

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES

September 3, 2008 – 3:00 P.M.

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

A. CALL TO ORDER – Chair

The meeting was called to order by the chair Tilmon Brown at 3:05.

The Introductory Statement was read by the staff.

The members present were Tilmon Brown, Tom Karwinski, Harris Oswalt, Bunky Ralph, Craig Roberts, and Andrew Martin.

Staff present were: Devereaux Bemis and Keri Coumanis.

The Minutes of the previous meeting were approved as posted per a motion of Tom Karwinski.

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

B. MID-MONTH APPROVALS

1. **Applicant's Name:** Laura Clarke
Property Address: 10 S. Catherine St.
Date of Approval: August, 2008
Replace rotten wood rafters and replace metal roof on carport with new materials to match existing in profile, dimension, material and color. Paint new wood if visible to match existing color scheme.

2. **Applicant's Name:** A-1 Roofing
Property Address: 1453 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: August 14, 2008
Install new roof using 3 tab black shingles

3. **Applicant's Name:** John L. Bridler
Property Address: 258 State Street
Date of Approval: August 15, 2008
Install new roof using 3 tab shingles black or charcoal black in color.

4. **Applicant's Name:** Ormandos Jackson
Property Address: 305 Marine Street
Date of Approval: August 15, 2008
Install new roof using 3 tab black shingles

5. **Applicant's Name:** Dixie Carlson and/or Alver Carlson

Property Address: 1653 Dauphin Street

Date of Approval: August 15, 2008

This COA replaces COA date June 29, 2006 which replaced one dated June 29, 2005.

Replace deteriorated siding matching existing in profile, dimension and materials. Repair windows with materials matching existing in profile and dimension. Repair sill as necessary. Repair and/or replace handrails with materials matching existing in profile and dimension. Prep house for painting. Repair roofs as necessary matching existing in profile, dimension and color. Rear flat roofs to use rolled roofing. Reinstall six-foot gate to match existing fence

6. **Applicant's Name:** Tuan Titlestad/Bay Town Builders

Property Address: 110 Dearborn St.

Date of Approval: August 18, 2008

Replace handrails and rotten wood as needed with new materials to match existing in profile, dimension, material and color.

7. **Applicant's Name:** Stuart & Marina Clotworthy

Property Address: 8 N. Reed Avenue

Date of Approval: August 19, 2008

Repair/replace damaged siding matching existing in profile, dimension and material. Replace the roof with black/light gray fiberglass shingle. Repair upper porch ceiling matching the existing in profile, dimension and material. Paint house white with white trim.

8. **Applicant's Name:** Bert Eichold

Property Address: 165 S. Georgia Avenue

Date of Approval: August 20, 2008

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

9. **Applicant's Name:** R&M Home Improvements

Property Address: 953 Dauphin Street

Date of Approval: August 20, 2008

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

Body: St. Anthony St. Gray

Trim: Off White

Door: Black

10. **Applicant's Name:** Stephen Klimjack

Property Address: 1306 Government Street

Date of Approval: August 20, 2008

Install signage (lettering) plans as submitted.

11. **Applicant's Name:** A. Bailey DuMont

Property Address: 162 Roberts Street

Date of Approval: August 20, 2008

(THIS COA REPLACES COA'S DATED 24 July 2007) Replace the existing white steel casement windows with white aluminum sash windows as per the submitted plans approved by the ARB.

And (THIS COA REPLACES COA DATED 11 July 2007) Carport repair: repair/replace columns to match existing. Paint ceiling, doors and columns white. Repairs to main house: caulk and repaint wood awning windows; repair and repaint portico and shutters to match existing. Minor repair to chimney and paint top of chimney white. All as original.

12. **Applicant's Name:** Nodar Design & Construction

Property Address: 1650 Dauphin Avenue

Date of Approval: August 21, 2008

Addition as approved by ARB per submitted plans.

13. **Applicant's Name:** Gail Stillwell

Property Address: 245 S. Warren Street

Date of Approval: August 22, 2008

Repaint trim a lighter shade of existing color. Paint front door Benjamin Moore Fairview Taupe HC85.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. **113-08-CA:** 263 N. Conception

Applicant: John & Nancy Lee

Request: Alter the previously approved request to substitute doors for the French doors. Paint the piers.

Approved. Certified Record Attached.

2. **114-08-CA:** 1351 Springhill Avenue

Applicant: Robert M. Weber for the Child Advocacy Center

Request: Construct a 2,220 sq. ft. addition. Install a 6-foot buffer fence.

Approved. Certified Record Attached.

3. **115-08-CA:** 207 Lanier

Applicant: Lucy Barr Designs for Mr. & Mrs. Angus Cooper

Request: Alter fireplace from interior to partially exterior. Ask opinion on garage door design.

Approved. Certified Record Attached.

4. **116-08-CA:** 404 Chatham

Applicant: William Carroll

Request: Install a new porch balustrade and columns.

Approved. Certified Record Attached.

5. **117-08-CA:** 1057 Selma
Applicant: Douglas Kearley for ARLO Properties
Request: Renovate building and replace chain link fence with wood fence.
Approved. Certified Record Attached.

6. **118-08-CA:** 310 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Douglas Kearley for Tony Moore
Request: Construct a split faced CMU vestibule with glass block and standing seam metal roof at rear of building. Install a neon sign above.
Approved. Certified Record Attached.

7. **119-08-CA:** 155 S. Broad Street
Applicant: Adline C. Clarke
Request: Remove rear additions. Remove shed.
Approved. Certified Record Attached.

8. **120-08-CA:** 453 Conti Street
Applicant: Stephen & Anne Carter
Request: Construct an overhead wood trellis to cover courtyard area at rear of property. Install beaded ceiling on front porch.
Approved. Certified Record Attached.

9. **121-08-CA:** 1006 Caroline Street
Applicant: Mary E. M. Bryant
Request: Construct a 10 x 10 foot addition on rear of house.
Denied for lack of information. Certified Record Attached.

10. **122-08-CA:** 114 Lanier
Applicant: Warren & Kathrine Butler
Request: Addition of a master bedroom, bath & closets with renovation of a garage.
Approved. Certified Record Attached.

11. **123-08-CA:** 208 Dauphin Street
Applicant: WRICO Signs for Max Morey
Request: Install three signs.
Approved. Certified Record Attached.

12. **124-08-CA:** 200 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Ron Knotts of CRS Construction for Woodlands Bank (Yvette Foster)
Request: Install an ATM and a night deposit in the windows.
Tabled. Referred to Deisgn Review Committee.
13. **125-08-CA:** 1653 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Alver Carlson
Request: Replace front porch roof's pink/red slate with similar colored reddish asphalt roofing. Replace drop siding in areas with lapped siding.
Approved. Certified Record Attached.
14. **126-08-CA:** 1114 Government Street
Applicant: Don Williams for Bobby Williams
Request: Renovate building to original conditions.
Approved. Certified Record Attached.
15. **127-08-CA:** 1655 McGill Avenue
Applicant: Joe Giattina for Sr. Paul Mary Wilson/Sacred Heart Residence
Request: Construct a 3-story, 40 unity independent housing addition with a connection to the existing building.
Approved. Certified Record Attached.
16. **128-08-CA:** 115 S. Conception Street
Applicant: Nicholas Holmes, Jr. for Christ Church Cathedral
Request: Install cast iron columns as supports for the porch roof approved at a previous meeting.
Approved. Certified Record Attached.

D. OTHER BUSINESS and ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Guidelines
 - a. Due to the lateness of the house, it was determined that the guidelines discussion would be held over until the September 15 meeting.
2. Luncheons
 - b. More luncheons with councilmembers will be arranged.

E. ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Bunky Ralph to adjourn the meeting to September 15 at 4 p.m. at Mobile Arts Council.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

113-08-CA: 263 N Conception
Applicant: John & Nancy Lee
Received: 08/13/08
Meeting: 09/03/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: DeTonti Square
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-B
Project: Alter the previously approved request to substitute doors for the French doors. Paint the piers.

BUILDING HISTORY

The building dates back to the 1830s but has had numerous changes through the years, including an added half story that was partially removed in recent times. The plan shows a two-room house with central hall and may have had rear cabinets and an inset porch.

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. On August 6, the Board approved several items including the installation of French doors on the N side of the building. This amends that request.
- B. The Guidelines state, “Often one of the most important decorative features of a house, doorways reflect the age and style of a building. Original doors and openings should be retained along with any moldings, transoms or sidelights. Replacements should respect the age and style of the building.”
- C. The applicant is proposing alter the original plan.
 - 1. The original plan called for French doors on the new side porch.
 - 2. The owners found a pair of historic doors in the attic of the house.
 - 3. The doors are six paneled, wood, 8’ 11” x 4’ 2”.
 - 4. The request is to use them as is, or replace the panels with glass.
 - 5. The doors will be left natural or painted to match the shutters & front doors.
 - 6. Paint the piers the foundation piers to match the shutters & doors (Forest Green).

STAFF ANALYSIS

Staff sees no problem with the wood doors being used, but would point out the opening would be larger. Staff suggests the panels not be replaced with glass. Staff believes the painting of the piers forest green would be appropriate.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

The applicants were not present. No public testimony took place.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Board members agreed they were familiar with this property and that the historic doors (though most likely interior doors) would be appropriate for the porch. The Board determined that the historic doors should be used as is (i.e. the panels may not be removed to allow for glass) or the applicant may opt for new French doors per the prior COA.

FINDING OF FACT

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion the Board finds the facts in the Staff report as written. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Decision on the Application

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the facts found 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 with the restriction that the historic doors be used in their original form, i.e. the wooden panels may not be removed to allow for glass. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 9/03/09.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

114-08-CA: 1351 Springhill Avenue
Applicant: Robert M. Weber for the Child Advocacy Center
Received: 08/15/08
Meeting: 09/03/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-1
Project: Construct a 2,220 sq. ft addition. Install a 6-foot buffer fence.

BUILDING HISTORY

The building is from the first third of the 20th century. It has COAs in the file for additions in 1991 and 1999.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. There have been at least one and possibly two additions to the building. In 1999 and addition was put on the west side.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior Standards state, “...New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.
- C. The applicant is proposing to install a rear addition and a fence.
 - 1. It appears the addition will be to the 1999 addition.
 - 2. The addition will be 30 x 73 and centered off the rear.
 - 3. It will be constructed of Hardiplank with a painted concrete foundation, wood windows and matching roof.
 - 4. The fence will be a six foot shadowbox design to go along the back property line at Julia Street.
- D. Clarifications
 - 1. Does this go off an addition and is the addition Hardiplank?
 - 2. Are there set back problems with the fence?

STAFF ANALYSIS

Provided the Board is agreeable with the materials and there are no set back problems, staff can see no objection to the request.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Robert M. Weber was present for the applicants. Mr. Weber discussed the setback regarding the fence, and, as advised by staff, agreed to go to permitting to determine the proper setback. Mr. Weber clarified that the new addition would be Hardiplank and have wood windows, identical to the 2000 addition to the historic building.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Board members clarified that wood windows would be used on this addition. Board members instructed the applicant to recheck the setback for the fence. Board members advised the applicant that even if the setback changed, he would still be issued a COA for the new construction.

FINDING OF FACT

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion the Board finds the facts in the Staff report as written. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Decision on the Application

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the facts found 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, specifically noting that wood windows would be used on this addition. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 9/03/09.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

115-08-CA: 207 Lanier
Applicant: Lucy Barr Designs for Mr. & Mrs. Angus Cooper
Received: 08/20/08
Meeting: 09/03/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Ashland Place
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Alter fireplace from interior to partially exterior. Ask opinion on garage door design.

BUILDING HISTORY

This is a contributing building constructed in 1912 for Edward C. Rendell a general superintendent at the M&O RR. It was designed by C. L. Hutchisson, Sr. The Hutchissons were one of the most important families of architects in the history of Mobile.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. The Board originally approved plans for a large addition to the house September 24, 2007. On December 17, 2007 and January 3, 2008 the Board agreed to alterations to the original plan.
- B. The guidelines state, “The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved.”
- C. The applicant is proposing to alter an original fireplace and chimney.
 - 1. Install a 6-foot wide chimney on the left side of the house that extends past the plane of the building 1-2 feet.
 - 2. Finish the stucco to match the house.
 - 3. The chimney would rise through the eave.
 - 4. There would be a shoulder and inset just above the 2nd floor level.
 - 5. The new chimney top will match the existing.
 - 6. Receive guidance from the Board on a construction problem necessitating a change in the garage doors as planned.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This request actually alters the method of historically heating the house from coal to wood. However, staff recognizes the problems with obtaining the proper coal for home use and does not find the request unreasonable. The alterations to the house would be minor so staff sees no problem with the request.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Lucy Barr was present for the applicants. The applicant explained that deviation from the original plans for the garage (as permitted by a prior COA) had changed to accommodate interior plan changes. Currently, there is a wide expanse of space over the garage doors which needs to be fixed. The applicant proposed to either run a band through the space, identical to that found on the home, or to place fixed panels in the space.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Board members agreed either panels or a band mimicking the band on the exterior of the main house would be appropriate. Board members approved the changes to the chimney.

FINDING OF FACT

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, A,B, and C(1-5) as written and amending fact C(6) to state that either a band conforming to the existing band on the house or panels above the garage door would be appropriate. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Decision on the Application

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the facts found 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 allowing for the changes to the requested chimney and for either of the above-discussed treatment for the space above the garage doors. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 9/03/09.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

116-08-CA: 404 Chatham
Applicant: William Carroll
Received: 08/18/08
Meeting: 09/03/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Install a new porch balustrade and columns.

BUILDING HISTORY

The building was constructed by Ellen McDonald in 1907.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. On July 2, the Board approved several items regarding the rear and side of the house and to open the front porch. The applicant was requested to return with drawings for the front porch for approval by the ARB.
- B. The Guidelines state, “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 handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts, columns, proportions and decorative details.”
- C. The applicant is proposing to recreate a more appropriate porch.
 - 1. A wood column will be installed with a 9½” base and a Doric capital.
 - 2. A pressure treated 2x5 base rail will support a 1 ½” x ½” picket, with a 2x4 pressure treated cap with beveled edge and ogee trim.
- D. Clarifications
 - 1. The drawing shows other notes that are impossible to read in the 8x11½ fax.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The work appears to have been completed.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. William Carroll was present. No public testimony took place.

BOARD DISCUSSION

No board discussion took place.

FINDING OF FACT

Tom Karwinski moved, that based upon the evidence presented in the application, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, amending fact C(1) to replace the term “Doric” with “box column with built up capitals” The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Decision on the Application

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the facts found 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: 9/03/09.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

117-08-CA: 1057 Selma
Applicant: Douglas Kearley for ARLO Properties
Received: 08/13/08
Meeting: 09/03/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Renovate building and replace chain link fence with wood fence.

BUILDING HISTORY

Records indicate the property was constructed around 1907. However, its appearance would suggest there have been a series of alterations to the house.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. In July ARLO investments received a COA to do repairs in kind.
- B. The Guidelines state, “The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved.... Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture and other visual qualities and where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.
- C. The applicant is proposing alter the original plan.
 - 1. Replace awning windows with 2/2 wood windows.
 - 2. Restore wood columns and handrail to front porch (replicating columns based on pilasters).
 - 3. The new wood brackets will match the existing.
 - 4. Scrape & paint house.
 - 5. Remove chain link fence & install 6-foot wood fence with gates at drive.
 - 6. Current main roof to remain.
 - 7. Remove burglar bars.

8. Glass in rear porch and form 2 cabinets.
9. The building has the form of a Gulf Coast Cottage with a full width porch and two front doors.
10. The decoration and cross gable are indicative of a Victorian cottage.
11. The rear has a wing and what looks to be an L-shaped porch that has been enclosed.
12. A section of the enclosure will become the glassed in rear porch.
13. The cabinets will be located at either end of the inset L-shaped, glassed in porch.
14. Reroof porches with 3 tab shingles.
15. The wood fence will be 2x4 rails toe nailed into 4x4 posts 8' on center.
16. The fence boards will be 1x6 with square edges.
17. The fence will run along the rear and left property line to slightly behind the back plane of the front porch.

D. Clarifications

1. The detail of the new wood railing was not provided.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This would appear to be a sympathetic renovation and the Board regularly approves fences such as this.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Douglas Kearley was present. No public testimony took place.

BOARD DISCUSSION

A discussion was held among the board members regarding the specific plan for the porch railing. The applicant clarified that the standard Victorian turned railing would be used

FINDING OF FACT

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion the Board finds the facts in the Staff report as written, amending fact C(16) to state the fence will have caps and to add C(18) to state that standard MHDC Victorian railing will be used on the porch. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Decision on the Application

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the facts found 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: 9/03/09.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

118-08-CA: 310 Dauphin
Applicant: Douglas Kearley for Tony Moore
Received: 08/14/08
Meeting: 09/03/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Construct a split faced CMU vestibule with glass block and standing seam metal roof at rear of building. Install a neon sign above.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this commercial building with a mansard roof was built in the late 19th century. In 1903, the Zoghby's opened a department store in it. It closed in 1985. It has been the Spot of Tea restaurant since the early 90s. The rear of the building has been used for an entertainment venue.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. The building has gone through numerous changes over the years. However, this request is for an alteration to the rear of the building. The 1904 Sanborn Map shows this block as commercial structures on Dauphin and the other three faces of the block being primarily residential. It is probable that the rear of the buildings were never very finished in appearance.
- B. The Guidelines state, "New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment."
- C. The applicant is proposing to create a free standing vestibule on the rear of the building.
 - 1. The vestibule will be roughly 13'4" x 24' with a connector to the main building.
 - 2. It will be constructed of split faced CMU, filled and painted.

3. There will be four sections of Argus 8x6x4 inch glass block.
4. It will have a gabled standing seam metal roof behind a parapet wall.
5. The roof will be notched where the staircase intersects.
6. The stairs will remain.
7. There will be a set of double doors on the west elevation.
8. Sign will be a 2'4" x 4'8" reverse channel aluminum letters (mill finished, polished).
9. It will have light blue neon.
10. It will be slightly under 11 sq. ft.

D. Clarifications

1. Color of the roof & coping
2. Color of the paint
3. Type of doors

STAFF ANALYSIS

This is a new treatment of a historically neglected building face. This is a modern interpretation and staff does not believe it will impair the building or the district.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Douglas Kearley was present to discuss the application. The applicant explained that this was a modern entrance to the rear of an historic building in order to benefit the owner's business. The applicant agreed to meet with staff about colors.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Board members sought clarification on the color of the sign, roof and doors. The applicant was instructed to meet with Staff for color approvals.

FINDING OF FACT

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion the Board finds the facts in the Staff report as written. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Decision on the Application

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the facts found 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: 9/03/09.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

119-08-CA: 155 S. Broad
Applicant: Adline C. Clarke
Received: 08/14/08
Meeting: 09/03/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Remove rear additions. Remove shed.

BUILDING HISTORY

The house was built for J. Leslie Taylor, circa 1898.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. The building has had irregular maintenance over the years, but no significant alterations in the recent past.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior Standards state, “... 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. The applicant is to remove two rear additions.
 - 1. Two areas on the rear will be removed.
 - 2. A new wall be constructed across the rear.
 - 3. There will be two exterior doors revealed.
 - 4. The doors will be installed along with brick stoops to the doors.
 - 5. An enclosed window will be reinstalled to match the existing.
 - 6. The rear shed will be demolished.

STAFF ANALYSIS

It is not unusual to remove later accretions to reveal a historic elevation. Staff sees no problem with the request provided the doors & windows are appropriate. A section of the original rear wing is in poor condition and needs stabilization.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Adline C. Clarke was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion was held concurrently with the public testimony. A discussion was held about the bay window, which is not a subject of the applicant's COA request. A discussion was held about requiring a new rear window in the renovated rear wall. The applicant explained that room would be storage and that for safety reasons the window would not be necessary.

FINDING OF FACT

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, amending fact C(7) to add that any new windows shall match existing. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Decision on the Application

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the facts found 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: 9/03/09.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

120-08-CA: 453 Conti
Applicant: Stephen & Anne Carter
Received: 08/08/08
Meeting: 09/03/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Construct an overhead wooden trellis to cover the courtyard area at the rear of property. The wooden fence on either side of the waterwall will be removed. Install beaded ceiling on front porch.

BUILDING HISTORY

The Spear house dates to 1838 and is one of the last wooden buildings constructed before the requirement that all buildings in downtown be masonry. It has gone through a number of changes through the years with the last few alterations attempting to more accurately reflect the probable original appearance.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This is a small cottage located on Conti Street two blocks west of the Cathedral. It has gone through a series of changes. This request is for the rear yard and the front porch.
- B. The guidelines state, “...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 should complement the design and scale of the main building.
- C. The applicant is proposing to have the front match the front of 451 Dauphin approved by the Board.
 - 1. Remove two sections of wood fence.
 - 2. Install a wooden trellis 53’7” x 22’6” and 10’4” tall at the rear per the submitted plan
 - 3. A portion of the trellis extends above the building roof.
 - 4. A tall block & brick wall surrounds the rear.

5. Install beaded board ceiling on porch ceiling.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This contributing building is an important historic resource. Beaded board would not have been a typical treatment of an 1830s porch ceiling. The wooden trellis is not attached to the house. Though in the rear of the house, it is behind a wall. This type of trellis is more typical of a bungalow than a Greek Revival cottage. However, the Board has allowed its use in various locations. When used behind the former Gus's Restaurant on Dauphin, the Board required that it be completely behind the walls and not on top of the walls. The trellis going above the roofline of the house is not typical of ARB applications.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Stephen Carter was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion was held concurrently with the public testimony. A discussion was held about the porch ceiling and the height of the arbor once it reaches the house. Mr. Carter agreed to alter the design of the arbor so that it remained below the brick wall and did not encroach on the house.

FINDING OF FACT

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, amending fact C(2) to state that the arbor would not be taller than the eave of the house or the top of the fence, with pitch sloping to the rear brick wall and C(5) to state that applicant may replace the porch ceiling with a paneled ceiling or tongue and groove ceiling. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Decision on the Application

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the facts as found 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: 9/03/09.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

121-08-CA: 1006 Caroline
Applicant: Mary E. M. Bryant
Received: 08/19/08
Meeting: 09/03/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Construct a 10x10 foot addition on rear of house.

BUILDING HISTORY

There is no history of the house in the file, but it was apparently built circa 1905.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. The staff has been working with the owner since February of 2007 to resolve a paint issue complaint made by a neighbor. It appears that construction on the addition has already begun without any of the necessary permits.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior Standards state, “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.
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. The applicant is proposing to add a 10 x 10 addition to the rear.
 - 1. The requirements for submission to the ARB include 9 items.
 - 2. There are only photographs of the building being framed.

STAFF ANALYSIS

Staff recommends denial for lack of information.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

There was no one present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

There was no finding of fact.

Decision on the Application

Craig Roberts moved that the application does not provide enough information and should be denied for lack of information. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

122-08-CA: 114 Lanier
Applicant: Warren & Katherine Butler
Received: 08/13/08
Meeting: 09/03/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Ashland Place
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Addition of a master bedroom, bath & closets with renovation of a garage which is in poor condition.

BUILDING HISTORY

The house was apparently built circa 1927 by Rex Wheeler, president of Wheeler-McLeod Tire Co. and Wheeler Motors.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This is one of the larger houses in Ashland Place. It is frame and sits on a large lot as part of the City Beautiful plan of Ashland Place.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior standards state:
 - 1. 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.
 - 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. The applicant is proposing to connect the house to the garage with a one story master suite wing.
 - a. There will be a one-story hipped roof addition on the rear, left side.
 - b. A cross gabled bay will extend past the plain of the original house and the addition.
 - c. A matching cross gable will emphasize an entrance on the pool elevation.

- d. The roof of the addition will tie into an addition to the north side of the existing garage. A lattice screen/gate will separate the house addition from the garage addition.
 - e. The materials will all be wood and match the existing according to the submitted plans.
 - f. Wood casement windows will match the existing.
 - g. The brackets on the house will be duplicated in the gables of the addition.
 - h. Asphalt shingle roofing will match the existing.
 - i. The brick foundation will match the existing.
 - j. The carport addition will have a lattice screen on the north end.
 - k. A series of posts will support the porch/breezeway which will be at grade.
- D. Clarifications
- 1. There is no design submitted for the carport.
 - 2. Is this the design for the lattice?

STAFF ANALYSIS

Staff has worked with the owner and many of the issues raised in the first rendering have been resolved. There is only one area of concern. The Board normally requires a physical break of some sort between the addition and the original building (207 Lanier for example). Though the design for the carport can be inferred from the plan, there is no design presented.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Pete Vallas and Katherine Butler were present to discuss the application. Pete Vallas presented revised drawings to the Board which clarified the garage design. The revised drawings revealed the placement of a corner board at the northeast corner of the original home to delineate the original structure from the new. The applicants agreed to return to the ARB for approval for the exterior latticework.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion was held concurrently with the public testimony. The board discussed adding the cornerboard and reconfirmed the materials would match existing.

FINDING OF FACT

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, adding fact C(L) to state “cornerboard will be placed at northeast corner of original structure” and fact C(M) to state design of exterior lattice work to be conditioned on approval by staff. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Decision on the Application

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the facts found 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: 9/03/09.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

123-08-CA: 208 Dauphin Street
Applicant: WRICO Signs for Max Morey
Received: 08/13/08
Meeting: 09/03/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Install three signs, one of which was previously approved.

BUILDING HISTORY

This was a contributing building that burned several years ago. It is now considered a new structure.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. The building is being renovated as a movie theater and two residential units. The Board has approved two signs, one for the front and another for either the east or west side. The owners wish to install the sign approved for the west side of the balcony, but now would like to create a hanging sign from the balcony and a V-shaped cabinet sign for changeable copy over the doorway.
- B. The Sign Guidelines state, “Signs shall be mounted or erected so they do not obscure the architectural features or openings of a building... The size of the sign shall be in proportion to the building and the neighboring structures... For double faced signs, each side shall be counted toward the maximum allowable square footage... Plastic, vinyl or similar materials are prohibited.
- C. Request to install 3 signs.
 - 1. The building is 27.88 linear feet multiplied time 1.5 equals a total allowable square footage of 42 sq. ft.
 - 2. The sign on the west side has been approved and is 4.5 sq. ft.

3. The sign for the front was approved but the owners wish to change its location from the fascia to hanging from the balcony. It will be approximately 17 feet above the sidewalk and be 12 sq. ft.
4. The third sign will be a V-shaped cabinet sign 24 sq. ft.
 - a. Aluminum cabinet painted black
 - b. Flat white faces tracked for 3/16" acrylic faces
 - c. Four lines of 6" changeable letters
 - d. Installed on wall as a triangle with filler.
 - e. Above the door is a wide stucco band over which is a series of windows.

STAFF ANALYSIS

It is difficult to determine from the submission what part of the façade might be obscured by the V-shaped sign. Staff sees no problems with the other two signs provided they meet the City's signage requirements.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Max Morey was present to discuss the application. Mr. Morey explained the reader board will be centered in the space above the door below the transom windows.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion was held concurrently with the public testimony.

FINDING OF FACT

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion the Board finds the facts in the Staff report as written. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Decision on the Application

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the facts found 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: 9/03/09.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

124-08-CA: 200 Dauphin St.
Applicant: Ron Knotts of CRS Construction for Woodlands Bank (Yvette Foster)
Received: 08/18/08
Meeting: 09/03/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin St.
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Remove one glass pane and recess solid panel 18”-24” to install ATM facing Dauphin in the newly recessed area. Install night drop at entrance of bank under the covered area beside the doors. All solid areas to match exterior of building.

Tilmon Brown recused himself.

BUILDING HISTORY

The building was constructed in the mid 1920s by the Van Antwerp Realty Company. George Rogers was the architect. In the original survey the building was considered non-contributing due to age. In the next update, the building will be considered contributing.

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. A renovation was done to the building in 2002-2003 when the paint was removed from the brick, the balcony added. At the July 2 meeting the Board denied a similar request due to lack of information.
- B. The Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Guidelines state, “Patterns and rhythms create a visual harmony in commercial districts. New construction and alterations should respect the already established streetscape.” Under High Priority Principles: “Preserve or restore original storefronts include recessed entries, display areas, bulkheads and transoms. Maintain a building ‘edge’ at the sidewalks.... If a non-historic building is to receive a new façade, the design should be compatible with adjacent historic buildings.” In the original application staff also quoted, “Many changes over time have occurred to storefronts in the LDSCD. In the event that a storefront does not fit the context of the district, a new more compatible design may

be introduced.... Large panes of glass that fit the original opening at the display level are recommended. Opaque treatments, such as black Plexiglas, or painting of existing glazing are not allowed. Reflective, mirror glass is also not allowed.”

- C. The applicant is proposing replace two panes of storefront glass.
 - 1. An ATM will be placed in the second window from the right.
 - 2. A night drop will be place in the entrance alcove.
 - 3. No design for either has been submitted.

STAFF ANALYSIS

In the original application staff wrote, “The use of solid panels violates the guidelines. The Board has allowed similar machines, but not in prominent sites and/or not removing two whole storefront windows.... Staff believes the windows on Dauphin Street to the west would be best suited for this since they are already partially blocked. Also, it would be better if only one bay were taken instead of two.”

Since writing the above, staff has researched the renovation to the building. The enclosed windows to the west on Dauphin Street were not in the approved plans. These help to contribute to an inappropriate look on the Dauphin Street façade. Staff sees no reason to compound a problem that was created in violation of a previous Certificate of Appropriateness. Also, there is no design to approve.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Ron Knotts and Yvette Foster were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Board discussion focused on the placement of the ATM and lack of information (i.e. design) in the file. A discussion was held about this corner’s prominence in the downtown district.

FINDING OF FACT

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion the Board finds the facts in the Staff report as written. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Decision on the Application

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, the application should be tabled and a Design Review Committee should be convened. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

125-08-CA: 1653 Dauphin St.
Applicant: Alver Carlson
Received: 08/15/08
Meeting: 09/03/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Replace front porch roof's pink/red slate with similar colored reddish asphalt roofing. Replace drop siding in areas with lapped siding.

BUILDING HISTORY

There is no research on the house. However, it would appear to be from the first decade of the 20th century. The form of the house suggests Victorian moving into American Four Square, and the classical columns indicate the same. The decorative bargeboard shows an unwillingness of the builders to completely abandon the earlier Victorian style.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. The house has received several NOV's from the UDD over the last few years. COAs back to 2003 have been approved for work not yet completed. This application is in response to an NOV issued recently.
- B. The guidelines state, “Materials [roofing] should be appropriate to the form and pitch and color..... The exterior material of a building helps define its style, quality and historic period. The original siding should be retained and repaired. Replacement of exterior finishes, when required, must match the original in profile, dimension and material. ”
- C. The applicant is proposing to install a partial roof using a different material than the rest of the house and to replace areas on one type of siding with a different type...
 - 1. The house and porch roofs use a pink/red slate.
 - 2. Applicant wishes to replace the porch roof with a similarly colored asphalt roof.
 - 3. The porch roof is 35 feet high or higher than the sidewalk and has a low pitch.
 - 4. The building has dropped siding.
 - 5. Replace some of the dropped siding with lapped siding.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The Board has never allowed a patching of one type of material with another as in this case. Staff recommends the request for the substitute siding be denied. The Board generally requires a consistency in roofing materials. However, the Board has also generally allowed the replacement of the older slate shingles with modern materials. The colors need to be verified by the Board.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Alver Carlson was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion was held concurrently with the public testimony. A discussion was held about the nature of the siding presently on the home, replacing with identical siding, and the color of the roof.

FINDING OF FACT

Andrew Martin moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, amending item C(4) and C(5) to replace “dropped” with “beveled.” The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Decision on the Application

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the facts found 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 with the condition that the siding be replaced with beveled siding. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 9/03/09.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

126-08-CA: 1114 Government St.
Applicant: Don Williams for Bobby Williams
Received: 08/18/08
Meeting: 09/03/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: This was originally the garage to the Bellingrath House on Ann St.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. The Board allowed the building to be moved to Government Street in 2005. It was damaged in Hurricane Katrina and has sat vacant since that time. A new owner acquired it while the building was under threat of demolition. It will be converted to a condo duplex.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior Standards state, “The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of the features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.”
- C. The applicant is proposing to repair the building with few alterations and wishes to discuss his plans with the Board.

STAFF ANALYSIS

Staff suggests the Board listen to the plans acting as a Design Committee of the Whole.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Don Williams and Bobby Williams were present to discuss the application. Don Williams explained renovation of this building would take place in two phases and that presently they were most concerned with stabilizing and weather-proofing the structure.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion was held concurrently with the public testimony. Board members recommended a design review committee be formed.

FINDING OF FACT

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, amending the facts to add C(1), that stabilization will be taking place, and C(2) the applicants will be weather tightening/reroofing the roof. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Decision on the Application

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the facts found 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. Craig Roberts also moved that a Design Review Committee should be convened. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 9/03/09.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

127-08-CA: 1655 McGill Ave.
Applicant: Joe Giattina, Ben Cummings, Sister Paul Mary Wilson , and Terry Plauche for Sacred Heart Residence
Received: 08/20/08
Meeting: 09/03/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Construct a 3-story, 40 unit independent housing addition with a connector to the existing building.

BUILDING HISTORY

This is a modern building that replaced the historic facility.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. There has been little activity over the years. The approval of the pergola is the most recent review by the Board.
- B. The Secretary of Interior Standards state, “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment. 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. The project is to erect a 3 story building connected to the main building. The site work will include new landscaping with protection for heritage trees, new and revised layout for parking and a new 16 foot brick paved sidewalk.
 1. The building will be placed at the front of the campus toward Hannon Street with 35’ setbacks.
 2. A slender connector will attach to the front of the W wing of the building.

3. The building will be 228 feet on the front and 57'4" on the sides.
4. The first floor will be brick; the upper two floors will be stucco.
5. There will be an at-grade brick paved front porch roughly right of center.
6. A central utility plant will be attached to the existing building behind the new building.
7. The connector will be 31' long and 9'4" wide.
8. The building massing will be broken with an 8'8" offset near the front door (end of the living room).
9. The connector will be set back 24' from the front of the new building.
10. The west end of the building will be inset 4' from the front and rear.
11. There is a small brick paved patio on the rear.
12. The front elevations show the brick patio with a wall to the front with columns surmounted by a pergola. The plans indicate that there will be two rows of columns.
13. The first floor rises from the ground to a string course created by a brick recess.
14. This is surmounted by several courses of brick topped with a soldier course and stone cap.
15. The height of the building is 36'8" to the soffit.
16. The upper two floors are stuccoed and utilize a regular arrangement of an irregular pattern of windows to create a visual interest.
17. The window areas of the building on the 2nd & 3rd floors use a different texture of stucco.
18. A stucco fascia and aluminum coping complete the building.
19. The roof in profile appears to dip toward the center of the building.
20. Windows will be pre-finished aluminum with fixed and casement lights.
21. The back porch appears to utilize the same post and lintel system as the front but without the brick base.
22. The connector to the main building is glass and aluminum with a flat concrete roof.
23. The conceptual landscape plan indicates numerous plantings, but is much sparser on the Conti Street side behind the building.
24. The original building utilizes different textures and voids (e.g. 3rd floor balcony and structure over the entrance) to create visual interest.
25. The proposed building utilizes different textures.

D. Clarifications.

1. Is the roof concave?
2. How accurate are the color samples?
3. Are there elevations of the new central unit?
4. What are the changes to parking?
5. Is it a concrete roof?
6. What is/are the color/s of the windows?
7. What will be the pavement pattern, color & texture?
8. Will the paving pattern be continued to the right of way?
9. Are there any signage proposals?

STAFF ANALYSIS

This is a large modern building meant to blend with an existing modern building without impairing the historic integrity of the neighborhood. This is a difficult task and the designers have decided to blend with the existing, adjacent building to form a cohesive campus. Staff's major concern is the height of the building. The use of the pergola on the front should help with the creation of a human scale so the building does not loom; and the 35' setbacks with vegetation should also soften the impact. The Hannon Street façade however has only a few trees to bring the massiveness to a human scale. Also, the front porch covers very little of the main façade. The overall design of the building utilizes setbacks and a varied window pattern to create visual interest. The concave roof does not seem to relate to anything in the neighborhood, but does help to lighten the structure. The Board may wish to spend some time considering the proposed landscape plan.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Joe Giattina, Ben Cummings, Sister Paul Mary Wilson, and Terry Plauche, Alver Carlson and another neighborhood representative were present to discuss the application. Mr. Giattina discussed the building's façade and the color of the windows. Mr. Giattina clarified that the roof was indeed concave, constructed of concrete with a stucco fascia and retained an internal drain system. Elevations of the new central unit were provided. The pavement will have a basketweave pattern and continued to the right of way. No signage was presented.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion was held concurrently with the public testimony. The neighborhood representatives stated that they were concerned with how the new building would fit in with the neighborhood but they were happy to see the applicants making compromises. The landscape architect discussed at length the use of the landscaping to make the transition from the building to the neighborhood. A discussion about the site plan in general was held and the desire by the applicants to preserve the lawn along Hannon street for neighborhood use and their lawn party. A discussion was held about the scale of the design and the possibility of introducing smaller components to diminish the proposed scale. Sister Paul Mary Wilson explained that they want the new residents to feel as included as possible and that there are financial concerns dictating the shape of the building. A discussion was held about the brick pavers replacing the sidewalk. Staff recommended this issue be tabled for now.

FINDING OF FACT

Harris Oswalt moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, adding fact C(26) to note that one tree would be removed. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Decision on the Application

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the facts found 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 passed. Tom Karwinski opposed.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 9/03/09.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

128-08-CA: 115 S. Conception St.
Applicant: Nicholas Holmes, Jr. for Christ Church Cathedral
Received: 08/18/08
Meeting: 09/03/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: To install cast iron columns as roof supports on previously approved porch.

BUILDING HISTORY

The building is one of the most significant structures in the City. Originally constructed as a Greek Revival building in the 1830's it suffered catastrophic damage in the 1906 hurricane. Its virtual complete rebuilding in the Classical Revival style of the early 20th century blended well with the original style. Through the years additions have been placed on the rear of the church and this area is one of those, though the porch does abut the Church.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This is a simple request to support the previously approved brackets supporting the canopy with columns.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior Standards state, "New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment."
- C. The applicant is requesting to alter the originally approved plans so the brackets supporting the entrance canopy will be replaced with cast iron posts per the submitted drawing.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The porch and canopy have already been approved by the ARB. Since this is a new porch, staff sees no problem with the substitution.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

No one was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

No board discussion took place.

FINDING OF FACT

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion the Board finds the facts in the Staff report as written. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Decision on the Application

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the facts found 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: 9/03/09.