

## ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES

May 5, 2010 – 3:00 P.M.

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

### A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Harris Oswalt, called the meeting to order at 3:00. Cart Blackwell, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:

**Members Present:** Gertrude Baker, Kim Hardin, Bill James, Thomas Karwinski, Bradford Ladd, Harris Oswalt, Craig Roberts, and Barja Wilson.

**Members Absent:** Carlos Gant, Jim Wagoner, and Janetta Whitt-Mitchell.

**Staff Members Present:** Devereaux Bemis, Cart Blackwell, Keri Coumanis, and John Lawler.

2. Mr. Oswalt held over approval of minutes for the April 21, 2010 meeting to the next meeting. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.
3. Mr. Ladd moved to approve the midmonth COAs granted by Staff

### B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED

#### 1. Applicant: Marsha Sutton

- a. Property Address: 208 South Warren Street
- b. Date of Approval: 4/13/10
- c. Project: Repair and replace the balusters on the porches. Repair the window sills and frames. All work will match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Paint the work to match the existing color scheme.

#### 2. Applicant: Mike Maddox

- a. Property Address: 19 South Lafayette Street
- b. Date of Approval: 4/13/10
- c. Project: Paint house, body light blue, trim white.

#### 3. Applicant: Thomas Neese

- a. Property Address: 8 North Julia Street
- b. Date of Approval: 4/14/10
- c. Project: Repaint the house per the existing color scheme. Repair and replace rotten woodwork when necessary. The repair and replacement will match the existing in profile, dimension, and material.

#### 4. Applicant: Information Transport Solutions

- a. Property Address: 1000 Dauphin Street
- b. Date of Approval: 4/14/10
- c. Project: Install a wooden hand rail to one side of the back porch stairs. The railing design will match the balustrade of the porch. Repair a damaged window. The work will match the existing.

#### 5. Applicant: Wayne Dobbs

- a. Property Address: 151 South Claiborne Street
- b. Date of Approval: 4/15/10
- c. Project: Repair and replace the porch ceiling to match the existing.

#### 6. Applicant: David T. McConnell

- a. Property Address: 2251 Ashland Place Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 4/15/10
- c. Project: Reroof with Timberline shingles. Repaint the house per the existing color scheme.

#### 7. Applicant: Wrico Signs

- a. Property Address: 1960 Government Street
- b. Date of Approval: 4/15/10

- c. Project: Reface the “tag line” of the existing aluminum sign. The refaced section will match the materials the existing sign.
- 8. Applicant: Robert Tacon**
- a. Property Address: 16 South Ann Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 4/15/10
  - c. Project: Install a concrete drive where the existing shell driveway is located.
- 9. Applicant: Kristen Gartman Rogers**
- a. Property Address: 352 McDonald Avenue
  - b. Date of Approval: 4/18/10
  - c. Project: Paint the existing aluminum siding Olympic’s Toasted Almond. Install a utility shed in the backyard. The shed will have minimal visibility from the street. The siding will be painted to match the house. The roofing will match the house.
- 10. Applicant: Connie Arensberg**
- a. Property Address: 1563 Fearnway
  - b. Date of Approval: 4/16/10
  - c. Project: Paint the house in the following Olympic color scheme: Body: Sprig of Ivy D68-3; Porch and steps: Old Dauphin Way Green; Trim: white or Bone White D20-3; and Door: Apple a Day B35-6.
- 11. Applicant: David and Rosemary Van Lent**
- a. Property Address: 115-117 North Julia Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 4/19/10
  - c. Project: Install a six foot aluminum interior lot gate and fence to either side of the building. The section of fence will extend from south lot line to the southwest corner of the house, recessed within the lot. The aluminum gate, which will swing inward, will be located at the point where the existing six foot fence transitions to a four foot fence. Construct a storage/garden shed according to MHDC stock plans in the back yard, five feet from the rear/east lot line.
- 12. Applicant: Forrest Raley**
- a. Property Address: 1556 Blair Avenue
  - b. Date of Approval: 4/19/10
  - c. Project: Repair rotten woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Retouch the paint. Retouch the staining on front door.
- 13. Applicant: Ormandos Mark Jackson**
- a. Property Address: 507 Saint Francis Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 4/19/10
  - c. Project: Install a white gravel drive between the house and the adjoining house to the east. The drive will be approximately 10 feet wide. The drive will extend approximately 80 feet within the lot.
- 14. Applicant: Jimmy Stauter**
- a. Property Address: 1708 McGill Avenue
  - b. Date of Approval: 4/20/10
  - c. Project: Repair siding. The work will match the existing. Touch up the paint per the existing color scheme.
- 15. Applicant: William Hodge**
- a. Property Address: 1023 Dauphin Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 4/20/10
  - c. Project: Repair the roof. The work will match the existing.
  - d. paint per the existing color scheme.
- 16. Applicant: Michael Scheurmann**
- a. Property Address: 118 Houston Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 4/23/10

- c. Project: Install 3' front yard picket fence along north property line running from sidewalk to solid face of the house; install 6' privacy fence along north property line from face of house to rear property line.

**17. Applicant: Chuck Dixon**

- a. Property Address: 908 Palmetto Street
- b. Date of Approval: 4/23/10
- c. Project: Install rear deck per submitted plan. Trim and railings to match existing back porch.

**18. Applicant: William Lott**

- a. Property Address: 960 Palmetto Street
- b. Date of Approval: 4/22/10
- c. Project: Repair foundation to far left support. Changes will not alter the appearance of the element or the structure. Paint the house in current color scheme. Repair any rotten wood to match the existing in profile, dimension and material.

**19. Applicant: John Thomas**

- a. Property Address: 1419 Government Street
- b. Date of Approval: 4/21/10
- c. Project: Refurbish and reseal front stained glass windows.

**C. APPLICATIONS**

**1. 2010-37-CA: 121 Bush Avenue**

- a. Applicant: Chris Bowen
- b. Project: Demolition of a house.

**APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

**2. 2010-38-CA: 1550 Government Street**

- a. Applicant: Image Designs Inc. for Winn Dixie
- b. Project: Sign Approval - Mount three wall signs to the building's east elevation.

**APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

**3. 2010-39-CA: 124 Ryan Avenue**

- a. Applicant: Charles Weems for Thomas S. Rue
- b. Project: Alter fenestration on the side elevations. Screen a back porch.

**APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

**4. 2010-40-CA: 263 South Cedar Street**

- a. Applicant: David L. Thomas, Sr.
- b. Project: Replace the front porch's wooden columns and railing with fiberglass versions replicating the existing.

**APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

**D. OTHER BUSINESS**

1. Toter Trashcans

Mr. Bemis told the Board that the lifts of the City's garbage trucks cannot pick up certain public trashcans. The service crews turned to the bag system to collect the contents of the non conforming containers. Mr. Bemis informed the Board that the City and Keep Mobile Beautiful propose replacing the ineffective containers with Toter Trashcans. He said that the proposed cans were the most sympathetic of those initially submitted for consideration. The Board asked where the trashcans would be located and how they would be secured to the ground. Mr. Bemis told the Board that trashcans would be located at various public spaces within the historic districts. Mr. James asked if approval

could be conditional on the proper installation and maintenance of the trashcans. Mr. Bemis said that those considerations could be included as recommendations. Mr. Roberts moved that proposed trashcans do not impair the architectural integrity of historic districts. Ms. Hardin, Mr. Karwinski, and Mr. Oswalt voted in opposition.

2. Midmonth Approvals – Fencing

Staff and the Board discussed midmonth fencing approvals. Height, design, location, picket dimensions, and site specifics were among the topics discussed.

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

**2010-37-CA:** 121 Bush Avenue  
**Applicant:** Chris Bowen  
**Received:** 4/12/10  
**Meeting:** 5/5/10

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Demolition of a house

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This house dates from the first quarter of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century. The original house consisted of a shotgun with a recessed wing. Later additions and porch enclosures expanded the dwelling.

**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. A March 15, 2010 fire gutted the interior and the majority of the exterior. The structural unsound building poses safety concerns.
- B. In regards to demolition, the Guidelines read as follows: “Proposed demolition of a building must be brought before the Board for consideration. The Board may deny a demolition request if the building’s loss will impair the historic integrity of the district.” However, our ordinance mirrors the Mobile City Code, see §44-79, which sets forth the following standard of review and required findings for the demolition of historic structures:
  - 1. *Required findings; demolition/relocation.* The board shall not grant certificates of appropriateness for the demolition or relocation of any property within a historic district unless the board finds that the removal or relocation of such building will not be detrimental to the historical or architectural character of the district. In making this determination, the board shall consider:
    - i. The historic or architectural significance of the structure;  
This building is a contributing structure within the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The gradual and piecemeal nature of the house’s expansion is illustrative of earlier approaches to home expansion.
    - ii. The importance of the structures to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;
      - 1. While not an exemplar of a particular architectural style or building type, this house contributes to the physical density and rhythm of Bush Avenue’s largely intact streetscape.

- iii. The difficulty or the impossibility of reproducing the structure because of its design, texture, material, detail or unique location;
    - 1. The building materials are capable of being reproduced.
  - iv. Whether the structure is one of the last remaining examples of its kind in the neighborhood, the county, or the region or is a good example of its type, or is part of an ensemble of historic buildings creating a neighborhood;
    - 1. While the house is not a surviving example of a single architectural style, the building does evidence the evolution and expansion of a small one story single family dwelling over the last three quarters of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century.
  - v. Whether there are definite plans for reuse of the property if the proposed demolition is carried out, and what effect such plans will have on the architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological, social, aesthetic, or environmental character of the surrounding area.
    - 1. The applicant is investigating the feasibility and options of rebuilding. If granted approval, the applicant will demolish the house and if possible submit plans for a new duplex. The initial plan is to demolish the house and clear the lot.
  - vi. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
    - 1. The owner acquired the property in August of 1997 for \$42,000.
  - vii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
    - 1. The applicant has considered rebuilding on the property.
  - viii. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
    - 1. Not applicable.
  - ix. Description of the options currently held for the purchase of such property, including the price received for such option, the conditions placed upon such option and the date of expiration of such option;
    - 1. Not applicable.
  - x. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
    - 1. Not given
  - xi. Financial proof of the ability to complete the replacement project, which may include but not be limited to a performance bond, a letter of credit, a trust for completion of improvements, or a letter of commitment from a financial institution; and
    - 1. Check submitted.
  - xii. Such other information as may reasonably be required by the board.
    - 1.
3. *Post demolition or relocation plans required.* In no event shall the board entertain any application for the demolition or relocation of any historic property unless the applicant also presents at the same time the post-demolition or post-relocation plans for the site.”

C. Scope of Work:

- 1. Demolish the house.

CLARIFICATIONS

- 1. Does the applicant plan to landscape the lot?

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

When reviewing demolition requests, three considerations are taken into account: the significance of the building; the condition of the building; and the nature of the proposed redevelopment. While the house is contributing building within the district and a component to the streetscape, it does not represent a particular building type or style. With regard to the building's condition, the March 15, 2010 fire gutted the house's interior. The rear portion of the house is a burned shell. Though the façade and south elevations appear salvageable, the house is structurally and materially unsound. The applicant is investigating rebuilding options.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-2), as well as concerns for fire and safety, Staff recommends approval of the demolition request, but reminds the owner that any new structure will have to be approved by the Architectural Review Board.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Chris Bowen was present to discuss the application.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt asked Mr. Bowen if he had any clarifications to make or comments to add with regard to the Staff Report. Mr. Bowen said that he was sorry the house burned. He informed the Board that since the fire the City has issued several tickets on the burned out structure. Mr. Bowen said that if demolition approval was granted, he would like to construct a duplex or a single family residence on the site. Mr. Oswalt reminded Mr. Bowen about the Staff clarification regarding proposed interim landscaping and plantings. Mr. Bowen said the site would be leveled and planted with grass.

Mr. Karwinski asked Mr. Bowen if the chain link fences surrounding the house were located on the property. Mr. Bowen said he was not sure, but he believed the fencing to the right of the house was within the property line. Mr. Karwinski told Mr. Bowen that according to the Guidelines, chain link is an inappropriate fencing type for use within Mobile's Historic Districts. Mr. Bowen said that if any of the chain link fencing was on the property he would remove it, but added that if any of the neighboring property owners wanted the fencing to remain, he would retain the fencing for the time being. Mr. Oswalt told the Board that the removal of the existing fencing was not part of the application.

Mr. Oswalt addressed his fellow board members and Staff asking them if they had any final comments or questions. Mr. Bemis asked the Board to amend the application. He told the Board that the Mobile Historic Development Commission holds an easement on the house. He pointed easements run in perpetuity. Mr. Bemis said that since the Commission still holds an interest in the property, demolition approval should be made conditional on the applicant's purchasing back of easement through a financial settlement with the MHDC. Mr. Karwinski asked if the Board could be involved in the proceeding of the financial settlement. Mr. Bemis clarified the nature of the easement. He told the Board that the settlement amount would be equal to the appraised value of the easement at the time the easement was granted or at the time the houses was destroyed, whichever was greater. Mr. Baker asked Staff why the easement procedure was not included in the Agenda. Ms. Bemis and Ms. Coumanis informed the Board that when the Agenda was posted the Properties Committee the Mobile Historic Development Commission's Properties Committee had not officially granted demolition approval. Ms. Coumanis added that the

demolition of easement properties is a rare occurrence. Mr. Ladd asked Staff if demolition approval could be granted on the condition that a workable settlement be agreed upon between the owners and the Commission. Mr. Karwinski said that the application should be tabled until the applicant and the Commission can come to an agreement, after which the application should reappear before the Board for reconsideration. Mr. Oswalt asked Mr. Bowen if he was willing to amend his application. Mr. Bowen answered yes. He told the Board that the Commission holds a number of easements on properties owned by his partner and himself. Mr. Bowen said they would reach an agreement with the Commission as to the financial settlement. Mr. Oswalt asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak for or against the application. Upon receiving no response, he 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, amending the application to make approval conditional on the Commission and the owner reaching an agreement regarding the value of the easement.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

## **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the facts as amended by the Board, the application does impair the historic integrity of the district and the building, but demolition approval be granted on the above stated condition.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 5/5/11**



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

**2010-38-CA: 1550 Government Street**  
**Applicant: Image Designs Inc. for Winn Dixie**  
**Received: 4/14/10**  
**Meeting: 5/5/10**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way  
Classification: Non-Contributing  
Zoning: B-4  
Project: Sign Approval – Mount three signs to the building’s east elevation.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This non-contributing building houses a Winn Dixie supermarket.

**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 January 7, 2009. At that time, the Board approved renovations to the building’s exterior. As part of the ongoing interior and exterior rehabilitations, the applicants propose mounting three aluminum signs to the building’s east elevation. On January 9, 1995, the Board of Zoning Adjustment granted a sign variance allowing up to 200 square feet of signage for the property.
- 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 (per submitted plan):
1. Mount a wall sign over the building's main entrance
    - a. "WINN DIXIE" and an intermediate check symbol will comprise the sign design.
    - b. The sign will feature an aluminum face.
    - c. The sign will feature plastic backing.
    - d. The sign will feature "V" Series LED illumination.
    - e. The silhouetted indirect illumination will project toward the wall.
    - f. The sign will measure 5'8" in height and 29' 10 1/2" in length.
    - g. The distance from the ground to the bottom of the sign will measure 16' 4".
    - h. The distance from the ground to the top of the sign will measure 22'.
  2. Mount two individually lettered signs north of the building's main entrance.
    - a. The signs will feature aluminum facings.
    - b. The signs will feature plastic backing.
    - c. The signs will feature "V" Series LED illumination.
    - d. The signs' silhouetted indirect illumination will project toward the wall.
    - e. The sign featuring the lettering "FOOD" will measure 1 1/2' in height & 5' 7" in length.
    - f. The distance from the ground to the bottom of the sign will measure 12'.
    - g. The distance from the ground to the top of the sign will measure 13 1/2'.
    - h. The sign featuring the lettering "PHARMACY" will measure 1 1/2' in height & 12' in length.
    - i. The distance from the ground to the bottom of the sign will measure 12'.
    - j. The distance from the ground to the top of the sign will measure 13 1/2'.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

When evaluating signage requests, sign size, material, and lighting are taken into account. The total square footage of the three is under the 200 square foot sign variance granted to the property. The signage designs and materials meet the standards established by the Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts and Government Street. With regard lighting, the proposed indirect, backlit, silhouetted LED illumination is a form of approvable reverse channel lighting.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-7), Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or the historical integrity of the district. Staff recommends approval of the application.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Andy Nicholson with Image Designs was present to discuss the application.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt asked Mr. Nicholson if he had any clarifications to make or comments to add with regard to the Staff Report. Mr. Nicholson first addressed the lighting of the proposed signs. He told the Board that the proposed lighting is a type of low voltage, reverse channel LED lighting. He pointed out that the lighting would have a halo-like effect. Mr. Nicholson demonstrated how the lighting would illuminate the signage. With regard to materials, he informed the Board that plastic backing would prevent birds from nesting within the

signs. Mr. Oswalt asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak for against the application. Upon hearing no response, Mr. Oswalt closed the period of public comment.

#### **FINDING OF FACT**

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

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

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 5/5/11**

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

**2010-39-CA: 124 Ryan Avenue**  
**Applicant: Charles Weems for Thomas S. Rue**  
**Received: 4/15/10**  
**Meeting: 5/5/10**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Ashland Place  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Alter the fenestration on the side elevations. Screen a rear porch.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This classically detailed one-and-one-half story house was built in 1927.

**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 applicants propose the alteration of side elevation fenestration and the screening of a rear porch.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. “The type, size and dividing lights of windows and their location and configuration (rhythm) on the building help establish the historic character of a building. Original window openings should be retained as well as original window sashes and glazing.”
  - 2. “The size and placement of new windows for additions or alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.”
  - 3. “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture. Historic porches should be maintained and repaired to reflect their period. Particular attention should be paid to the handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions and decorative details.”
- C. Scope of Work:
  - 1. Project I – Alter the fenestration on the side elevations.
    - a. Remove the north elevation’s two louvered quadrant windows.
    - b. Install a glazed lunette in the center of the gable.
    - c. The lunette will measure 54” in length x 2 ½’ in height.
    - d. Remove the louvers from the south elevation’s single quadrant window.
    - e. Install a framed and glazed window unit within the existing window opening.
    - f. Paint the work to match the existing color scheme.
  - 2. Project II - Screen the rear porch.
    - a. Dimensional wood framing will secure the screening.
    - b. The screening and framing will conform to the existing porch bays.
    - c. Paint the work to match the existing color scheme.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

While the Guidelines state the window openings should be maintained and preserved, staff believes the proposed alterations to the side elevations' attic level fenestration would not impair the architectural integrity of the house. Converting attic spaces to usable living space is a traditional treatment and the installation of windows in the gable ends is a typical method. The lunette proposed for the north elevation echoes the classical detailing and curved forms of the façade. Trees obscure views from the public right of way. The proposed glazing of the south elevation's single quadrant window would likewise be minimally visible from the public right of way. Removing the louvers and installing glazing would not alter the configuration and rhythm of the south elevation's fenestration.

Screening is a prevalent practice characteristic of 20<sup>th</sup> century regional architecture. The proposed screening of the back porch would not alter the form or integrity of the house. The porch is minimally visible from the public right of way. The framing of the screening will conform to the existing porch bays.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-3), Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or historical integrity of the house or the district therefore recommends approval of this application. Staff further recommends that the north elevation's louvered vents be saved on site.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Mr. Charles Weems was present to discuss the application.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswald asked Mr. Weems if he had any clarifications to make or comments to add with regard to the Staff Report. Mr. Weems answered no saying the Staff Report adequately addressed the proposals. Mr. Karwinski asked Mr. Weems what was the intended use of the attic space. Mr. Weems informed the Board that the attic would be used by the owner's grandchildren. Mr. Karwinski told Mr. Weems he might encounter problems with egress requirements. Mr. Weems said he was addressing those concerns. Mr. Ladd said that concerns about ingress and egress are not under Board's jurisdiction.

Mr. Karwinski asked Mr. Weems exactly where the proposed lunette would be located on the west elevation. Mr. Weems explained to the Board that a later rear addition resulted in asymmetrical fenestration on the north elevation. He told the Board that the proposed fanlight would be centrally located, thereby removing the asymmetry of the north elevation's attic fenestration.

Mr. Ladd informed his fellow Board members that he visited the site. He said that the proposed alteration to the north elevation's fenestration would improve the appearance of that side of the house. Mr. Oswald asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak for or against the application. Upon hearing no response, Mr. Oswald closed the period of public comment.

## **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 as written.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

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

Ms. Baker 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: 5/5/11**

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

**2010-40-CA:** 263 South Cedar Street  
**Applicant:** Mr. David L. Thomas, Sr.  
**Received:** 4/19/10  
**Meeting:** 5/5/10

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Church Street East  
Classification: Non-Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Replace the wooden front porch columns and railing with fiberglass versions matching the existing.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This 2000 house constitutes recent infill construction in the Church East Historic District.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

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

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. Since receiving construction approval, this property has not appeared before the Architectural Review Board.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and the Guidelines for New Residential and Commercial Construction state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. “The exterior of a building helps define its style.”
  - 2. “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture...Particular attention should be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions, and decorative details.”
  - 3. “Modern materials which have the same textural qualities and character as materials of nearby historic buildings may be acceptable.”
- C. Scope of Work:
  - 1. Replace the front porch’s wooden columns and balustrade with fiberglass versions replicating the originals.
  - 2. The columns will not be fluted.

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

This house constitutes non-contributing or non historic infill. The proposed replacement columns and balustrade will match the existing. The Guidelines for New Construction allow the use of modern

materials. Given the house's recent construction and the proposed replication, the change will not detract from the integrity of the district.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

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

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Mr. David L. Thomas, Sr. was present to discuss the application.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Blackwell informed the Board that he met with the applicant prior to the meeting. He explained that the proposed columnar treatment remained the same, but Mr. Thomas would like to amend the application to allow a 3' high aluminum railing instead of fiberglass picket type railing. Mr. Oswald asked Mr. Thomas if he had any clarifications or comments to make with regard to the Staff Report. Mr. Thomas told the Board that Mr. Blackwell adequately addressed the altered the proposal. He provided a copy of the proposed railing for the Board's inspection. Mr. James asked Mr. Blackwell about the design of the proposed columns. Mr. Blackwell told Mr. James the replacement columns would have the same dimensions of the existing, but without fluting.

### **FINDING OF FACT**

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, amending the application to allow the use of a 3' aluminum railing.

The motion received a second and was unanimously 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 unanimously approved.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 5/5/11**