.
 - j. The privacy fence boundaries have been revised from 30 x 40 feet (1200 sq ft., with a 37’ setback) to 50 x 55 feet (2750 sq. ft., with a 47’ setback). This revision was made to accommodate additional equipment and a larger well structure.

- k. Addition of the electrical building to the pumping station site. The proposed building shall be inside of the 6-foot tall wooden privacy fence.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The Board has approved the construction of several of these features. However the small building is new and the fence is expanded in area. Previously the fence was to enclose a relatively small area of the site; that area is more than doubled in the present plan. Even with the multi-family units nearby and the nursing home across the street, the predominant character of the area is residential. The previous request was for a relatively small installation. This expansion now fills more of the site and creates a utilitarian aspect to the lot. The expansion of the fence and the placement of the building do not attempt to blend the use into a residential setting. Staff believes that the use can be accommodated on the site, but believes some design consideration should be given to the property.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Ray Miller of Volkert was present to discuss the application. In answer to the Board's questions he explained that the roof is concrete and that the shutters were added to dress up the building following a meeting with staff. The nearest similar building is in Texas.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the shutters and recommended that they be deleted from the plans.

FINDING OF FACT

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion was seconded by Barja Wilson and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued with the recommendation that the shutters be removed. The motion was seconded by Jim Wagoner and approved with one dissenting vote.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 7/02/09.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

075-08-CA: 102 LeVert Avenue
Applicant: Mr. & Mrs. English Parks Moore
Received: 06/14/08
Meeting: 07/02/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Ashland Place
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Construct and addition on the SE corner of the east wing.

BUILDING HISTORY

The house was built by Russell C. English in 1928.

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 2006 the sunroom on the east side was removed by a previous owner. The Board approved repairs to the house from the damage caused by that removal. A year later the Board approved the demolition and removal of a non-historic shed and greenhouse for an in-ground swimming pool. There was also an approval for a new stone walk in the front yard and a new wood shadowbox privacy fence: removal of the existing rubble wall and construction of a fence ranging from 7 to 8 feet with stone posts and wood posts. The fence was never built.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior Standards for additions state: “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. 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. Construct a one and a half story addition to the south side at the east end.
 - a. The walls will be stucco with a granite base
 - b. The base will be from the stone salvaged from the fence along Old Shell Road.
 - c. The ground floor will be a master bath and kitchen/family room.
 - d. The upstairs will be for future expansion.
 - e. The windows will be metal casements similar to existing.
 - f. The roof pitch will match the existing with a flat top to keep the height equal to the existing.
 - g. The eave detail will match existing.
 - h. The roofing material will match the existing if possible.
 - i. There will be a paved area to the northeast “as was previously approved by the ARB.”
 - j. Owners would like approval for the fence as previously approved.
 - k. There will be a paved area in the courtyard between the new addition and the original house.

D. Clarifications

- a. Will the original windows be reused?
- b. What will be the material for the new parking area?
- c. What roofing material will be used if the original is unavailable?

STAFF ANALYSIS

The Board has approved the dismantling of the stone fence so its reuse in the base of the house would be appropriate. The use of the stucco differentiates the new construction from the original. The Board has asked for a lower roofline in the past on additions, but the stucco material and the flat cap may be sufficient for the Board's purposes.

There have been numerous complaints about a wood fence approved in Ashland Place that is part of the front yard. Though the Board approved a series of fences for this property, they were never built and the COA has expired. It also appears that the new owners' fence does not match the one approved.

Staff sees no problem with the addition if the clarifications are resolved. However, staff believes a full submittal should be made for the fence and the Board needs to visit Ashland Place to view the previously approved fences.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mrs. Moore and Nicholas Holmes III were present to discuss the application. Mrs. Moore withdrew the fence application. It is their intention to rehabilitate and reuse the current casements. If new ones are needed they will look for matching windows. They are also looking for matching roof materials.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion occurred concurrently with the public hearing when details of the plan were worked out. It was noted that some of the matching materials for the roof and windows would be difficult to find.

FINDING OF FACT

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion the Board finds the facts in the Staff report adding a fact that the applicants will be back with alternate materials for the roof and windows if matching materials cannot be found and that the fence would be submitted at a later date. The motion was seconded by Carlos Gant and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 7/02/09.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

077-08-CA: 1104 Old Shell Road
Applicant: Douglas Kearley for Steve May
Received: 06/16/08
Meeting: 07/02/08

Conflicts of Interest: This building at one time was in the inventory of the Mobile Revolving Fund for Historic Properties, a committee of the Mobile Historic Development Commission. Tilmon Brown, Jim Wagoner and Devereaux Bemis both members of the MRF; and Bunky Ralph, Tilmon Brown, Jim Wagoner and Mary Couser are members of the MHDC. Devereaux Bemis is executive director of the MHDC. None of these people have a personal financial interest in the project.

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Remove rear dilapidated porch and “square-in” rear of the house for kitchen, laundry and half bath. All to match existing.

BUILDING HISTORY

Records indicate that the structure was built circa 1910. The building had been declared a public nuisance when the Mobile Revolving Fund for Historic Properties acquired the building a public auction. The MRF then spent several years attempting to clear the title. The building was sold to the present owner who is doing extensive renovations.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This is a workers cottage that was due for demolition. It is being renovated to a single-family residence.
- B. The Guidelines state: “Where rear or side porches are to be enclosed, one recommended method is to preserve the original con-figuration of columns, handrails, and other important architectural features.”
- C. Request to remove dilapidated rear porch and construct new rooms and porch.
 - a. The rear porch had collapsed and been repaired through the years.
 - b. There was little to no original material left of the original porch.
 - c. The rear porch will be removed and the roofline extended to the east building line of the existing structure.
 - d. An existing window will be relocated to the east elevation.
 - e. A covered stoop with steps will be placed on the rear.

STAFF ANALYSIS

Staff believes this is an important renovation for this section of Old Shell Road. The small nature of the site makes the adaptation of the structure difficult for modern living. The squaring off of the building should be an obvious alteration, as the Board requires, due to the change in roof pitch. If the Board wishes to see a more definite break, staff suggests the use of a corner board or alteration of foundation materials to indicate the new part of the building.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Before the public testimony was taken, staff disclosed the relationship of the building to members of the Board. There was no conflict of interest in that none of the parties had a financial interest in the project.

Douglas Kearley was present to discuss the application. He stated the addition would be primarily for a kitchen.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion occurred concurrently with the public hearing.

FINDING OF FACT

Jim Wagoner moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Jim Wagoner moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 7/02/09.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

078-08-CA: 119 N. Julia Street
Applicant: Bradley A. Roe
Received: 06/16/08
Meeting: 07/02/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-1
Project: Construct 16 x 30 garage and storage building.

BUILDING HISTORY

There is no research on the building, but it would appear to be a turn of the 20th century building with Queen Anne influence. However, it has been heavily modified, probably in the 1920s. It has served a number of purposes through the years.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This is a very deep lot with the house to the front and fence around the yard.
- B. The Guidelines state: “The appropriateness of accessory structures shall be measured by the guidelines applicable to new construction. The structure should complement the design and scale of the main building.”
- C. Request to build a garage.
 - a. Construct a one-story 16 x 30 garage and storage unit per the submitted plans.
 - b. Material will be lapped Hardiboard or S.Y.P with a 4½-inch exposure.
 - c. Cedar shake trim will be place in the gable to match that on the house.
 - d. There will be a garage and pedestrian door on the front.
 - e. It will have exposed rafters.
 - f. Windows will be fixed, tempered glass with applied muntins.
 - g. The roof will be a metal shingle
 - h. There will be a series of five very large windows along the N side.
 - i. The rear will have three large windows and louvered vent in the gable.
- D. Clarifications
 - a. What type of doors will be used, both garage and pedestrian?
 - b. What will the windows be?
 - c. What shingle will be used and what color?
 - d. Cedar shake?
 - e. What will be the design for the south side?
 - f. Paint colors.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The building is set at the rear of the house along the south property and behind a fence. The use of the shingles to match the shingles on the house is appropriate. There appears to be a large window to wall ratio on the north side and the rear. However, pending clarification of the materials, staff sees no impairment from the proposed building.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Bradley Roe was present to discuss the application. He stated there were so many windows so he could watch his children in the back yard while working in his shop. There would be a wood paneled garage and pedestrian door and the paint and roofing would match the house.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the application. Craig Roberts suggested that the windows needed a moulding around the outside edge of the glass to more resemble a tradition sash.

FINDING OF FACT

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion was seconded by Cameron Pfeiffer and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued with the recommendation that the windows have a one inch molding around the outside of the glass. The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 7/02/09.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

079-08-CA: 200 Dauphin Street
Applicant: CRS Constructions for Woodlands Bank
Received: 06/11/08 (+45 Days: 07/26/08)
Meeting: 07/02/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street Commercial District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B4
Project: Remove two windows and install an ATM and a night deposit.

BUILDING HISTORY

The building was constructed in 1925 by the Van Antwerp Realty Company based on a design by George Rogers. It has recently undergone various renovations including the removal of paint and the addition of a balcony.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. The building is comprised has a corner entrance and storefronts on Dauphin and Conception. There is also a door on Conception Street that leads to the upper floor. Originally the Dauphin Street elevation had a major entrance flanked by display windows.
- B. The Lower Dauphin Street Commercial District Design Guidelines state: “ Many changes over time have occurred to storefronts in the LDSCD. In the event that a storefront does not fit the context of the district, a new more compatible design may be introduced... Large panes of glass that fit the original opening at the display level are recommended. Opaque treatments, such as black Plexiglas, or painting of existing glazing, are not allowed. Reflective, mirror glass is also not allowed.”
- C. The applicant is proposing to remove two glass panels on front of the building and replace with solid panels and ATM/Night Deposit Box.
- D. Clarification: What window is it going into?

STAFF ANALYSIS

The use of the solid panels violates the guidelines. The Board has allowed similar machines, but not in prominent sites and/or not removing two whole storefront windows. The proposed solid panels bear the logo of the bank and therefore become signage. Staff believes the windows on Dauphin Street to the west would be best suited for this since they are already partially blocked. Also, it would be better if only one bay were taken instead of two. Staff also recommends the Board develop a policy on these machines.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

There was no one present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board was not sure which window was being proposed for the changes. The Board discussed the importance of windows and how these machines had been installed in other areas. The Board noted that Hancock Bank was required to move its machines from the Dauphin Street façade to the less traveled St. Emanuel Street. It was pointed out that Dauphin is the more traveled street, but the other side faced Bienville Square. The Board also discussed staff's recommendation that the machinery be located in one of the windows already compromised. There was concern expressed that the background was signage and no signage application was submitted for analysis of current signage and the proposed new.

FINDING OF FACT

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Jim Wagoner moved that, based upon lack of information, that the application be tabled. The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph and unanimously approved.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

080-08-CA: 16 Oakland Terrace
Applicant: Angela Graham for Gloria Ellison
Received: 06/10/08 (+45 Days: 07/25/08)
Meeting: 07/02/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R1
Project: Install aluminum fence.

BUILDING HISTORY

The building would appear to be a Bungalow from around 1925 with a later dormer.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. The building is probably from around 1925 but has and has had a dormer added to the front and the front porch was enclosed with jalousie windows.
- B. The Guidelines state that fence “... 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. The applicant is proposing to
 - a. Install 24 feet of fencing from the north, front edge of the house to the sidewalk.
 - b. Fencing to be aluminum with a fleur-de-lis design.
 - c. There is a wood fence along the north property line and a wire fence along the south property line.
- D. Information needed
 - a. Height of fence.
 - b. Color of fence.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This fence is not atypical in the historic districts. Generally, the Board has not allowed the simple crimped-spear top. Since the proposal is for a cast fleur-de-lis this would fall within the generally accepted styles. This would lead from the wood fence to the sidewalk. Staff sees no problem with this fence if the height and color are acceptable to the Board. Since this will be in front of the house, staff would encourage the design not to be too tall.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Angela Graham was present to discuss the application. She stated the fence would be 4 feet tall and painted black.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no further Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion was seconded by Jim Wagoner and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Tom Karwinski and approved with one dissenting vote.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 7/02/09.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

076-08-CA: 501 Government Street
Applicant: Pope Building & Renovation for Jay P. Altmayer II
Received: 06/23/08
Meeting: 07/02/08:

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Construct a rail for the porch steps.

BUILDING HISTORY

This is an Italianate Townhouse built in 1876 by the Pollock family. For the last several years it was used as the offices of John Dendy, architect. It is being renovated for offices.

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. Currently there are no rails on the steps.
- B. The Guidelines state: “Historic porches should be maintained and repaired to reflect their period. Particular attention should be paid to handrails...The balustrade of the stairs should match the design and materials of the porch...”
- C. The request is to install a balustrade using the design of the fence as inspiration.
 - a. The rails will be 36 inches high.
 - b. The height of the fence is several inches shorter.
 - c. The pieces will have to be pieced together.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The step handrail is an angled element while the fence sections are not. Often, historic handrails used vertical pickets in place of the more elaborate panels used on the porch. When more elaborate pieces were used in the railings, they did not necessarily match the panels on the porch rails. It was not common to use the same panels for an iron fence as for the porch. The proposed panels are too short for modern code, were never part of the house, will have to be pieced and cut in such a manner that the design will be damaged. Staff recommends that a baluster would be a more appropriate solution.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Randy Pope was present to discuss the application. He agreed with the staff recommendation that the design was not right for this location and use.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the height requirements on the fence. There was concern that it should be built to code. Craig Roberts agreed to consult with staff if a mid-month request was made.

FINDING OF FACT

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does impair the historic integrity of the district and the building; that a Certificate of Appropriateness be denied; and that staff be authorized to approve a design on a mid-month basis. The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph and approved with one in opposition. It should be noted that the applicant should be advised to check the Code requirements.