

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES

June 4, 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 3:04 PM.

The Introductory Statement was read by the staff.

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

The Minutes of the previous meeting were unanimously approved per a motion of Bunky Ralph and second of Harris Oswalt.

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

B. MID-MONTH APPROVALS

1. **Applicant's Name:** CFL Construction LLC
Property Address: 1116 Old Shell Road
Date of Approval: May 12, 2008
Repair rotten exterior wood – including the sills, windows, siding, rafters, fascia, soffit, etc – to match existing.
Repair and step up the foundation to match existing. Reroof with galvanized 5v-crimp metal panels.
2. **Applicant's Name:** John Mims
Property Address: 25 South Lafayette Street
Date of Approval: May 12, 2008
Replace the rotted rear French doors with new doors to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Paint the previously painted brick in the same color as the wood. Repaint the trim in the existing color.
3. **Applicant's Name:** Paul Mattern
Property Address: 157 South Catherine Street
Date of Approval: May 13, 2008
Paint in the following BLP Weather Tite color scheme:
 - Body – Pastel Sun
 - Trim – White
4. **Applicant's Name:** Nick Holmes Jr.
Property Address: 22 South Lafayette Street
Date of Approval: May 14, 2008
Repaint house to match existing color scheme: white with dark green shutters.
5. **Applicant's Name:** Debra Kraus
Property Address: 105 South Ann Street
Date of Approval: May 14, 2008
Reroof with 3tab shingles in Charcoal Grey. Repair rotten siding, windows, rear balusters, rear and front porch deck with materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Paint in the following Ace Paint colors:
 - Body – Silent white, E-39
 - Trim, Foundation and Accents – India Ink
6. **Applicant's Name:** DeWayne Gardner
Property Address: 4 South Monterey Street
Date of Approval: May 15, 2008
Remove aluminum siding and repair rotten wood. Repair rotten eaves and fascia. Repair any damaged windows per existing. Reroof with Weathered Wood Timberline shingles. Repaint in the following BLP color scheme:
 - Body – Wingate

- Trim – Hopewell
7. **Applicant's Name:** Kelli Rytterstrom
Property Address: 13 South Julia Street
Date of Approval: May 16, 2008
Paint the house in the following ICI Paints color scheme:
 - Body – Neutral Wheat, 10YY 35/094
 - Trim – White Swan, 60YY 83/062
 8. **Applicant's Name:** Mike Henderson Roofing & Repair Services
Property Address: 160 Macy Place
Date of Approval: May 20, 2008
Re roof with 3tab Owens-Corning shingles in Onyx Black.
 9. **Applicant's Name:** WM Construction
Property Address: 1560 Luling Street
Date of Approval: May 20, 2008
Repair/replace the rear wood privacy fence with new fencing to match existing.
 10. **Applicant's Name:** Doug Cunningham
Property Address: 261 North Jackson Street
Date of Approval: May 20, 2008
Install a new architectural shingle roof in a dark blend on the rear shed-roof addition (the main roof will not be changed). Paint in the existing color scheme.
 11. **Applicant's Name:** Quality Living Homes
Property Address: 1055 Selma Street
Date of Approval: May 20, 2008
Paint new materials in the following Sherwin-Williams color scheme:
 - Body – Poolhouse, SW7603
 - Trim – Westhighland White, SW7566
 - Door – Black
 12. **Applicant's Name:** Richard and Peg Gudmundson
Property Address: 14 South Catherine Street
Date of Approval: May 20, 2008
Replace rotten wood on siding with new materials to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Remove front shutters. Install original features to front dormer porch per MHDC. Install missing lattice to match existing. Remove paint on stone caps to bring back to original. Paint house in the following Sherwin-Williams colors:
 - Body – Downing Straw, SW2813
 - Accent – Roycroft Copper Red, SW2839
 - Trim – Classical White, SW2829
 - Previously Painted Brickwork – Rookwood Brown, SW2806
 13. **Applicant's Name:** Scott Phillips/Your Handyman
Property Address: 1260 Texas Street
Date of Approval: May 21, 2008
Replace rotten wood on siding with new materials to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Paint in the existing color scheme.
 14. **Applicant's Name:** George Swann
Property Address: 106 Garnett Street
Date of Approval: May 21, 2008
Repair rotten and damaged wood throughout the exterior – including the columns and roof – with materials to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Reroof to match existing shingles. Paint new materials in the existing color scheme.
 15. **Applicant's Name:** Pope Building and Renovation LLC
Property Address: 501 Government Street

Date of Approval: May 23, 2008

Repair the stucco with materials to match existing. Paint in the existing color scheme.

16. **Applicant's Name:** Sumrall Construction

Property Address: 1154 Dauphin Street

Date of Approval: May 23, 2008

Repair rotten wood throughout the exterior with wood to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Reinstall the missing siding on the rear elevation (about twenty boards).

17. **Applicant's Name:** Bill and Carolyn Cross

Property Address: 1050 Church Street

Date of Approval: May 23, 2008

Extend the south side of the driveway to match the design provided. Materials will be concrete to match existing.

18. **Applicant's Name:** Paul Howen

Property Address: 69 North Reed Avenue

Date of Approval: May 23, 2008

Replace rotten wood to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Paint in the existing colors.

19. **Applicant's Name:** John E. Nichols Sr.

Property Address: 1356 Dauphin Street

Date of Approval: May 27, 2008

Paint in the existing Sherwin-Williams color scheme:

- Body and Lattice – Cashew Nut, BM-9-25
- Trim – Coquille, BM-8-10

20. **Applicant's Name:** Miller Contracting

Property Address: 1711 Hunter Avenue

Date of Approval: May 27, 2008

Reroof flat section of roof with modified torch down material. Reroof gabled section of roof with architectural shingles in a dark blend. Replace rotted lattice panels with new panels to match. Repaint (colors TBD).

21. **Applicant's Name:** Dobson Sheet Metal and Roofing

Property Address: 960 Government Street

Date of Approval: May 28, 2008

Replace missing roof tile with tile to match existing in material, profile and dimension.

22. **Applicant's Name:** John Edward Walters

Property Address: 310 South Monterey Street

Date of Approval: May 28, 2008

Replace the rotten fascia with new wood to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Repair the front steps with new materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Paint in the following color scheme:

- Body – August Moon (Sandstone)
- Trim – White
- Porch Steps and Door – Brick Dust

23. **Applicant's Name:** Darnell Stie II

Property Address: 125 Michael Donald Avenue

Date of Approval: May 28, 2008

Install a 3'-0" tall treated wood picket fence around the front yard.

24. **Applicant's Name:** Herbert Pair

Property Address: 357 Congress Street

Date of Approval: May 28, 2008

Extend the lattice fence along the east side. It will be 3'-0" tall to the tree by the driveway.

25. **Applicant's Name:** The Music Box LLC

Property Address: 455 Dauphin Street

Date of Approval: May 28, 2008

Paint body in BLP Magnolia Homestead, RC10.

C. OLD BUSINESS

1. **009-08-CA:** 254-256 Congress Street
Applicant: Cummings Architecture
Request: Install a fence and parking area.
Approved

D. NEW BUSINESS

1. **058-08-CA:** 701 Government Street
Applicant: AJ Isacks
Request: Install a fence.
Approved
2. **059-08-CA:** 251 Government Street
Applicant: Gregory Dickinson
Request: Install a fence.
Approved for a maximum of 6 months
3. **060-08-CA:** 1154 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Doug Sumrall
Request: Remove two doors.
Tabled and referred to the Design Committee
4. **061-08-CA:** 69 South Ann Street
Applicant: Gilbert and Nikki Tucker
Request: Construct a single-family residence.
Tabled and referred to the Design Committee
5. **062-08-CA:** 114 St. Emanuel Street
Applicant: Holmes and Holmes, Architects
Request: Construct an addition.
Approved
6. **063-08-CA:** 1009 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Larry Vahle
Request: Install a fence.
Approved

E. OTHER BUSINESS and ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Three design committees were established and will meet next week.
2. The members were given their registration forms for the 2008 National Alliance of Preservation Commissions (NAPC) Forum.

F. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:20 PM.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

009-08-CA: 254-256 Congress Street
Applicant: Cummings Architecture/Etsie Foreman
Received: 01/22/08 **Resubmitted:** 05/19/08
Meeting: 02/06/08 **Meeting:** 07/03/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: DeTonti Square
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-B
Project: Install a fence and parking area.

BUILDING HISTORY

This is currently an empty lot that once held residential buildings.

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 empty lot on the north side of Congress is approximately 78'-0" x 105'-0" with a small portion that extends to North Joachim. A four-unit, two-story residential building was approved for this lot on 02/06/08. However, the Board requested that the applicant resubmit a more appropriate parking plan.
- B. The Guidelines state that fences “should complement the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District.” Also, “the height of solid fences in historic districts is generally restricted to six feet, however, if a commercial property or multi-family housing adjoins the subject property, an eight foot fence may be considered.” Parking areas should be “minimized through good site planning and design.”
- C. The proposed plan includes the following:
1. Construct a 10'-0" tall open covered parking structure per the submitted plans.
 - a. The structure will sit at the northwest corner of the lot; the north and west sides will be flush with the existing stucco wall.
 - b. It will have steel pipe columns supporting beams, wood trim and framing for the built-up roof.
 2. Repave the rear parking area with concrete pavers, installing two new 12'-0" wide asphalt drives at the North Joachim side of the property per the submitted plans.
 3. Replace the stucco and metal wall at Congress with a new metal fence per the submitted plans.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff feels that the new rear parking area plan is more appropriate and will not impair the integrity of the district. The applicant is using an alternative paving material and the covered parking structure has been lowered per staff's original recommendation. Staff does recommend more landscaping if possible.

The applicant will need to contact Urban Forestry regarding the removal of any existing trees and Traffic Engineering and Right-of-Way regarding the new curb cut on North Joachim.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Cheryl Miller was present to represent Cummings Architecture. She agreed to look for more opportunities to better her landscaping design, and to plant around the Joachim Street drive. She also stated that her company recently received permits to remove surrounding trees.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the request and emphasized the need for more plantings.

FINDING OF FACT

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

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 6/04/09.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

058-08-CA: 701 Government Street
Applicant: AJ Isacks
Received: 05/19/08 (+45 Days: 07/03/08)
Meeting: 06/04/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Install a fence.

BUILDING HISTORY

This lot has been empty of buildings and used as the parking area for the library for a number of 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. As mentioned above, this is the parking area for the library. It was recently repaved and landscaped.
- B. The Guidelines state that fences “should complement the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District.” Also, “the height of solid fences in historic districts is generally restricted to six feet, however, if a commercial property or multi-family housing adjoins the subject property, an eight foot fence may be considered.”
- C. The applicant is proposing to install 500’-0” of steel ornamental fence along Washington and Monroe streets per the submitted plans. The fence will be 6’-0” tall.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff feels the work will not impair the integrity of the district and recommends approval.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Jay Isacks was present to discuss the application. He stated the fence would be of steel construction and would match the library fence at 701 Government.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the request which will be painted in the color of Roycroft Green.

FINDING OF FACT

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report adding to the facts that there would be a 24-foot rolling gate, and that the fence would be painted Roycroft Green. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswalt and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 6/04/09.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

059-08-CA: 251 Government Street
Applicant: Gregory Dickinson
Received: 05/19/08 (+45 Days: 07/03/08)
Meeting: 06/04/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

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

BUILDING HISTORY

This has been an empty lot for a number of years. According to records, Mobile County owns it, but the Radisson Admiral Semmes uses it as a parking and construction storage area.

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. As mentioned above, the Radisson Admiral Semmes uses this empty lot as a parking and construction storage area. A chain link fence has been on this site for a number of years. It has been removed and rebuilt several times, generally without COAs. Before Mardi Gras a large section was removed and various parts and pieces have been put up. The office received a 311 complaint and asked the hotel representatives to come before the Board.
- B. The Guidelines state that fences “should complement the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District.” Also, “the height of solid fences in historic districts is generally restricted to six feet, however, if a commercial property or multi-family housing adjoins the subject property, an eight foot fence may be considered.”
- C. The applicant is proposing to reinstall 56’-0” of chain link fence on the Church Street side of the lot.

RECOMMENDATION

Chain link fencing has been around since the 1870s in one form or another, primarily as decorative woven wire. Nonetheless, modern chain link is generally not allowed in historic districts that predate its widespread use. However, staff believes a wooden fence here would not be appropriate in the urban context. Therefore, staff suggests that an overall landscape plan for the lot be developed with an open-style fence.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Gregory Dickinson was present to discuss the application. He stated that the fence was temporary and that the hotel planned to expand into the parking lot.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the request. It was discussed that the property still belonged to the County and would not be sold unless an expansion of the hotel was constructed. The Board discussed that chain link fences were not allowed in the district and that this was a very visible and important location within the historic district. It was pointed out that the Board did allow temporary fencing and construction fences. There was concern expressed that the lot had recently been improved, though counterproductive activity did occur in it constantly. The Board made it clear that at the end of six months there needed to be some progress toward the new building or a new landscaping plan for the parcel would need to be submitted. The Board did say an extension to the six months could be granted if progress was occurring.

FINDING OF FACT

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report adding that the fence would be a temporary structure. The motion was seconded by Cameron Pfeiffer and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the facts as amended by the Board, that the application does impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued for a period of six months after which an extension could be applied for or an overall landscape plan would have to be submitted to the Board. The motion was seconded by Robert Brown and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 12/04/08.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

060-08-CA: 1154 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Doug Sumrall
Received: 05/23/08 (+45 Days: 07/07/08)
Meeting: 06/04/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-1
Project: Remove two doors.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this two-story frame Queen Anne was constructed circa 1895. It had been used as apartments for a number of years.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed 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 historic district...”

STAFF REPORT

- A. As mentioned above, this residence had been used as apartments for a number of years. This use has resulted in the addition of doors throughout the exterior, many of which are now obsolete in the building’s current configuration.
- B. The Guidelines state that renovations and new additions should respect the age and style of the building.
- C. The applicant is proposing to remove two doors on the west side. The transoms and gabled awnings will remain and the siding will be feathered in to match existing.

RECOMMENDATION

The Board has generally allowed later doors to be removed as long as the solid to void ratio is maintained.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Doug Sumrall was present on behalf of the owners to discuss the application. He believed the doors were added at a later time.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the request, expressing concern about the gables that would be left to cover the transom windows. There was also concern that the doors might be historic. It was determined that Mr. Sumrall was not empowered to authorize changes to the requested plans. The Board believed there were some pertinent issues that needed to be discussed with the owners.

FINDING OF FACT

There was no finding of fact.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph moved to table the request and refer it to a design committee that the owners could attend. The motion was seconded by Robert Brown and unanimously approved.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

061-08-CA: 69 South Ann Street
Applicant: Gilbert and Nikki Tucker
Received: 05/19/08 (+45 Days: 07/03/08)
Meeting: 06/04/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Construct a single-family residence.

BUILDING HISTORY

This is currently an empty lot that once held a residential building.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This empty lot on the east side of South Ann is approximately 78’-0” x 160’-0”.
- B. The Guidelines for New Residential and Commercial Construction state “the goal of new construction should be to blend into the historic district but to avoid creating a false sense of history.”
- C. The proposed plan includes the following:
 1. Construct a one-story single-family residence per the submitted plans.
 - a. The building will face South Ann and have a setback to match the neighboring residences.
 - b. The ceiling and window heights will be 10’-0” and 8’-0” respectively to match the neighboring residences.
 - c. The roof will have a 10/12 pitch to match neighboring residences and have Weathered Wood architectural shingles.
 - d. The house will rest on a 2’-0” continuous masonry foundation with a brick water table.
 - e. The siding will be Board and Batten.
 - f. The windows will be 2/2 wood sashes with wood trim.
 - g. The west (front) elevation will feature a ¾-lite wood entry door; a two-part front porch with Craftsman-style brick plinths, wood columns and brick steps; a shed-roof dormer with wood windows; a false window with shutters on the right side; and a front-gable extension with a gable vent and paired 2/2 wood sash windows with a transom and decorative wood shutters.
 - h. The south (right) elevation will have a half-moon window and a wood six-panel side door.
 - i. The north (left) elevation will have 2/2 wood sash windows.
 - j. The east (rear) elevation will have paired 2/2 wood sash windows and a wood six-panel rear door leading to a rear deck.
 - k. The trim, cornice, etc will be per the submitted drawings.
 2. Construct a two-car garage per the submitted plans.
 - a. The structure will sit at the southeast corner of the lot and match the proposed residence.
 - b. It will have paneled garage doors with transoms.
 - c. A concrete ribbon driveway will lead to it.
 3. Install a 6’-0” wood privacy fence around the back yard and a gate at the driveway.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff feels that the proposed construction will not impair the historic integrity of the district. The new building follows the setback and orientation pattern of residences in the vicinity. Its massing and scale, including the raised foundation and footprint, are proportional to buildings typical of the district. It has a front porch, an “important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture,” and other details that are in sympathy to the district. Ornamentation is similar to the nearby residences. As such, it “relates to the historic context” of the district. Staff does, however, believe that there should be more windows added to the side elevations in order to break up the expanse of wall space and have a solid to void ratio more in keeping with historic proportions.

The applicant will also need to contact Urban Forestry regarding the removal of any trees and Traffic Engineering and Right-of-Way regarding curb cuts.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Nikki Tucker and Jeff Lang were present to discuss the application. They confirmed that the roof would be a Timberline roof and the height of the building would be 36 inches above grade. The interior ceiling heights will be 10 feet and the doors would be eight feet.

Frances and Heinz Hoffman were present to address the application. Mrs. Hoffman spoke to the matter. She believes that the design as submitted did impair the historic integrity of the neighborhood. She felt that the design was out of scale, and that the quality, detail and design of the building were not compatible with the surrounding buildings. She felt the construction and details of the building were neither appropriately historic nor modern to blend with the structures in the neighborhood. She pointed out that the doorway did not meet the Guidelines and that the columns were not in keeping. She also noted that there were no board and batten structures in the area and the shed dormer was not appropriate. She asked that it be sent to a design committee for review.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the request during the public testimony. Concern was expressed that the window light pattern and the half circle window were not appropriate. There was also concern expressed that the foundation and water table overpowered the house and should be diminished in importance. As the conversation continued, the Board agreed to accept Mrs. Hoffman's suggestion.

FINDING OF FACT

There was no finding of fact.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph moved that the applications be tabled and referred to the Design Committee. The motion was seconded by Cameron Pfeiffer and unanimously approved.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

062-08-CA: 114 St Emanuel Street
Applicant: Holmes and Holmes, Architects
Received: 05/23/08 (+45 Days: 07/07/08)
Meeting: 06/04/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Construct an addition.

BUILDING HISTORY

This main building on this lot is Christ Church Cathedral, a Greek Revival building that was constructed circa 1838. The other buildings belonging to the cathedral (109-111 South Conception and 115 South Conception) were constructed in 1857 and 1900, respectively.

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 north side of the Cathedral (which is the east – or rear – side of the secondary buildings) is a garden area. There are rear exits, a fire escape and HVAC condensers in the area of the proposed porch.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state that new additions should respect the age and style of the building.
- C. The applicant is proposing to attach a new porch at the north side of the Cathedral per the submitted plans.
 - 1. It will have scored stucco on self-furring lath and concrete stairs leading to the garden.
 - 2. It will feature a wood and metal awning with cast iron brackets.
 - 3. There will be a new iron rialto match the existing iron railings at the north and east elevations.
 - 4. New windows and doors will be bronze impact-resistant anodized aluminum to match the color of the Lexan support window frames that protect the nave windows.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the work will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district. Staff recommends approving the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Nicholas Holmes, Jr. and Johnny Cook were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the request.

FINDING OF FACT

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

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 6/04/09.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

063-08-CA: 1009 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Larry Vahle
Received: 05/28/08 (+45 Days: 07/12/08)
Meeting: 06/04/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-2
Project: Replace the fence.

BUILDING HISTORY

This is the Salvation Army building, which was constructed in 1977.

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. There is currently a 32” tall picket fence around the front of the property.
- B. The Guidelines state that fences “should complement the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District.” Also, “the height of solid fences in historic districts is generally restricted to six feet, however, if a commercial property or multi-family housing adjoins the subject property, an eight foot fence may be considered.”
- C. Mr. Vahle is proposing to replace the existing 32” tall wood picket fence with a staggered wood picket fence that will go from 36” tall to 48” tall per the submitted photos. There will be a pedestrian gate at each walkway.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff feels the work will not impair the integrity of the district and recommends approval.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Larry Vahle and Edward Cox were present to discuss the application. They noted that a rolling gate would be at the east parking area.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the request. It was noted that the applicant may need to consult with Urban Development and/or Traffic Engineering.

FINDING OF FACT

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswalt 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 Barja Wilson and unanimously approved. The applicants are advised to have the fence approved by the Urban Development Department and Traffic Engineering.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 6/04/09.