

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
November 4, 2009 – 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.
2. Cart Blackwell, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
3. **Members Present:** Gertrude Baker, Kim Hardin, Bill James, Tom Karwinski, Bradford Ladd, Craig Roberts, and Janetta Whitt-Mitchell.
4. **Members Absent:** Carlos Gant, Jim Wagoner, and Barja Wilson.
5. **Staff Members Present:** Cart Blackwell, Keri Coumanis, and John Lawler.
6. Mr. Karwinski moved to approve the Minutes from October 7th and 21st, 2009 meetings. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.
7. Mr. Roberts moved to approve the midmonth COAs granted by Staff.

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED

1. **Applicant: Frank Kruse**
 - a. Property Address: 215 Cedar Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/20/09
 - c. Project: Reroof with 3-tab shingles, charcoal in color. Repaint in Crucible (dark bluish/grey) by Valspar.
2. **Applicant: J. T. Smith**
 - a. Property Address: 255 Roper Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/14/09
 - c. Project: Face existing fence wooden frame (from Oakleigh house and property to the north) with boards and crown with a wooden cap.
3. **Applicant: Ethel Harris**
 - a. Property Address: 1105 Elmira Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/09/09
 - c. Project: Install a 6' rear lot dog-eared privacy fence. The fence is to commence at a point even with the northeast corner of the eastern ell of the house. The fence will extend around the south and west lot lines stopping at a point even with the fence at the eastern lot line. Install a 3' dog-eared privacy fence with wooden walkway and double driveway gates, to open inward, at the northern end of the lot. The fence will terminate at the 6" sections of fence. Repave concrete drive. Drive measures 9' in width and extends 83' into the lot.
4. **Applicant: Harold Allen**
 - a. Property Address: 50 St. Emanuel Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/13/09
 - c. Project: Repair and Replace railing and posts on balcony. Repair the doors. Repair and replace windows. Work is to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material.
5. **Applicant: Brooks Conkle**
 - a. Property Address: 215 Scott Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/20/09
 - Project: Repair floor joists. Stabilize foundation piers. Stucco concrete block foundation piers. Paint body of house taupe. Paint trim brown. Reroof house with 3-tab shingles.
6. **Applicant: Douglas Burtu Kearley**
 - a. Property Address: 564 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/19/09

- c. Project: Remove boarding from storefront. Repair and Replace trim. Install a 6' interior lot privacy fence to match that of the adjoining unit (per submitted plan).
- 7. Applicant: Emory Florey for Paladin Construction Company**
 - a. Property Address: 805 Church Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/19/09
 - c. Project: Repair metal roofing on the smaller metal building located on the property. Repair the parapet flashing on the main building.
- 8. Applicant: Brett Williams**
 - a. Property Address: 1310 Brown Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/16/09
 - c. Project: Repair wooden siding to match the existing in profile and dimension.
- 9. Applicant: Wayne and Paula Thorpe**
 - a. Property Address: 1651 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/16/09
 - c. Project: This amends a COA of 9/29/09. To be precise – construct a wooden fence with alternating 36” and 41” pickets and 45” posts with caps (per submitted plan).
- 10. Applicant: Maynard Cooper & Gale, PC**
 - a. Property Address: 3 South Royal Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/21/09
 - c. Project: Mount a 1.52 square foot non-illuminated bronze sign to rusticated block of Gibbs door surround (per submitted plan).
- 11. Applicant: Susan Dominguez**
 - a. Property Address: 16 Hannon Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/22/09
 - c. Project: Redeck porch with tongue and groove decking, paint gray.
- 12. Applicant: Katina Collins**
 - a. Property Address: 607 St. Francis Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/21/09
 - c. Project: Repaint house with Gaines Blue for body and Fort Morgan Sand for trim.
- 13. Applicant: Tony Bryan for the City of Mobile**
 - a. Property Address: 651 Church Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/22/09
 - c. Project: Install a bronze-finished aluminum awning to the south side of building per submitted plan.

C. APPLICATIONS

- 1. 119-09: 1561 Bruister Street
 - a. Applicant: Steve and Jody Marine
 - b. Project: Window Replacement.

WITHDRAWN. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
- 2. 120-09: 22 Houston Street
 - a. Applicant: Nancy and Dale Partridge
 - b. Project: Minor Demolition and Addition.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
- 3. 121-09: 154 South Lawrence Street
 - a. Applicant: James Twilley for Virginia Haas
 - b. Project: Side Rear Addition.

DENIED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
- 4. 122-09: 1114 Government Street
 - a. Applicant: Tilmon Brown for Bobby Williams

b. Project: Revisions to Approved Plans. Site Plan Approval; Ancillary Construction.

APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Guidelines
2. Midmonth Approvals
3. Discussion

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIE RECORD

WITHDRAWN

119-09-CA: 1561 Bruister Street
Applicant: Steve and Jody Marine
Received: 10/16/09
Meeting: 11/04/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Window Replacement.

BUILDING HISTORY

This house dates from 1913-1914. The house features neoclassical detailing on an Arts & Crafts inspired bungalow form.

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 Board. The applicants would like to replace the front elevation’s twelve-over-one sash windows with one-over-one windows.
- 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. “Where windows cannot be repaired, new windows must be compatible to the existing. The size and placement of new windows for additions or alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.”
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. Remove the existing twelve-over-twelve sash windows from the front elevation.
 - 2. Replace the existing windows with one-over-one sash windows.

STAFF ANALYSIS

Historic window sashes should be retained. The muntins (dividing lights) therein help define the architectural character a house. This house marries classical detailing with a Craftsman-inspired design. The front elevation’s twelve-over-one sash windows are an important component of this union of two design philosophies. The windows on the side elevations of the house are of the same type and configuration as the front. Additionally, neighboring houses also utilize multi-light upper sashes over single lower sashes, thus giving visual and stylistic continuity to the streetscape. In accordance with B.1. and B.2. above, the removal and replacement of the twelve-over-one sash windows with one-over-one

sash windows would remove/destroy historic materials and impair the architectural integrity of the house and character of the district. Staff does not recommend approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Steve Marine was present to discuss the application. Mr. Marine thanked the Board for their volunteer service in aid of the Historic Districts. He explained that he and his wife are both teachers. They have three sons. One son is in graduate school. A second son is an undergraduate. The third son is soon to enter college. He said while the windows appear from the exterior to be in good state of repair, they are rotten. Mr. Marine informed that Board that replacing the upper twelve light sashes with replicas of the existing would cost more than replacing the twelve light sashes with one light sashes. He explained that he and his wife would like to replace all the houses twelve-over-one windows with one-over-one windows in increments of two windows at a time. Mr. Marine stated that of the 11 houses on the street, six have one-over-one windows. He noted that the deterioration to the windows was largely internal, adding that during the winter his family uses plastic against the windows to maintain a suitable temperature. Mr. Marine closed by saying he sees two options. He can either replace the twelve-over-one windows with one-over-one windows or retain the rotten windows because replacing the twelve-over-one windows would be too expensive.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Roberts asked Staff whether the house's twelve-over-one windows were original to the date of construction or where the windows later alterations. Staff informed the Board that the exiting twelve-over-one windows were the original windows. Ms Coumanis elaborated saying that multi-light upper windows were common to both the period and the style of the house. Mr. Roberts then asked the applicant about the contractors he had consulted. Mr. Karwinski explained to the applicant that the rationale of the Staff' recommendation was the maintenance of the house's integrity of detail, of which the window light configuration is important component. He asked Mr. Marine whether he had investigated the use of interior or exterior storm windows. Mr. Marine stated that storm windows also posed cost issues. Mr. James asked the applicant if he had considered repairing the windows, as Staff suggested. Mr. Marine answered that he had not investigated that alternative. He asked the Board if repairing windows was more cost effective than replacing windows. Both Mr. James and Ms Harden informed the applicant that based on their combined experience, repair often proves less expensive than replacement. Mr. Roberts and Mrs. Whitt-Mitchell recommended that applicant withdraw his application and take the replacement approach. Staff was asked to provide names of window restoration craftsmen. Mr. Blackwell said he would contact the applicant with the information. Mr. Marine agreed to withdraw his application.

WITHDRAWN

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

120-09-CA: 22 South Houston Street
Applicant: Nancy and Dale Partridge
Received: 10/15/09
Meeting: 11/04/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

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

BUILDING HISTORY

This house appears in the 1922 insert of the 1901 Sanborn Insurance Maps of Mobile. Since 1922 three additions were made. Two gabled ells, one to the south and one to northwest, were added before 1955. A shed extension on the west elevation was constructed at an even later date.

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 demolition of the later rear shed roofed addition and the reconstruction of a larger expanded addition in and beyond its footprint. The applicants also propose an extension of the early rear gabled ell.
- B. The Design Guidelines for Mobile’s downtown commercial buildings, state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new shall be differentiated from the old shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.”
 - 2. “New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.”
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. Project I**
 - A. Demolish the existing later shed addition
 - B. Construct an expanded addition in and beyond (to the north) of the existing shed addition (Per Submitted Plans).
 - 1. The addition will rest on brick faced foundation piers.
 - 2. Recessed, framed, and suspended lattice skirting will extend between the foundation piers.
 - 3. The wooden lap siding will match the existing.
 - 4. Corner posts will mark the corners of the addition.

5. The window and door casings will match the existing.
6. The roofing shingles will match the existing.
7. South Elevation
 - a. The South Elevation will feature paired two-over-two windows wooden windows.
 - b. The existing gable roof will be extended over the addition.
8. West Elevation
 - a. The West Elevation will feature a tripartite grouping of three two-over-two wooden windows.
 - b. A six light wooden French door will access the addition.
 - c. A flight of brick steps with flanking wooden railings will access the French door.
 - d. A bracketed wooden canopy will extend over the door and steps.
 - e. The existing gable roof will be over the addition.
 - f. The gable face will feature a vertical board siding to match the existing and a vent to match the existing.

2. Project II

- A. Extend the Rear (West) Elevation ell.
 1. The addition will rest on brick foundation piers
 2. Recessed, framed, and suspended lattice skirting will extend between the foundation piers.
 3. The wooden lap siding will match the existing.
 4. The window and door casings will match the existing.
 5. The roofing shingles will match the existing.
 6. Corner posts will mark the corners of the addition.
 7. North Elevation
 - a. The North Elevation is a blind elevation. Then how do you have number 4?
 8. West Elevation.
 - a. The West Elevation's gable will feature the same vertical boarding, louvered vent and overhang as the existing gable end.
 9. South Elevation
 - a. The South Elevation will feature a four light window.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This rear elevation of this house has one early addition and one later addition. Project I addresses the demolition of the later shed roof addition and the construction of new addition in and beyond its footprint. Project II addresses the extension of the earlier gabled roof addition.

Project I - the demolition of a later addition

The proposed new addition will maintain and extend the footprint of the later addition thus allowing improved circulation within the house. The existing main gable roof (with a broken pitch the south) will be extended over the addition. The materials and detailing of the addition will match the existing. Staff does not believe the addition impairs the architectural or historical character of the house, therefore recommends approval of the proposed demolition the later shed addition and the construction of the proposed addition.

Project II - the extension of the early gable roofed addition

The materials and detailing will match the existing. Staff does not believe the addition impairs the architectural or historical character of the house. Staff recommends approval of the proposed extension of the earlier addition.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Dale Partridge was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Karwinski asked the applicant to explain the proposed floor plan. Mr. Partridge explained the floor plan noting that the plan was determined by ceiling heights and influenced by personal preference. The Board discussed possible alterations to the floor plan.

FINDING OF FACT

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the facts as 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.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 11/04/10

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

121-09-CA: 154 South Lawrence Street
Applicant: James Twilley for Virginia Haas
Received: 10/20/09
Meeting: 11/04/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Rear/Side Addition.

BUILDING HISTORY

This house dates from 1891. The façade treatment, a projecting gabled bay to the side of a recessed porch, is a common front elevation configuration for the period and the region.

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 Board on August 19, 2009. The application which called for a proposed rear/side addition off an enclosed porch was tabled for a Design Review Committee. A Design Review Committee convened onsite on October 14, 2009. The applicant provided revised drawings of the proposed addition. A member of the Design Review Committee provided an alternative scheme. The alternative scheme is cost prohibitive to the owner and not conducive to the proposed interior plan. The applicant returns to the Board with an altered proposal for the addition.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 1. “The goal of new construction should be to blend into the historic district, but to avoid creating a false sense of history.”
 2. “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.”
 3. “New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.”
- C. Scope of Work (Per Submitted Plans):
 1. Construct a 34’ by 11’ addition to the northwest side of house.
 2. Remove the existing shed roof.
 3. Alter and extend the pitch of the northern slope of the rear gable.
 4. The roofing materials will match the existing
 5. The siding of addition will match existing siding of house in profile, dimension, and material.

6. Brick foundation piers will support the addition.
7. Paint walls and trim to match the existing color scheme.
8. North elevation feature two individual and one paired unit of six-over-six wooden windows salvaged from the existing elevation.
9. The West Elevation of the addition will feature one six-over-six window.
10. Remove the existing doorway from the existing rear (West) elevation
11. Cover the door bay with siding to match the existing siding.
12. Convert the existing window bay on the West Elevation to a door.

Clarifications

1. What is the height of the point where the existing northern roof slope will be altered?
2. What is the height of the North Elevation wall?
3. What is the distance from the northwest corner board to the addition's west elevation's window?

STAFF ANALYSIS

The proposed addition will be adjacent to an earlier addition. The existing roofline would be altered and extended to cover the earlier and proposed additions. The submitted drawings leave much to conjecture. While the proposed addition is barely visible from the street, the proposed scope of work would drastically alter the architectural and historical character of the rear and west elevations. Staff does not recommend approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

James Twilley was present to discuss the application. Mr. Twilley informed the Board that during the October 14, 2009 Design Review Committee Mr. Karwinski supplied him with an alternative plan. He liked the plan, but upon the consultation with the applicant it was decided to resubmit the original proposal. Cost factors, ceiling heights, site view, and window heights motivated the decision.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Twilley asked the Board about spray installations for the underside of raised buildings. A discussion ensued. Mr. Oswalt reminded the Board that their concern is for the architectural and historical character of the building's exterior. Mr. James asked Staff to clarify their recommendations. Mr. Blackwell explained that while the addition would largely be hidden from the street, the alteration and extension of the roof to cover the proposed addition would greatly alter the integrity of the building's rear elevation. He added that the submitted drawings failed to convey the full effect of the roof. Mr. Roberts further clarified the Staff's recommendations adding that it was the nature of the roof, in addition to the quality of the drawings, which made the application inappropriate. He pointed out that if the application was approved a large expanse roof would extend over the north elevation. The roof altered roof would also result in a large expanse of siding on the west elevation. Mr. James disagreed saying that location of the addition, essentially unseen from the street, should affect the Board's ruling. Mr. Roberts stated that the Board must take into account the architectural and historical integrity of all a building's elevations. Mr. Ladd asked if his fellow Board members had any suggestions for the applicant. Mr. Roberts and Mr. James discussed the size and roof configuration of the addition.

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.

Mr. James voted in opposition.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

122-09-CA: 1114 Government Street
Applicant: Tilmon Brown for Bobby Williams
Received: 10/26/09
Meeting: 11/04/09

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Revisions to Approved Plans; Site Plan Approval; Ancillary Construction.

BUILDING HISTORY

This classically detailed L-shaped building originally served as the garage of Bellingrath House at --- Ann Street. The Board approved the relocation of the building on March 28, 2005.

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 Board on October 1, 2008. The applicant returns to the Board with a proposal encompassing revisions to the approved plans, a proposal for parking, and ancillary construction. In the course of the restoration, original windows were more closely examined. The window sashes installed do not match the proposed, however, they are closer to the dimensions of the originals (being one inch off). Other revisions include an altered treatment of the new rear porch’s columns posts and railings. The applicant also submits a proposed site plan and a parking trellis for the Board’s approval.
- 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. “Where windows cannot be repaired, new windows must be compatible to the existing. 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. Particular attention should be paid to the handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions and decorative details.”
 - 4. “Modern paving materials are acceptable in the historic districts. However, it is important that the design, location and materials be compatible with the property.”
 - 5. “Landscaping can often assist in creating an appropriate setting. Asphalt is inappropriate for walkways. Gravel or shell are preferred paving material, however, a variance from the Board of Zoning Adjustment is required for commercial applications. Hard surface materials may be acceptable.”

6. "The appearance of parking areas should be minimized through good site planning and design. New materials such as grasspave or grasscrete, which provides a solid parking surface while still allowing grass to grow giving the appearance of a continuance of a front lawn, may be a feasible alternative."
7. "Parking areas should be screened from view by the use of low masonry walls, wood or iron fences or landscaping. Circular drives and parking pads in front of the yard are generally inappropriate in the historic districts."
8. "An accessory structure is any construction other than the main building on the property. It includes but is not limited to garages, carports, pergolas, decks, pool covers, sheds, and the like. The appropriateness of accessory structures shall be measured by the guidelines applicable to new construction. The structure shall complement the design and scale of the main building."

C. Scope of Work (Per Submitted Plans):

1. Revisions to Approved Plans
 - A. Install wooden six-over-six sash wooden windows with sashes measuring 36" x 54" instead of the 36" x 62."
 - B. Install rear balustrade of a concentric rectilinear design with diagonal cross rails instead of the approved pickets (per submitted photograph).
 - C. Install columnar posts with molded bases, paneled shafts, and molded capitals instead of the approved simpler square section columnar posts (per submitted rendering).
2. Site Plan and Driveway Approval (per submitted site plan)
 - A. Install a concrete driveway featuring a drive approach, ribbons, and parking pad.
 1. The drive extends (including the parking pad) 196' into the lot
 2. A fully paved driveway approach precedes concrete ribbons that extend before and beyond the body of the house.
 3. The concrete ribbons terminate in a 40' by 35' parking pad.
 - B. Install a concrete Front Walkway accessing the main entrance..
 1. The first leg of the L-shaped front walkway is 38' long.
 2. The first leg of the front walkway features a 10' square break.
 3. The second leg of the front walkway is 40' long.
 4. The second leg of the front walkway angles northeast, terminating in the paved entranceway.
 - C. Install a concrete T-shaped Rear walkway accessing the exterior stair and rear porch.
3. Ancillary Construction
 - A. Construct a parking trellis (per submitted photograph)
 1. The parking trellis will cover the 40' x 35' parking pad.
 2. The trellis will be three bays wide by one bay deep.
 3. 8 square section columnar posts with articulated bases will support the roof trellis.

Clarifications

1. What will happen to the existing pedestrian entrance ascending from the sidewalk?
2. What is the width of the driveway approach?
 - A. Will it be the same width as the existing driveway approach?
 - B. Will the existing driveway approach be removed?
3. What is the depth of the driveway approach?
4. Will grass be planted between the driveway ribbons?

5. What are the widths of the front and rear walkways?
6. Where will the parking trellis be located on the lot?
7. What are the exact dimensions (height, width, and length) of the parking trellis?
8. Will there be additional columnar posts supporting the roof trellis?

STAFF ANALYSIS

The Bellingrath Garage building was moved to this site in 2005. Damaged during hurricane Katrina, the building stood vacant and deteriorated until late 2008 when the present owner commenced work on the property.

The proposed window sashes differ in size from the original and the approved sashes. As installed, the windows are closer in dimension to the originals than those originally submitted to and approved by the Board. Staff recommends approval of the window sashes.

The proposed site plan leaves much to conjecture. While the majority of the rear lot will be hardscaped, (much of it already is) the Board has approved similar proposals for rear lot parking along Government Street in recent years. Additionally, the front lawn provides ample greenspace that will preserve the streetscape as well as provide absorption for water runoff. Pending clarification of the parking and site plan questions, Staff recommends approval of the proposed system of drives and walks.

As proposed, the parking trellis will cover the whole of the parking pad. Staff believes that eight piers will not adequately supports the roof trellis. Additionally, Staff is unclear as to how the placement of the piers will affect ingress to and egress from the parking shelter. As submitted, Staff does not recommend approval of the parking trellis.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Tilmon Brown and Bobby Williams were present to discuss the application. Mr. Brown addressed Project I of the Staff Report. He reiterated the Report noting that after the building was moved from its original site it stood vacant. He informed the Board that original windows were thought to be lost, but during the construction process two windows were found. Mr. Brown said that upon examination of the windows he altered the sash sizes to more accurately correspond with the originals.

Mr. Brown then answered the Staff Clarifications. The existing drive approach would remain. At the street, the driveway approach measures 12 feet. The driveway ribbons would commence at a point 30' into the lot. The pedestrian entrance from the sidewalk would be retained. The last remaining portions of the walkway extending from the pedestrian entrance would be removed. The front and rear walks will measure 3' in width. Grass will be planted between the driveway ribbons.

In closing, Mr. Brown addressed the proposed parking trellis, clarifying the design and dimensions. He stated that the trellis would be utilized as patio as well as for parking. Mr. Brown informed the Board that the image he submitted was a schematic one. Ten columnar posts, not eight, would support and define four 10' square bays. The proposed trellis would cover only half of the parking pad.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Karwinski asked the applicant why he had not returned to the Board with changes to the approved plans when the alterations

were made. He said the practice of seeking forgiveness after action was all too common. Ms Harden agreed.

A discussion of the proposed rear porch columnar treatment and parking pad trellis design ensued. Mr. Brown explained that the columns would increase in size and embellishment. The approved columns were 8' square. The proposed columns would receive facing boards and moldings. Mr. Harden informed the applicant that while she did find fault with the proposed railing design, the railing as proposed might encounter problems with city codes. Mr. Karwinski asked for drawings of the proposed columns, railing, and trellis. Ms. Harden asked the height as well as other dimensions of the parking trellis. Staff informed the Board that the dimensions were not part of the applicant's submission.

Mrs. Whitt Mitchell asked if drawings were necessary for the Board's approval. Mr. Williams said he was concerned about the occupying the residence within a reasonable date. Mr. Karwinski said the proposal could be approved as is, excepting the trellis and the parking pad thereby allowing the applicant to move into the residence. Mrs. Whitt-Mitchell recommended that the applicant be required to submit drawings for Staff approval so the whole scope of work could be approved. Mr. Ladd agreed, noting that the building was private residence. Ms. Harden reminded the applicant that the railing might encounter problems with code regulations.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Ladd 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 report to allow Staff approval of the parking trellis upon submission of drawings by the applicant.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Ladd 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.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 11/04/10