CALL TO ORDER – Chair
1. Roll Call
2. Approval of Minutes
3. Approval of Mid-Month Requests Approved by Staff

MID MONTH APPROVALS

1. Applicant's Name: Summer’s Roofing and Construction Co., Inc.  
   Property Address: 359 Chatham Street  
   Date of Approval: 8/10/04  
   Work Approved: Re-roof building with 25 year 3-tab fiberglass shingles, shadow gray in color.

2. Applicant's Name: Fred South  
   Property Address: 1318 Chamberlain Avenue  
   Date of Approval: 8/11/04  
   Work Approved: Repair or replace rotten wood with materials matching existing in material, profile and dimension. Paint new materials to match existing.

3. Applicant's Name: Kiker Corporation  
   Property Address: 1111 Government Street  
   Date of Approval: 8/11/04  
   Work Approved: Re-roof flat roof with materials to match existing.

4. Applicant's Name: Kiker Corporation  
   Property Address: 209 North Washington Street  
   Date of Approval: 8/11/04  
   Work Approved: Re-roof flat roof with materials to match existing.

5. Applicant's Name: John Moore  
   Property Address: 310 Charles Street  
   Date of Approval: 8/12/04  
   Work Approved: Repaint house in American Tradition color scheme: Body: Molear Vaquero Red Trim: white  
   Replace existing columns with new box columns in stock design provided by MHDC staff – new columns to total 4, as original design.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant's Name</th>
<th>Property Address</th>
<th>Date of Approval</th>
<th>Work Approved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Sand Dollar Properties</td>
<td>110 South Dearborn Street</td>
<td>8/13/04 asc</td>
<td>Replace roof decking as necessary; install new charcoal shingles to match existing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Bill Zasiris</td>
<td>20 South Reed Street</td>
<td>8/16/04 weh</td>
<td>Re-roof house with 3 tab fiberglass shingles, charcoal in color.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Charles Alfred Cowley Jr.</td>
<td>955 Palmetto Street</td>
<td>8/16/04 asc</td>
<td>Replace rotten wood as necessary to match existing in material and profile and dimension. Repaint house in existing color scheme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Donald’s Roofing</td>
<td>110 S. Bayou Street</td>
<td>8/16/04 asc</td>
<td>Re-roof building with materials matching existing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Cooner Roofing Inc.</td>
<td>1457 Brown Street</td>
<td>8/18/04 weh</td>
<td>Re-roof house with 3 tab fiberglass shingles, charcoal black in color.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Contractors of Today/Gary Soutullo</td>
<td>206 Roper Street</td>
<td>8/18/04 weh</td>
<td>Remove existing concrete steps and replace with new wood steps with handrails matching existing porch rail. Paint to match existing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. Applicant's Name: Bernhardt Roofing Company  
    Property Address: 258 Dexter Street  
    Date of Approval: 8/25/04 asc  
    Work Approved: Re-roof with 3-tab fiberglass shingles, black in color.

14. Applicant’s Name: Conrad Construction  
    Property Address: 253 St. Anthony Street  
    Date of Approval: 8/25/04 asc  
    Work Approved: Replace glass as necessary; repair/replace wood siding as necessary with new wood siding to match existing in profile and dimension; prime and paint new materials.

15. Applicant's Name: Larry and Cathy Burdette  
    Property Address: 1561 Luling Street  
    Date of Approval: 8/26/04 weh  
    Work Approved: Repaint house in the following colors:  
        Body – Lettuce Alone B68-3  
        Trim – Bistro White 7006-4

16. Applicant's Name: Mark and Denise Burks  
    Property Address: 1559 Dauphin Street  
    Date of Approval: 8/26/04 weh  
    Work Approved: Construct 3 car garage as per submitted plans. Design is modified MHDC stock plan utilizing building elements found on main residence. Building to measure 38’ x 24’ and is to be located at the rear of the property behind existing guest house. Siding to be hardiplank painted to match main house, hipped roof with timberline shingles matching that of the main residence.

17. Applicant's Name: Leland Moore Jr.  
    Property Address: 12 North Reed Avenue  
    Date of Approval: 8/26/04 weh  
    Work Approved: Repaint house in existing color scheme. Repair existing flat roof – install 5-v crimp galvalume roofing over flat roof surface and flash into existing asbestos tile as necessary. Repair rotten soffit & fascia with materials matching in profile & dimension.

18. Applicant's Name: DNC of Mobile  
    Property Address: 113 South Dearborn Street  
    Date of Approval: 8/26/04 asc  
    Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary with new materials matching existing in material, profile and dimension. Prime new materials. Paint colors to be submitted at a later date.
19. Applicant's Name: Barbara and Fred South
Property Address: 1112 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 8/26/04 asc
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood with materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension.
Repaint house in the following Sherwin Williams color scheme:
   Body: SW6325
   Trim: Cream
   Base: SW 6328
   Cedar Shakes: SW6326

20. Applicant's Name: Goldengate Properties/E. Bradford Ladd
Property Address: 2301 DeLeon Ave.
Date of Approval: 8/26/04 asc
Work Approved: Minor wood repair with new wood to match existing in dimension and profile.
Paint in the following Benjamin Moore colors: body-Rockport Gray; trim-Titanium, window sashes - white.

21. Applicant's Name: Thomas Roofing/Robert Ramsey
Property Address: 311 West Street
Date of Approval: 8/26/04 asc
Work Approved: Install new charcoal 3 tab shingle roof on pitched roof and modified flat roof system on flat roof sections.

22. Applicant's Name: O. C. Wiggins
Property Address: 1005 Augusta Street
Date of Approval: 8/26/04 jss
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Re-roof house in timberline shingles heather in color to match existing.

C. OLD BUSINESS:

1. **020-03/04-CA** 165-67 State Street
   Applicant: Devereaux Bemis
   Nature of Project: Retain prototype fence type constructed at the Board’s request.

D. NEW BUSINESS:

1. **090/03/04/CA** 12 North Reed Avenue
   Applicant: Ryan Freisen
   Nature of Project: Install 6’ privacy fence around perimeter of property as per submitted plans.
2. **091-03/04-CA**
   Applicant: The McMillan Family Trust of 2002
   Nature of Project: Retain 43’ cell tower installed without proper federal permits, without zoning clearance, without a building permit, and without ARB approval.

E. **OTHER BUSINESS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

1. Discussion with the Board by Steve Walker
2. Federal Courthouse Review by Staff

F. **ADJOURN**
INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: DeTonti Square Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-B, Residential Business
Additional Permits Required: (1) Building
Nature of Project: Construct 8’ high wood and Hardiplank fence as per submitted design. Stain fence dark brown.

Fence to be constructed of 4’ x 8’ panels of Hardiplank mounted between 6”x 6” treated wood posts. Panels to have ½” x 4” applied batten strips spaced evenly between the panel. Fence to be stained.

History of the Project:

At the November 10, 2003 meeting, the Board had questions concerning the use of Hardiplank for fencing in the historic district. It also had questions concerning the structural integrity of the fence as designed. The Board noted it would be willing to review a full scale mock up of the fence.

The fence has been erected as presented, and Board Members are encouraged to visit the site and examine the fence.

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 and Gates</td>
<td>Construct wood and hardiplank 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…”

A. The Guidelines state that “The standards listed and shown…illustrate elements that contribute to the architectural character of the buildings in Mobile’s historic districts. These define the architectural style of the buildings and establish a repetition of forms and details, which create harmony and character of the historic districts.

1. The existing structure is solid masonry.
2. The building materials are compatible for use in the district.
3. The building materials have been approved for use in the district.
4. The Board encourages the use of new materials when appropriate.

Staff has no recommendation for this application.
APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS - STAFF COMMENTS

090-03/04 – CA
12 North Reed Avenue
Applicant: Ryan Friesen
Received: 8/27/04
Submission Date + 45 Days: 10/11/04
Meeting Date (s): 1) 9/13/04 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single family residential
Additional Permits Required: (1) Fence
Nature of Project: Install 6’ high wood privacy fence as per submitted plans.

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>Install wood privacy 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 complement the building and not 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 structure.
2. The residence is located on the northwest corner of North Reed Avenue and New Hamilton Streets.
3. Typically, the Design Guidelines limit fences to 6’ in height.
4. Typical side yard setbacks for fences is 12’ for standard (60’ or wider) corner lots.
5. The subject lot is 50’ in width at the front, so due to the substandard lot size, a setback of 9.8’ is allowed.
6. The applicant is requesting to construct the fence on the sidewalk.
7. A common alley separates the houses facing North Reed Avenue from North Monterey Street.
8. The house that faces North Monterey Street directly behind the subject property has a wood privacy fence with brick columns located directly on the sidewalk.
9. As this is a corner property, the applicant will have to apply for a zoning variance to allow the fence to be closer to the sidewalk.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.
APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS - STAFF COMMENTS

091-03/04 – CA 203 Church Street
Applicant: The McMillan Trust of 2002, David D. Wilkins, representative
Received: 8/31/04 Meeting Date (s): 1) 9/13/04 2) 3)
Submission Date + 45 Days: 10/12/04

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4, General Business
Additional Permits Required: (1) Fence
Nature of Project: Retain 43’ cell tower installed without proper federal permits,
without zoning clearance, without a building permit, and without ARB approval.

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>Install iron 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

The current Design Review Guidelines do not directly address structures such as cell towers, satellite dishes, antennas, etc. However, Section 9 under Standard of Review addresses the appropriateness and the impact of elements within the context of historic districts. A list of facts is enumerated for the Board’s consideration of this request.

1. The tower is located in the Central Parking lot due south of Government Plaza, between Church Street and Interstate 10.
2. The parking lot is directly adjacent to the historic Chandler House, and is within the viewshed of the Christ Episcopal Church, The Museum of Mobile and the Fort Conde Welcome Center.
3. The tower is 43’ tall, and tapers from 20” in diameter at the base to 15” at the top.
4. The plan notes that the tower is to match existing light poles. However, the one existing light pole is approximately 25’ high, and much smaller in diameter.
5. The plan notes that the tower will provide additional illumination for the parking lot, at an elevation of approximately 20’ above grade. However, the light is placed on the tower at a height approximately 30’ above grade and is pointed directly down at the existing building.
6. Plans call for the placement of a radio base station at the base of the tower and an antenna at the apex.
7. Typically, towers of this nature have up to 2 co-locations for cell phone use, requiring additional buildings to house equipment. The plans provided show no additional buildings.

8. The Applicant has agreed to paint the pole black or dark green or any other color as directed by the Board.

9. The Applicants will be required to submit information to the Alabama Historical Commission for Section 106 Review to mitigate any negative impact on the Church Street East Historic District.

Staff was unable to reach a consensus on whether or not the tower impaired the historic integrity of the Church Street East Historic District. Staff suggests the Board visit the site and determine an appropriate decision.