CALL TO ORDER
The meeting was called to order by Chair Cindy Klotz at 3:02 p.m.

Ed Hooker, MHDC Architectural Engineer, called the roll as follows:

In Attendance    Address   Item Number
Brenda Bolton    310 West Street  063-03/04-CA
Harold Bolton    310 West Street  063-03/04-CA
Dennis Carlisle  10 McPhillips Ave.  063-03/04-CA
Bill Smith        66 Bradford Ave.   062-03/04-CA

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES
Bunky Ralph moved to approve the minutes as mailed. The motion was seconded by Lynda Burkett and approved.

APPROVAL OF THE MID-MONTH CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS:
Bunky Ralph moved to approve the mid-month Certificates of Appropriateness. The motion was seconded by Lynda Burkett and approved.

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS

1. Applicant's Name: Warren Bettis
   Property Address: 62 Bradford Avenue
   Date of Approval: 4/7/04 asc
   Work Approved: Install 6 ft. high dog eared privacy fence on south property line beginning at a point behind an existing white picket fence; install 6 ft. gate across driveway to match design of privacy fence. Privacy fence and gate to be left natural to weather.

2. Applicant's Name: J. Gary Cooper
   Property Address: 1208 Palmetto
   Date of Approval: 4/12/04 jss
   Work Approved: Replace rotten wood with new materials matching existing in profile and dimension. Repaint house in existing color scheme.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Number</th>
<th>Applicant's Name</th>
<th>Property Address</th>
<th>Date of Approval</th>
<th>Work Approved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fred and Barbara South</td>
<td>1112 Dauphin Street</td>
<td>4/12/04 asc</td>
<td>Repaint house in existing color scheme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>J and F Remodeling</td>
<td>213 Levert</td>
<td>4/13/04 asc</td>
<td>Replace rotten wood as necessary with new materials to match existing in profile and dimension. Re-roof with Timberline roofing materials, slate blend in color to match existing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Antonio Wooten</td>
<td>912 Savannah St.</td>
<td>4/14/04 weh</td>
<td>Re-roof with 3 tab fiberglass, charcoal black in color. Replace rotten wood with new materials matching existing in profile and dimension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Jim Walker</td>
<td>470-6 Dauphin Street</td>
<td>4/14/04 jss</td>
<td>Repair damaged brick parapet on east elevation with brick to match existing using lime sand mortar mix. Re-brick openings and holes under third story window sills on east elevation. Repair or re-brick as per existing beneath entrance on west elevation at rear. Provide flashing and drip mold along parapet on west elevation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Dan Elcan and Assoc./Clark, Geer and Latham</td>
<td>213 and 219 S. Catherine</td>
<td>4/14/04 asc</td>
<td>Move two buildings from their original locations on S. Catherine Street to two lots on Etheridge as defined on the site plan for 1500 Government Street. The two houses are to be placed in line with the existing house to the north. Houses are to be placed on new brick piers and drives and sidewalks installed per the submitted plan. Two 3” diameter live oaks are to be planted at the front of each property. Any repairs are to match the original in profile, dimension and material. Lots are to be seeded and mulched after relocating structures and grading site to drain. Construct 6’ wood privacy fence along the north property line beginning 25’ from the sidewalk and extending along</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
900 Old Shell Road
Geraldine Harper / A & G Harper Construction Co.
4/16/04
Demolish non-contributing building declared unsafe by Urban Development and City Council.

10. Applicant’s Name: Bret Faircloth
Property Address: 1457 Monroe Street
Date of Approval: 4/16/04
Work Approved: Replace existing chain link fence with 6’ wood privacy fence as per submitted plan. Construct 8’ x 12’ storage building following MHDC stock plans, paint to match existing residence.

11. Applicant's Name: Katherine Lubecki
Property Address: 1209 Selma Street
Date of Approval: 4/16/04
Work Approved: Remove deteriorated outbuildings. Repair roof with shingles to match existing in color, profile and dimension. Remove screening from front porch. Construct section of privacy fence to enclose rear yard. Fence to match that already existing. Install iron fencing between house and existing fence on each side to enclose rear yard.

12. Applicant's Name: Daoust Contracting
Property Address: 1756 Hunter Avenue
Date of Approval: 4/19/04
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood on windows, siding and fascia as necessary with new materials to match existing in profile and dimension. Prime new materials to paint.

13. Applicant's Name: Freddie and Virginia Sigler
Property Address: 500 Canal Street
Date of Approval: 4/19/04

Work Approved: Construct a 6’ high wood shadowbox fence along the north property line to end 5’ from Lawrence Street and 5’ from the existing alley. Construct a 6’ high stucco-covered masonry with brick pier wall running with the east property line 5’ west of the sidewalk. Wall to have sloped cap and brick piers to have pyramidal caps.

14. Applicant's Name: Buddy Von Fosson  
Property Address: 855 Church Street  
Date of Approval: 4/19/04 jdb  
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary with new materials to match existing in profile and dimension. Repaint house in existing color scheme.

15. Applicant's Name: Haley’s Bar  
Property Address: 278 Dauphin Street  
Date of Approval: 4/20/04 weh  
Work Approved: Repaint building in existing color scheme.

16. Applicant's Name: David Naman  
Property Address: 216 Dauphin Street  
Date of Approval: 4/26/04 weh  
Work Approved: Repaint exterior building trim 790F-6A, Trail Print. Install sign as per submitted design. Sign to be double sided, totaling 18 square feet.

17. Applicant's Name: Daoust Contracting  
Property Address: 110 S. Dearborn  
Date of Approval: 4/27/04 weh  
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood on porch deck, spindles and columns as necessary with new materials to match existing in profile and dimension. Prime new materials.

18. Applicant's Name: David Newell  
Property Address: 963 Church Street  
Date of Approval: 4/27/04 asc  
Work Approved: Repaint house in the following BLP paint scheme:  
   Body and door: Super White  
   Shutters: Cypress Green

19. Applicant's Name: Mike Kittrell  
Property Address: 1400 Old Shell Road  
Date of Approval: 4/27/04 asc  
Work Approved: Minor repair to eave and decking; install new asphalt 3 tab shingle, Onyx Black in color.
20. Applicant's Name: Keith Realty  
Property Address: 1005 New St. Francis Street  
Date of Approval: 4/28/04  jss  
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood on west porch with new materials matching existing in profile and dimension. Paint new materials to match existing color scheme.

21. Applicant's Name: Thomas Building  
Property Address: 110 Beverly Court  
Date of Approval: 4/28/04  weh  
Work Approved: Replace termite damaged wood on fixed wood doors on rear of building with new materials to match existing in profile and dimension. Paint new materials to match existing color scheme.

22. Applicant's Name: George Kennedy  
Property Address: 963 Palmetto  
Date of Approval: 4/28/04 weh  
Work Approved: Repaint house to match existing.

23. Applicant's Name: George Kennedy  
Property Address: 963 Palmetto Street  
Date of Approval: 4/28/04 weh  
Work Approved: Install 3’ high picket fence along north & west property line as per submitted site plan. Fence to be painted white. Install driveway in existing location as per submitted site plan. Plant 3’ high shrubs along west property line behind fence to decrease effect of parking. Install lattice panels around a/c unit. Repair sidewalk along west & north property lines  
NOTE: Right-of-Way permit required for sidewalk work.

24. Applicant's Name: Ray Lamb  
Property Address: 1551 Monterey Place  
Date of Approval: 4/28/04  weh  
Work Approved: Remove later door and replace original window in triple window. Feather in siding below replaced window to match existing. Remove later door on rear of residence and feather in siding to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Install 3’ wood picket fence along east/Catherine Street property line.
25. Applicant's Name: Ray Lamb
Property Address: 104 South Catherine Street
Date of Approval: 4/28/04  weh
Work Approved: Remove later metal door on rear of garage apartment and feather in siding to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Remove existing deteriorated garage doors and replace with frame and panel doors as per submitted plans.

26. Applicant's Name: J. E. Mizell, General Contracting
Property Address: 1111 Church Street
Date of Approval: 4/29/04  asc
Work Approved: Re-roof building E with 3 tab shingles, charcoal in color.

27. Applicant's Name: Michael Ivy
Property Address: 1015 Old Shell Road
Date of Approval: 5/3/04  weh
Work Approved: Repaint house in existing colors:
   Body - Rookwood Blue Green SW 2811
   Trim – Off White

28. Applicant's Name: Dawes Contracting Co.
Property Address: 109 Beverly Court
Date of Approval: 5/4/04  weh
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary with new materials to match existing in profile and dimension. Paint new materials to match existing color scheme.

29. Applicant's Name: Wendell Quimby
Property Address: 14 Semmes Avenue
Date of Approval: 5/5/04 jdb
Work Approved: Re-roof building with 3tab fiberglas shingles, black in color.

30. Applicant's Name: Pamela Powe
Property Address: 59 South Lafayette Street
Date of Approval: 5/5/04 weh
Work Approved: Replace deteriorated front door with new door as per submitted design.

31. Applicant's Name: Jim Walker
Property Address: 602 Church
Date of Approval: 5/5/04 jss
Work Approved: Repaint house in existing color scheme. Window sash to be flat red.
32. Applicant's Name: Frank Willis  
Property Address: 1417 Church Street  
Date of Approval: 5/5/04  
Work Approved: Install new mitered wood column bases on front porch per photo on file in MHDC office.

33. Applicant's Name: Big Swell, Inc.  
Property Address: 360 Chatham Street  
Date of Approval: 5/6/04  
Work Approved: Repair rotten wood with new wood to match existing in dimension and profile; install new wood front porch railing, Design #1 supplied by MHDC and pipe stair rail painted black; paint exterior in the following Sherwin-Williams colors: body- Rookwood Blue Green SW 2811; trim-Classical White; deck and foundation infill-Battleship Gray.

34. Applicant's Name: Sid Harrell  
Property Address: 1156 Palmetto St.  
Date of Approval: 5/6/04  
Work Approved: Paint exterior in the following Sherwin-Williams colors: Body-Cabildo Beige; trim-Classical White; porch deck-dark green.

35. Applicant's Name: Warren Riley  
Property Address: 1719 Dauphin Street  
Date of Approval: 5/7/04  
Work Approved: Install black fiberglass 20 year 3 tab shingles to match existing.

36. Applicant's Name: Michael Ivy  
Property Address: 1015 Old Shell Road  
Date of Approval: 5/10/04  
Work Approved: Install approximately 15’ of 6’ wood privacy fencing at right side of house, between house and existing fence, as per submitted site plan.

37. Applicant's Name: Robert M. Thompson  
Property Address: 1651 Laurel Street  
Date of Approval: 5/10/04  
Work Approved: Construct free-standing one car garage measuring 18’ x 20’ as per MHDC stock plan. All design details, roofing, and paint to match that of the main residence.

38. Applicant's Name: Lipford Construction/ Society of 1842  
Property Address: 16 South Claiborne Street  
Date of Approval: 5/10/04
Work Approved: Replace rotten flooring with materials to match existing in profile and dimension. Repair to existing wood blinds with materials matching existing in profile and dimension.

39. Applicant's Name: Summers Roofing Company  
Property Address: 908 Palmetto  
Date of Approval: 5/10/04  
Work Approved: Re-roof with 3 tab fiberglass shingles, Rustic Black in color.

OLD BUSINESS:

1. **086-02/03-CA**  
Applicant: Wanda Cochran  
Nature of Request: Amend previously-approved plans to construct a 1 story residence as per submitted plans.  
APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

D. NEW BUSINESS:

1. **062-03/04-CA**  
Applicant: Bill Smith  
Nature of Request: Install 8’ wood dog-eared privacy fence in rear yard as per submitted site plan.  
APPROVED Certified Record attached.

2. **063-03/04 – CA**  
Applicant: Harold and Brenda Bolton  
Nature of Request: Construct a 26’ x 19’ addition to rear of house and renovate existing non-original enclosure to back porch, as per submitted plans.  
APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

3. **064-03/04 – CA**  
Applicant: Chestang Fence Co.  
Nature of Request: Install 6’ wood privacy fence at rear of property as per submitted site plan. Install 6’ metal fence along north property line at sidewalk as per submitted site plan.  
APPROVED Certified Record attached.
OTHER BUSINESS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS:

1. Discussion of Review Board Rules and Regulations
   Bunky Ralph, David Tharp and Harris Oswalt will serve on a committee to bring recommendations to the Board at the next meeting.

2. Discussion of Staff Approval of 6’ wood privacy fences
   Ed Hooker proposed that the Board pass a resolution allowing staff to approve non-controversial 6 ft. high wood fences on a mid-month basis. After much discussion concerning the type of fencing that could receive staff approval, the Board provided the following list:
   a. standard dog eared fence no to exceed 6 ft. in height;
   b. good neighbor policy—flat side out—to be followed;
   c. fence to be located behind the main façade of the house;
   d. “These should complement the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District.”
   e. Two staff signatures would be required—Director, Assistant Director, or Architectural Engineer.

   Wanda Cochran stated that the Board is required by law to make decisions on the Guidelines based on specific factual findings. Neighborhood consent is not an appropriate method of making decisions. If the Board wishes to permit staff to approve fences on a mid-month basis, it should adopt a resolution to that effect after due notice, advertising and an opportunity for public comment at a regular Board meeting.

   Bunky Ralph moved to consider a resolution at the next meeting. The motion was seconded by Lynda Burkett and approved.

3. David Tharp and Tilmon Brown will serve on a committee to suggest zoning changes for the districts.

4. Lynda Burkett called the Board’s attention to an Arts Alive display at the Saenger Theatre put together by Douglas Kearley and Nick Holmes, III.

5. The Sturdivent appeal before Council regarding Hardiplank will be on Tuesday, May 25, 2004

6. Devereaux Bemis reminded the ARB that it is the only Board that will be looking at plans for the new Federal Courthouse. Its comments on the project must be taken into consideration, although, they can be disregarded. This review is possible because Mobile is a Certified Local Government. Normally Devereaux Bemis reviews these plans, but in the case of the Federal Courthouse project, it was decided
that the ARB should perform this review. Drawings are 50% complete, however, detailed elevations are not yet completed.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.
APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

086-02/03 – CA    Northwest corner of State and Conception Streets
Applicant:        Wanda Cochran
Received:         5/7/04
Submission Date + 45 Days: 9/26/03
Meeting Date(s): 1) 8/25/03 2) 5/24/04 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: DeTonti Square Historic District
Classification: Non-Contributing (vacant lot/new construction)
Additional Permits Required: (4) Building, Mechanical, Electrical, Plumbing
Conflicts of Interest: Wanda Cochran recused herself from discussion on the application.
Nature of Project: Construction of a 1 story, stucco-covered wood frame residence as per submitted plans.

The building is sited on the northwest corner of State and Conception. The lot measures 95’ by 60’. The main façade faces Conception Street. The front porch of the building located at a distance of 5’ from the sidewalk. The south side of the house is set back 5’ from the sidewalk.
The proposed building is 1 story frame with traditional 3-part stucco exterior. The ground plan is L-shaped in design with an elevated rear courtyard. The proposed building has a 3’ finished floor above grade. The distance from grade to the roof ridge is 23’ at the highest point. The front porch measures 7’ deep; the rear screened porch measures 8’ deep. The proposed roof is an end gable over the main mass and a side gable over the garage. Proposed roofing material is standing seam metal.

The following are proposed building materials:
  a. foundation – solid stucco-covered masonry with metal foundation vents
  b. façade – true stucco
  c. doors – wood
  d. windows – wood double hung; wood casement
  e. porch details – wood columns, wood railing
  f. roof – standing seam metal

PROJECT HISTORY:
The ARB originally approved this application August 2003 (copy of Certified Record attached).

AMENDED REQUEST:
Construct a one story frame residence with stucco-covered masonry foundation, hardiplank siding, and a metal roof. In addition to material changes, the house has been reoriented to face State Street instead of Conception, with a combination stucco-covered masonry wall and iron gate/fence connected to an existing brick wall along Conception Street. An 8’ masonry wall is proposed to be constructed along the west property line.

The building is sited on the northwest corner of State and Conception. The lot measures 95’ by 60’. The main façade faces State Street. The front porch of the building located at a distance of 4’-5” from the sidewalk. The east side of the house is located at a distance of 2’ from the sidewalk. The proposed building is 1 story
frame with hardiplank siding. The ground plan is L-shaped in design. The proposed building has a 3’ finished floor above grade. The distance from grade to the roof ridge is 19’ – 3 ½” at the highest point. The front porch measures 7’ deep; the rear screened porch measures 8’ deep. The proposed roof is an end gable over the main mass and a side gable over the garage. Proposed roofing material is standing seam metal.

The following are REVISED proposed building materials:

g. foundation – solid stucco-covered masonry with metal foundation vents
h. façade – hardiplank
i. doors – wood
j. windows – wood double hung
k. porch details – wood columns, wood railing
l. roof – standing seam metal

**APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT**

*Guidelines for New Commercial and Residential Construction in Mobile’s Historic Districts*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sections</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Description of Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Design Standards for New Construction</td>
<td>Construct new residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,I</td>
<td>Placement and Orientation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,II</td>
<td>Massing and Scale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,III</td>
<td>Façade Elements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,IV</td>
<td>Materials and Ornamentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3, IV, A</td>
<td>Appropriate Materials for New Residential Construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “In the case of a proposed new building, that such building will not, in itself, or by reason of its location on the site, materially impair the architectural or historical value of the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity and that such building will not be injurious to the general visual character of the Historic District in which it is to be located.”

**STAFF REPORT**

3,I

I. **Placement and Orientation:** The guidelines state that new construction should be placed on the lot so that setback and spacing approximate those of nearby historic buildings.

   A. Setbacks in DeTonti Square range from buildings constructed at the sidewalk to buildings with a 5’-15’ setback.

   B. This is a corner lot close to the center of the neighborhood.

   C. The 3 story masonry townhouse to the north faces Conception Street and has a front setback within 3’ of the property line.
D. The structure to the west faces State Street and has a front setback within 5’ of the property line.
E. The proposed front setback for this building is 4’-5” from the sidewalk/property line; the proposed side setback for this building is 2’.
F. The newly-adopted Overlay Zoning will allow the proposed setbacks.

II. Massing and Scale:

A. The guidelines state that new construction should reference the massing of forms of nearby historic buildings.
   1. 1, 1 ½ and 2 story wood frame and masonry structures are common in the DeTonti Square Historic District.
   2. The proposed building is a 1-story wood frame structure with true stucco exterior.
B. The guidelines state that new buildings should have foundations similar in height to those of nearby historic buildings.
   1. Historic buildings in DeTonti Square are constructed on piers, or are elevated above grade by a continuous foundation wall at a height of 2’-3’, and some even taller given the topography of the lot.
   2. Property covenants require new construction to be 2’-6” above grade.
   3. The proposed foundation is designed using solid stucco-covered masonry, at a height 3’ above grade.
C. The guidelines state that new construction should consider roof shapes, pitches and complexity similar to or compatible with those of adjacent historic buildings.
   1. A variety of roof shapes exist in the DeTonti Square Historic District, but the most common are simple end gables and hips.
   2. Side gabled roofs are common in the DeTonti Square Historic District.
   3. The proposed roof shape is end gable over the main mass and end gable over the garage.

III. Façade Elements:

A. The guidelines state that new construction should reflect the use of façade elements of nearby historic buildings.
   1. The use of a single half glass and wood panel door with transom above is a common design element found throughout the Historic Districts.
   2. The use of wooden columns and simple wood porch railing is common throughout the district.
   3. MHDC Stock Rail Design 1, 1” square wood pickets mounted between 2x4s and capped with a chamfered top rail, is proposed for the front and rear porch balustrade.

IV. Materials and Ornamentation:

A. The guidelines provide a list of appropriate materials for compatible new construction.
   1. Hardiplank is an approved siding material for use in new construction.
B. The guidelines state that the degree of ornamentation used in new construction should be compatible with the degree of ornamentation found upon nearby historic buildings. Profiles and dimensions should be consistent with examples in the district.

1. Examples of historic ornamentation include foundation vents and wood porch details
2. The proposed design utilizes a single entry door and double-hung windows.
3. The Board encourages use of modern materials and design methods in new construction.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Staff reported a change in roofing material from metal to asphalt shingle. Cindy Klotz noted that no colors had been submitted, but that that could be dealt with on a mid-month basis.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Tilmon Brown questioned the location of the garage. Ed Hooker explained that it was that the carport opening faced State Street and was to the east of the main house.

FINDING OF FACTS

Bunko Ralph moved to find the facts in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Tilmon Brown and approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Lynda Burkett moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness noting that the roof material would be asphalt shingle and that colors must be submitted by the applicant. The motion was seconded by Jim Wagoner and approved.
APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

062-03/04 – CA  66 Bradford Avenue
Applicant:  Bill Smith
Received:  4/28/04  Meeting Date (s):
Submission Date + 45 Days:  6/12/04  1)  5/24/04  2)  3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District:  Old Dauphin Street Historic District
Classification:  Contributing
Zoning:  R-1, Single Family Residential
Additional Permits Required:  (1) Fence
Nature of Project:  Construct 8’ high wood dog-eared fence at rear of property as per submitted plan.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sections</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Description of Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fences, Walls &amp; Gates</td>
<td>Construct wood fence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “The Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed change:...Will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the historic district…

STAFF REPORT

A. The Guidelines state that Fences “should compliment the building and no detract from it. Design, scale, placement, and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District.”
1. The main structure is a one story frame residence.
2. The proposed fencing on the sides and rear property lines are 8’ high wood dog-eared.
3. Typically, the Design Guidelines limit wood privacy fences to 6’ in height.
4. The Design Guidelines do allow 8’ high wood fences where residential property adjoins commercial property.
5. The property adjacent to the rear property line is a four-plex apartment with parking in the rear.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Bill Smith added that the fence would be left natural to weather
Cindy Klotz noted that the finished side of the fence should face out.
There was no one to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was discussion concerning the previous Old Dauphin Way Review Board practice of requiring that
the smooth or finished side of the fence faced outward—“the good neighbor policy.”
It was noted by staff that there was an adjacent fourplex that justified the request for an 8 ft. high fence.

FINDING OF FACTS

David Tharp moved to find the facts in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph and
approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

David Tharp moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness noting that the good side of the fence would
face out and that it would be left natural to weather. The motion was seconded by Lynda Burkett and
approved.
APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

063-03/04 – CA
310 West Street
Applicant: Harold and Brenda Bolton
Received: 5/10/04
Submission Date + 45 Days: 6/25/04
Meeting Date(s): 1) 5/24/04 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Leinkauf Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1 Single Family Residential
Additional Permits Required: (1) Building
Nature of Project: Construct a 26’ x 19’ addition to rear of house and renovate existing non-original enclosure to back porch, as per submitted plans. All new construction to match existing exterior materials and details, including brick and stucco exterior walls, wood casement windows, tile roof, open bead board eaves and exposed rafter tails, and architectural gable brackets. Rear entrance and landing steps to reflect front brick and concrete steps. Wall recess at breakfast area link will break up massing of east elevation. Roof pitch and gables will reflect existing roof lines. The existing non-original enclosure of back porch will be replaced with glass door infill as per submitted plan. Existing landscaping will remain. New exterior painted surfaces to match existing.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts

Sections Topic Description of Work
3 Additions Construct Family Room Addition

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “The Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed change:…Will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the historic district…”

STAFF REPORT

A. The Guidelines state that “The appropriateness of additions shall be measured by the guidelines applicable to new construction. The addition should compliment the design and scale of the main building.”

1. The main structure is a one story stucco veneer with brick base bungalow, with an end gable terra cotta tile roof with decorative cross gable.
2. The proposed addition is a one story stucco veneer with brick base, cross gable roof with matching terra cotta tiles.
3. The addition occurs at a point approximately 60’ from the front of the residence.
   a. The addition will be screened from public view by mature landscaping.

4. The proposed addition repeats the design of the existing residence by utilizing the following elements:
   a. Brick matching that on the main residence;
   b. Stucco painted to match that on the main residence;
   c. Wood casement windows matching those in the main residence;
   d. Terra cotta roof tiles matching that on the main residence;
   e. Decorative rafter tails and exposed beaded board decking

4. One mature tree, a water oak, must be removed to construct the addition.
5. A Tree Removal Clearance from Urban Forestry will be required before a Certificate of Appropriateness can be issued.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

The architect, Dennis Carlisle spoke on behalf of the project. They will be able to match the color of the stucco and have found a Watsontown Brick—Sturbridge Flash Mat—that is a close match.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Bunky Ralph questioned whether a tree removal permit had been granted. The owners responded that the tree was a diseased water oak and that it should not be difficult to obtain a permit. Ed Hooker offered that the tree was in the footprint of the addition and that Urban Forestry generally issued a removal permit in such a case.

FINDING OF FACTS

David Tharp moved to find the facts in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph and approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness conditional upon a tree removal permit being obtained. The motion was seconded by Lynda Burkett and approved.
APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

062-03/04 – CA
Applicant: Chestang Fence Company
Received: 4/28/04
Submission Date + 45 Days: 6/12/04
Meeting Date(s): 1) 5/24/04 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Street Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Additional Permits Required: (1) Fence
Nature of Project: Install 6’ wood privacy fence at rear of property as per submitted site plan. Install 6’ metal fence along north property line at sidewalk as per submitted site plan.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

*Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sections</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Description of Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fences, Walls &amp; Gates</td>
<td>Construct wood fence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construct metal fence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “The Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed change:…Will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the historic district…

STAFF REPORT

A. The Guidelines state that Fences “should compliment the building and no detract from it. Design, scale, placement, and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District.”
1. The main structure is a two story frame residence.
3. The proposed fencing on the north property line is 6’ metal painted black.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.
PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Ed Hooker explained that the fence was begun without a permit. The normal side setback for a 6 ft. wood privacy fence is 25 ft., however, Urban Development has compromised at 15 ft. side setback. In order to enclose the yard, an iron fence will be constructed along Old Shell Road and will return on the west property line for the first 15 feet. At that point, a 6 ft. wood privacy fence will be installed to enclose the yard. St. Mary’s fence design recently reviewed by the Board will be provided to the applicant.

There was no one to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACTS

Harris Oswalt moved to find the facts in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph and approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness contingent upon the 6 ft. metal fence matching that at St. Mary’s convent and the 6 ft. wood privacy fence to be constructed with the finished side facing out. The motion was seconded by Lynda Burkett and approved.