

**CITY OF MOBILE  
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD**

Minutes of the Meeting  
September 25, 2006

**CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m. by Chair, Bunky Ralph. Devereaux Bemis, MHDC Director, called the roll as follows:

**Members Present:** Tilmon Brown, Douglas Kearley, Harris Oswalt, Cameron Pfeiffer, Bunky Ralph, David Tharp, Jim Wagoner.

**Members Absent:** Robert Brown, Joe Sackett.

**Staff Members Present:** Anne Crutcher, Devereaux Bemis, John Lawler

<u>In Attendance</u>	<u>Mailing Address</u>	<u>Item Number</u>
Lucy Barr		099-05/06-CA
Neal Higgins		101-05/06-CA
Charles Howard	1805 Dauphin Street	103-05/06-CA
Hastings and Anne Read	1225 Selma Street	102-05/06-CA
Maura Garino	301 Government Street	098-05/06-CA

David Tharp moved to approve the minutes of the last meeting as emailed with the correction that Jim Wagoner was in attendance. The motion was seconded by Douglas Kearley and unanimously approved.

Jim Wagoner moved to approve the mid-month Certificates of Appropriateness. The motion was seconded by David Tharp and unanimously approved.

**MID-MONTH APPROVALS**

- 1. Applicant's Name:** Mark Willis  
**Property Address:** 1721 Conti Street  
**Date of Approval:** August 29, 2006

Re-roof garage with metal roofing material (per submitted), charcoal in color. Replace rotten wood as necessary on rear of building with materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Paint house as per submitted color samples. Remove non-historic clabbered knee wall at porch and restore columns to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Repair existing 6 foot dog eared privacy fence.

- 2. Applicant's Name:** The United Holiness Church  
**Property Address:** 102 North Pine Street  
**Date of Approval:** August 31, 2006  
Repair roof with shingles to match existing materials in profile and dimension.

- 3. Applicant's Name:** Juan Titlestaad  
**Property Address:** 155 Marine Street  
**Date of Approval:** August 31, 2006

Demolish rear unfinished addition. Plans for new construction to be submitted at future date. Original structure to remain except as necessary for permitted demolition.

- 4. Applicant's Name:** The Renaissance Group/ Stephen Barr  
**Property Address:** 308 St. Louis Street  
**Date of Approval:** August 31, 2006  
Re-roof with membrane roof and new decking as necessary. Install new flashing and cap flashing as needed. Sky lights to be installed according to submitted plans.
- 5. Applicant's Name:** St. Francis Place/Enlaw Construction Inc.  
**Property Address:** 753 St. Francis Street  
**Date of Approval:** September 1, 2006

Clean, repair and repaint masonry and iron fencing to match existing.

- 6. Applicant's Name:** St. Francis Place/Enlaw Construction Inc.  
**Property Address:** 753 St. Francis Street  
**Date of Approval:** September 1, 2006

Clean, repair and repaint masonry and iron fencing to match existing.

- 7. Applicant's Name:** Tuan Titlestaad  
**Property Address:** 155 Marine Street  
**Date of Approval:** September 1, 2006

Repair or replace rotten wood as necessary with materials to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Prep and prime to paint house. Colors to be submitted later.

- 8. Applicant's Name:** China Chef/Sin Au  
**Property Address:** 1702-A Government  
**Date of Approval:** September 5, 2006

Install 16 inch high sign in signboard on building. The letters will be individually mounted, red with gold trim. The material will be metal with a plastic coating.

- 9. Applicant's Name:** Traditional Services  
**Property Address:** 150 Government Street

**Date of Approval:** September 6, 2006

Install new built up bitumen roof with new aluminum parapet caps on flat sections only. Replace galvanized gutters with new anodized aluminum gutters to match existing in profile, dimension and material.

**10. Applicant's Name:** Caroline Contracting

**Property Address:** 1005 Caroline Avenue

**Date of Approval:** September 7, 2006

Install new 30 year weathered wood architectural shingle roof. Repair to soffit and fascia as necessary with new wood to match existing in dimension and profile. Paint exterior (paint colors to be submitted at a later date.)

**11. Applicant's Name:** Certapro Painters

**Property Address:** 1260 Dauphin Street

**Date of Approval:** September 7, 2006

Paint wrought iron black.

**12. Applicant's Name:** Jim Wagoner

**Property Address:** 1805 Dauphin Street

**Date of Approval:** September 7, 2006

Repair to rotten wood on garage as necessary with new wood to match existing in dimension and profile; paint garage in existing color scheme.

**13. Applicant's Name:** Ray Hudson

**Property Address:** 550 Eslava

**Date of Approval:** September 7, 2006

Replace rotten wood as necessary with new materials to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Paint new materials to match existing color scheme

**14. Applicant's Name:** Bob Schwarz

**Property Address:** 13 N. Reed Avenue

**Date of Approval:** September 8, 2006

Repair to rotten wood on front porch decking; repaint front porch to match existing.

**15. Applicant's Name:** Taylor Waite

**Property Address:** 1420 Government Street

**Date of Approval:** September 8, 2006

General exterior repairs to include: replace broken window glass; repair leak in roof matching existing materials, repair to rotten wood as necessary with new wood to match existing in dimension and profile; paint exterior to match existing.

**NOTICES OF VIOLATION and MUNICIPAL OFFENSE TICKETS:**

No NoVs or MoTs were written during this time period.

**OLD BUSINESS:**

1. **085-05/06-CA** 206 S. Cedar Street  
Applicant: George K. Noland, Jr.  
Nature of Request: Add screen enclosed rear porch.

**APPROVED.** Certified Record attached.

**E.NEW BUSINESS:**

1. **097-05/06-CA** 68 N. Reed Avenue  
Applicant: Sandy and Philip Foster  
Nature of Request: Request to install 6 ft. wood privacy fence on south property line.

**APPROVED.** Certified Record attached.

2. **098-05/06-CA** 301 Government Street  
Applicant: Holiday Inn/Lafayette Plaza, L.L.C  
Nature of Request: Request to install signage.

**DENIED.** Certified Record attached.

3. **099-05/06-CA** 103 Ryan Avenue  
Applicant: John Lawler, Lucy Barr Designs, Inc.  
Nature of Request: Remove frame laundry room and construct brick breakfast room and entry.

**APPROVED.** Certified Record attached.

4. **100-05/06-CA** 353 Chatham Street  
Applicant: Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund/Douglas Kearley, architect  
Nature of Request: Request to construct new residence, install fencing and driveway.

**APPROVED.** Certified Record attached.

5. **101-05/06-CA** 1059 Elmira Street  
Applicant: Neal Higgins/Stair Depot of Alabama, Inc.

Nature of Request: Request to construct rear addition.

**APPROVED.** Certified Record attached.

6. **102-05/06-CA** 1225 Selma Street  
Applicant: Ann and Hastings Read/Douglas Kearley, architect  
Nature of Request: Request to construct rear screened porch and walkway, install dormer and 2 skylights and construct tea house in rear yard.

**APPROVED.** Certified Record attached.

7. **103-05/06-CA** 1805 Dauphin Street  
Applicant: James Wagoner and Charles Howard  
Nature of Request: Add 2 story porch on east side of garage.

**APPROVED.** Certified Record attached.

8. **104-05/06-CA** 160 S. Georgia Avenue  
Applicant: Cathy Dunning  
Nature of Request: Request to install brick walkway from house to sidewalk and from sidewalk to curb, leaving the sidewalk concrete.

**APPROVED.** Certified Record attached.

**OTHER BUSINESS and ANNOUNCEMENTS:**

1. John Lawler addressed the Board relative to the appropriateness of remaining in the room when there is an application before the Board in which a Board member has an interest. John stated that it would be most appropriate for the Board member to leave the room since remaining in the room might inhibit free discussion of the application.

2. Devereaux Bemis introduced Aileen de la Torre who will take Ed's place working with the Review Board. She will begin work on October 2, 2006. She is a graduate of the University of Georgia preservation program and worked in Miami. She serves on the Mobile Revolving Fund for Historic Properties.

**There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:05 p.m.**

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
CERTIFIED RECORD**

**085-05/06-CA**            206 S. Cedar Street  
**Applicant:**            George K. Noland, Jr.  
**Received:**            8/14/06                            **Meeting Date (s):**  
Submission Date + 45 Days: 9/28/06                            1) 8/28/06    2) 9/25/06    3)

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:**       Church Street East Historic District  
**Classification:**       Contributing  
**Zoning:**                R-1, Single Family Residential  
**Nature of Project:**    Build screened porch over rear deck.

**APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT**  
*Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts*

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, 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**

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff's judgment, the proposed work complies with the Design Review Guidelines and will not impair the historic integrity of the structure and the district.

1. The building is a c. 1890 Victorian shotgun with an offset rear addition.
2. The lot measures 43' x 103'.
3. There is an existing rear deck approximately 12' x 24' that is 22 ft. from the rear property line and in line with the existing house.
4. The deck is not visible from the street, but is visible from the yards of adjacent properties.
5. The Historic District Overlay Ordinance allows additions to structures in historic districts to be able to maintain lines established by the historic structures.
6. The Historic District Overlay Ordinance allows the site coverage to increase from 35% to 50%.
7. The addition will have a shed roof with shingles to match those existing on the house.
8. The roof will be supported by 8" square posts that have both base and capital detailing.
9. Screening will be installed between wood framing.
10. There will be a new wood screen door to give access to the landing.
11. A new landing will be installed with newel and railing details as per MHDC drawings.
12. The cmu piers will be stuccoed and lattice panels installed between the piers.
13. If removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Neither the applicant nor his representative was present to discuss the application. There was no one else to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record. Staff explained that the work on the rear deck/porch had received a stop work order, but that the deck portion had already been rebuilt. There will be four posts across the rear with capital and base detailing. The Board stressed that the bottom rail should slope to the inside of the railing.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

There was no Board discussion.

**FINDING OF FACT**

David Tharp moved that based on the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswald and unanimously approved.

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Douglas Kearley with David Tharp voting in opposition.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 09/25/07.**

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
CERTIFIED RECORD**

**097-05/06-CA**            68 N. Reed Avenue  
**Applicant:**            Sandy and Philip Foster  
**Received:**            9/5/06                            **Meeting Date (s):**  
Submission Date + 45 Days: 10/20/06                            1) 9/25/06    2)                            3)

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:**        Old Dauphin Way Historic District  
**Classification:**        Contributing  
**Zoning:**                    R-1, Single Family Residential  
**Nature of Project:**     Remove existing 4 ft. of chain link fencing and construct 6 ft. privacy fence on 65' section of southern boundary.

**APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT**  
*Design Review Guidelines For Mobile's Historic Districts*

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, 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**

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff's judgment, the proposed work complies with the Design Review Guidelines and will not impair the historic integrity of the structure and the district.

- A. The Design Review Guidelines state that fences "...should compliment the building and not detract from it. Design, scale placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic Districts."
  - 1. The subject structure is a 20<sup>th</sup> century Bungalow.
  - 2. The subject structure is a contributing element within the Old Dauphin Way Historic District.
  - 3. The subject lot measures approximately 42 ft x 144 ft.
  - 4. The new portion of wood fencing will replace chain link, an inappropriate material in the districts.
  - 5. The proposed wood fence will be 6 ft. high.
  - 6. The proposed fence will complete the wood privacy fence already in place in the rear yard.
  - 7. The proposed fence will be left natural to weather.
  - 8. Fences of this type are common throughout the historic districts.



Staff recommends approval of the fence as submitted.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Neither the applicant nor his representative was present to discuss the application. There was no one else to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

There was no Board discussion.

**FINDING OF FACT**

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion was seconded by David Tharp and unanimously approved.

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by David Tharp and unanimously approved.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 09/25/07.**

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
CERTIFIED RECORD**

**097-05/06-CA**                      301 Government Street  
**Applicant:**                      Holiday Inn  
**Received:**                      9/8/06                      **Meeting Date(s)**  
**Submission Date + 45 days**    10/23/06                      1) 9/25/06                      2)                      3)

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:**                      Church Street East  
**Classification:**                      Non-Contributing  
**Zoning:**                                      B-4  
**Conflicts of Interest:**                      Tilmon Brown recused himself from discussion and voting on the application.  
**Additional Permits Required:**                      Signage  
**Nature of Project:**                      Install six signs as follows:  
north elevation—178.25 sq. ft  
south elevation—178.25 sq. ft.;  
north elevation in gable—33.125 sq ft.;  
west elevation above iron work—82.25 sq. ft.  
south elevation on canopy—35 sq. ft.  
(All of the above signs to be open face neon channel aluminum letters.)  
monument sign—22.5 sq. ft – interior pole aluminum sign with vinyl lettering.

**Total requested signage: 530 square feet.**

*Applicable Sections of Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic District and Government Street  
Zoning Ordinance for the City of Mobile*

**A. Mounting and Placement**

1. Two signs each 178.25 sq. ft. will be placed on the north and south elevation at the cornice level.
2. The two signs target the interstate and are not at pedestrian level.
3. Signs at ground level on north elevation and west elevation, each 82.25 sq ft.
4. There will be a sign in the gable on the north elevation 33.125 sq. ft.
5. There will be a monument sign at the corner of Government and Jackson Streets.
6. The monument sign is 22 square feet and is 4’6” high.
7. The monument sign will be ground lit.

**B. Design**

1. The Holiday Inn letter sets are open face neon channel letters made of aluminum.
- 2 The monument sign is a pole sign masked by an aluminum surround with vinyl lettering.

**C. Size**

1. The signs exceed the total of 64 sq. ft. allowed by the Sign Ordinance.

2. The building occupies the entire block with 120 front linear feet of building on Government Street.
3. There is no provision for tenant signage.
4. The applicant will require a variance from the Sign Ordinance.

Exceptions to the ordinance granted by the Board of Adjustment include:

- a. Holiday Inn in 1992 the was granted a variance for 254 sq ft. of signage; additional signage in the amount of 10 sq. ft. per tenant was granted.
- b. The Radisson Hotel was granted a sign variance not to exceed 300 square feet. In 1993, the hotel requested an additional 100 sq. ft. to allow another interstate sign. Since then additional signage has been added to awnings without a permit or Review Board approval. Total current signage is in excess of 400 sq. ft.
- c. Shoppes of Midtown requested 468 sq. ft. of signage. Each storefront has a maximum of 30 sq ft.

Staff recommends that the Board deny the application since the Board may only approve 64 square feet of signage allowed under the Sign Ordinance. The Board may wish to consider the appropriateness of the amount of requested signage and send a letter to the Board of Adjustment in support of the application. Staff feels that the overall size of the interstate signs could be reduced and that consideration for tenant signage should be given.

#### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Maura Garino of the Lafayette Plaza/Holiday Inn was present to discuss the application. There was no one else to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record. Staff explained that it had just received the specifications on sign construction—that the letters would be open channel with neon and covered by a clear plastic shield. The Board suggested to the applicant that a backlit reverse channel letter is preferred in the districts.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board questioned Staff regarding its ability to approve the application. Although the amount of signage was approximately 530 sq. ft., Board members were in agreement that the amount of signage requested for the multi-story building that occupies an entire city block was appropriate. Staff explained that no matter the size of the building, the Sign Ordinance permits a maximum of 64 sq ft. of signage. For any amount in excess of 64 sq. ft., the applicant must seek a variance from the Board of Adjustment. Staff recommended that the Board deny the application but send a letter to the BoA in support of the variance.

#### **FINDING OF FACT**

Jim Wagoner moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion was seconded by Douglas Kearley and unanimously approved.

### **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Jim Wagoner moved that approving the application exceeds the authority of the Board and should be denied, and that the Board will write a letter of support to the Board of Adjustment for the amount of signage requested with the caveat that the signs be backlit reverse channel letters. The motion was seconded by Douglas Kearley and approved with David Tharp voting in opposition.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
CERTIFIED RECORD**

**099-05/06 – CA**            103 Ryan Avenue  
**Applicant:**            John Lawler/Lucy Barr Designs  
**Received:**            9/11/06                    **Meeting Date (s):**  
**Submission Date + 45 Days:**    10/20/06                    1) 9/25/06    2)                    3)

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:**    Ashland Place Historic District  
**Classification:**    Contributing  
**Zoning:**            R-1, Single family residential  
**Conflicts of Interest:** John Lawler was not present for discussion and voting on his application.  
**Nature of the Project:** Remove existing utility room and construct breakfast room and covered entry.

**STAFF REPORT**

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, 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...”

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff’s judgment, the proposed work is in compliance with the *Design Review Guideline*.

1. The residence is a brick bungalow dating from 1923.
2. Some time ago there was a small addition to the south side.
3. The existing frame laundry room with shed roof will be removed.
4. A brick addition will be placed on the house that mimics the design of the existing rear gable.
5. Brick will match the existing brick with wood siding in the gable end to match existing siding.
6. Gable roof and knee braces will match original detailing.
7. There will be an inset porch with wood deck and handrail to match the existing.
8. Windows to be reused.
9. Shingles to match existing.

Staff recommends approval of the addition as submitted.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Designer Lucy Barr was present to discuss the application. She had no additions to the application. There was no one else to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record. Staff explained that materials for the addition would match those already on the house and that windows would be reused in the new addition.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

There was no Board discussion.

### **FINDING OF FACT**

Harris Oswalt moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion was seconded by Jim Wagoner and unanimously approved.

### **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Harris Oswalt moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Tilmon Brown and unanimously approved.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 09/25/06.**

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
CERTIFIED RECORD**

**100-05/06-CA**                      353 Chatham Street  
**Applicant:**                      Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund/ Douglas Kearley, architect  
**Received:**                      9/11/06                      Meeting Dates:  
Submission Date + 45 days:                      1) 9/25/06                      2)

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:**                      Oakleigh Garden Historic District  
**Classification:**                      Non-contributing, vacant lot/new construction)  
**Conflicts of Interest:**                      Douglas Kearley recused himself from discussion and voting on the application.  
**Additional Permits Required:**                      Land Disturbance, Building, Mechanical, Electrical, Plumbing.  
**Nature of Project:**                      Construct single story frame residence approximately 1400 square feet; construct 6’ wood fence and 6’ masonry wall; install driveway.

**STAFF REPORT**

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, 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…”

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff’s judgment, the proposed work is in compliance with the *Design Review Guidelines and New Construction Guidelines*..

*Site Considerations:*

1. Lot is 175’ x 54’ and will have courtyard on the north side
2. Brick masonry wall will be located on the north side running from the house to the north property line and be set back 12 ft. from the sidewalk.
3. The remainder of the lot will have a capped 6 ft. privacy fence set back 25 ft. on the south property line and 12 ft on the north property line.
4. Driveway will be Bahamian limestone on compacted fill.
5. Front walk will be 5’ wide Old Mobile brick in a herringbone pattern laid on a sand bed.
6. Site coverage, building and fence setbacks to be approved by the Urban Development Department.

*Building Specifications:*

1. House will be approximately 24’6” x 60’.
2. House will be constructed on a floating slab but pier construction will be simulated.
3. The house will be constructed of hardiplank.
4. The main roof will be gabled with a low hip to either side which will be roofed with 5 v crimp.
6. Windows will be wood with true divided lights.

7. Doors will be wood.
8. Railing and column details are in keeping with the style of the house.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted contingent upon setbacks being approved by Urban Development. Applicant to submit paint colors and color of roofing material.

#### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Neither the applicant nor his representative was present to discuss the application. There was no one else to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record. Staff explained to the Board that the design was a modified Charleston single house plan. There would be a masonry wall at the front, wood privacy fence encircling the lot. The driveway would be located on the south side of the lot. Windows would be wood true divided light.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

There was no Board discussion.

#### **FINDING OF FACT**

Harris Oswalt moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion was seconded by David Tharp and unanimously approved.

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

David Tharp moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswalt and unanimously approved.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 09/25/07.**



**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
CERTIFIED RECORD**

**101-05/06 – CA**            1059 Elmira Street  
**Applicant:**                Neal Higgins/Stair Depot of Alabama, Inc.  
**Received:**                 8/31/06                                **Meeting Date (s):**  
**Submission Date + 45 Days:**    10/15/06                                1) 9/25/06            2)                                3)

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:**        Oakleigh Garden Historic District  
**Classification:**         Contributing  
**Zoning:**                    Non-conforming use-commercial  
**Nature of the Project:** Construct rear addition per the submitted plans.

**STAFF REPORT**

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, 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.…”

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff’s judgment, the proposed work is in compliance with the *Design Review Guideline*.

1. The residence is a c. 1890 Victorian frame shotgun.
2. The rear addition was demolished due to its deteriorated condition although a CoA had been issued for extensive repair.
3. The proposed addition will include 1 bedroom and 2 baths.
4. The addition will be approximately 16 ft. x 20 ft.
5. The existing gable will be extended to cover the addition.
5. The addition will use the same materials as the existing house including foundation, siding, roofing details.
6. Windows and door will be wood to match existing.
7. Stair rail details will be provided by MHDC.
8. Applicant will be seeking approval from the Planning Commission since the property is a non-conforming use in the area.

Staff recommends approval of the addition as submitted conditioned on the Planning Commission granting the applicant permission to proceed.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Owner Neal Higgins was present to discuss the application.  
There was no one else to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application.  
Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record.

Finding that the rear of the house was in extremely poor condition resulting in the tub falling through the floor, Mr. Higgins stated that he removed, rather than repaired, the area. The Board questioned Mr. Higgins about the removal of any historic windows. He explained that he had not removed any windows. Staff did explain that Mr. Higgins had obtained a CoA for extensive repairs to the rear of the house. Replacing and expanding the rear of the house will require Planning Commission approval since the property is a non-conforming use in an R-1 zone.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

There was no Board discussion

**FINDING OF FACT**

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion was seconded by David Tharp and unanimously approved.

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by David Tharp and unanimously approved.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 09/25/06.**

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
CERTIFIED RECORD**

**079-05/06-CA**            1225 Selma Street  
**Applicant:**            Ann and Hastings Read  
**Received:**            9/11/0606                            **Meeting Date (s):**  
Submission Date + 45 Days: 10/26/06                            1) 9/25/06    2)                            3)

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:**        Oakleigh Garden Historic District  
**Classification:**        Contributing  
**Zoning:**                    R-1, Single Family Residential  
**Conflicts of Interest:** Douglas Kearley recused himself from discussion and voting on the application.  
**Nature of Project:**     Build a teahouse in the back yard; build a screen porch and raised walkway at the rear and west side. Reroof with Timberline shingles, slate gray; add egress rated skylight at east and west side for existing bedroom with no windows. Add dormer for bathroom. Colors to be submitted at a later date.

**APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT**  
*Design Review Guidelines For Mobile's Historic Districts*

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, 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**

The Design Review Guidelines concerning accessory structures state that, “The structure should complement the design and scale of the main building.”

Concerning porches the Guidelines further state, “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. The form and shape of the porch and its room should maintain their historic appearance. The materials should blend with the style of the building.”

Roofs: “A roof is one of the most dominant features of a building. Original or historic roof forms, as well as the original pitch of the roof should be maintained... Accessory roof elements not original to the structure, such as bents skylights, satellite dishes, etc. shall be located inconspicuously.”

- A. The tea house is proposed for the rear yard.
  - 1. The subject structure will be 22 x 16 feet.

2. The building will be constructed of Hardiboard with casement and fixed windows with simulated true divided lights.
  3. The doors will be wood with true panels and divided panes in the double doors.
  4. The roof will be gable on hip with fiberglass shingles.
- B. Construct a rear screened porch with a raised walkway along the west side.
1. The screened porch will be 12 x 16 feet.
  2. The elevated walk will be 3'8" wide.
  3. The columns and balustrade to be as submitted.
  4. The foundations will be 6x6 posts set in concrete
  5. M.A.R.C. lattice to be used as foundation screening.
  6. The decking is to be 5/4" tongue and groove.
  7. Two doors are to be relocated: west and south sides.
  8. The deck shown on the plans is not part of this application.
  9. A set of rear steps to match those on the side will lead into the back yard.
- C. Dormer and skylights
1. The dormer will be a low gabled dormer placed on the west side of the house near the rear.
  2. It will be wood with a pair of casement windows, true divided light.
  3. One skylight will be placed on the west side between the new dormer and the bay.
  4. The other skylight will be placed on the east side of the house to the rear of the bay.
  5. The skylights will be low profile Velux.

Staff believes the teahouse will not impair the district or the house. Staff believes that the dormer and skylights are set back and low enough to have no impairment on the district or the house Porches are often allowed on the rear of a house. This screened porch is in that tradition. Generally, the Board requires that the foundations match that of the house and this may be a condition of approval.

#### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Owners Anne and Hastings Read were present to discuss the application. There was no one else to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record. Staff explained that the skylights and dormer would be unobtrusively located, that the deck will not be part of this project and steps will lead to the backyard and that the porch and walk would be on a post rather than pier foundation. The owner explained that the screened porch will be a three season space. He also explained that using the post construction would be less expensive. He explained that the tea house will be constructed with hardiplank. The new construction will be painted to match the color scheme on the house.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

There was no Board discussion.

#### **FINDING OF FACT**

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion was seconded by David Tharp and unanimously approved.

### **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by David Tharp and unanimously approved.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 09/25/07.**

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
CERTIFIED RECORD**

**078-05/05-CA – CA**    1805 Dauphin Street  
**Applicant:**            James Wagoner and Charles Howard  
**Received:**             9/11/06                     **Meeting Date (s):**

**Submission Date + 45 Days:**    10/26/06                     1) 9/25/06        2)                     3)

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:**        Old Dauphin Way Historic District  
**Classification:**        Contributing  
**Zoning:**                    R-1, Single family residential  
**Conflicts of Interest:**   Jim Wagoner recused himself from discussion and voting on the application.  
**Additional Permits Required:** (1)Building  
**Nature of Project:**        Add a two story porch along the east elevation of an existing garage; new porch on garage will mirror the existing two story porch on the west elevation of the house.

**APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT**  
*Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts*

<u><b>Sections</b></u>	<u><b>Topic</b></u>	<u><b>Description of Work</b></u>
3	Accessory Structures & Site Considerations Porches & Canopies	Add porch to existing garage

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, 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**

The Design Review Guidelines concerning accessory structures state that, “The structure should complement the design and scale of the main building.”

Concerning porches the Guidelines further state, “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture. . . The form and shape of the porch and its room should maintain their historic appearance. The materials should blend with the style of the building.”

1.        The house was constructed about 1919 with classical detailing.
2.        There is no information on the construction of the garage, but it appears to match the house in many of its details.
3.        A rear porch was constructed and screened in 2002 at the rear of the house.

4. Plans call for an 8 foot wide porch to be placed on the east side of the existing garage facing the house.
5. The details for the proposed porch will match those on the rear porch of the house using paneled square columns and square balusters.
6. The porch will be constructed of wood with an uncovered second story deck matching that on the rear of the house.
7. A single and double window on the second floor of the garage will be replaced with single light 36" exterior wood doors.
8. The existing door and window on the first floor will remain.
9. Public view of the building will be minimal.
10. The flooring for the first floor is not called out on the plans.

Even though the flooring for the ground floor of the porch is not called out, staff believes the porch will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district and recommends approval.

#### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Charles Howard was present to discuss the application and had no comments. There was no one else to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record. Staff did explain that the garage may be contemporary with the house. Paneled columns will be used on the porch and the porch would be a concrete slab.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

There was no Board discussion.

#### **FINDING OF FACT**

Harris Oswalt moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion was seconded by Douglas Kearley and unanimously approved.

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

David Tharp moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswalt and unanimously approved.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 09/25/07.**

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
CERTIFIED RECORD**

**104-05/06-CA**                      160 S. Georgia Avenue  
**Applicant:**                      Kathy C. Dunning  
**Received:**                        9/11 /06                                      Meeting Dates:  
**Submission Date + 45 Days:**                      10/26/06                                      1) 9/25/06                      2)                      3)

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:**                      Oakleigh Garden Historic District  
**Classification:**                      Contributing  
**Zoning:**                                R-1 residential  
**Nature of Project:**                      Remove cracked walkway and sidewalk and replace with Santee Gray  
Antique brick.

**STAFF REPORT**

**APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT**  
*Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts*

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, 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 ANALYSIS**

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff’s judgment, the proposed work complies with the Design Review Guidelines and will not impair the historic integrity of the structure and the district.

- A. The Guidelines state that “Modern paving materials are acceptable in the historic districts. However, it is important that the design, location and materials be compatible with the property.”
  - 1. The house is a two story frame house built in the early years of the 20<sup>th</sup> century..
  - 2. The subject structure is a contributing element within the Oakleigh Garden Historic District.
  - 3. The applicant is requesting to remove existing deteriorated front walk and sidewalk.
  - 4. The applicants are requesting to install a new brick walk from the house to the sidewalk and from the sidewalk to the curb at the front of the property.
  - 5. The brick will be Santee Gray Antique brick laid in a running bond.
  - 6. The public sidewalk will remain concrete.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted. Applicant should consult with the Right of Way Department prior to beginning work.



**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Neither the applicant nor his representative was present to discuss the application. There was no one else to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record. Staff explained that the work was underway and did not involve the city's sidewalk; work was confined to the front walk and the area between the sidewalk and curb.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

There was no Board discussion.

**FINDING OF FACT**

Douglas Kearley moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion was seconded by Jim Wagoner and unanimously approved.

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by David Tharp and unanimously approved.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 09/25/07.**