ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
January 22, 2014 – 3:00 P.M.
Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER
1. The Chair, Bradford Ladd, called the meeting to order at 3:00. Cart Blackwell, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
   Members Present: Robert Allen, Bradford Ladd, Harris Oswalt, Craig Roberts, Steve Stone, and Jim Wagoner. It was noted that the meeting was the first many years (minus a few exceptions) which now former Board member Thomas Karwinski was not present.
   Members Absent: Kim Harden, Carolyn Hasser, and Nick Holmes III.
   Staff Members Present: Cart Blackwell and Keri Coumanis.
2. Steve Stone moved to approve the minutes of the December 18, 2013 meeting as posted. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.
3. Mr. Stone moved to approve the midmonth COA’s granted by Staff. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED

1. Applicant: Mr. & Mrs. J. Daly Baumhower
   a. Property Address: 960 Government Street
   b. Date of Approval: 12/16/13
   c. Project: Install canvas awning that will extend before the building’ two upper-story doors.

2. Applicant: Tom Bierster
   a. Property Address: 1216 Government Street
   b. Date of Approval: 12/13/13
   c. Project: Repair rotten cornice, replace porch deck tongue and groove, repaint.

3. Applicant: Ken Williams, Trinity Building Contractors
   a. Property Address: 1156 Old Shell Road
   b. Date of Approval: 12/16/13
   c. Project: Repair rotten wood as per existing and repaint to match. Repair/replace eight windows west elevation to match originals—6/6 double hung sash, true divided light.

4. Applicant: Bob Dobson
   a. Property Address: 318 Dauphin Street
   b. Date of Approval: 12/13/13
   c. Project: Reroof with single ply membrane, not visible from street.

5. Applicant: Celia and Mack Lewis
   a. Property Address: 158 South Jefferson Street
   b. Date of Approval: 12/11/13
   c. Project: Stain fence with a semi-transparent stain; dark green in color

6. Applicant: Brad Pearson with Southern Style Landscape
   a. Property Address: 22 South Lafayette Street
   b. Date of Approval: 12/16/13
   c. Project: Remove the existing concrete walkway that extends from the front steps to the sidewalk. Install a brick walkway on the aforementioned location.

7. Applicant: Bobby Gipson
   a. Property Address: 918 Conti Street
   b. Date of Approval: 12/17/13
c. Project: Reroof the building with shingles matching the existing. Replace deteriorated sections of fascia board to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Touch up the paint on the aforementioned to match the existing color scheme.

8. Applicant: Harold Allen Home Improvement
   a. Property Address: 1703 Dauphin Street
   b. Date of Approval: 12/17/13
   c. Project: Repair and replace deteriorated woodwork (when and where necessary) to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repaint per the submitted color scheme; the trim will be white and the body will be Benjamin Moore Bennington Gray.

9. Applicant: Wrico Signs for State Farm
   a. Property Address: 653 Government Street
   b. Date of Approval: 12/18/13
   c. Project: Install and replace signage. The signage package includes an awning and two wall signs. The proposed signage meets the size, material, and design requirements outlined in the Signage Design Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and the Government Street Signage Corridor.

10. Applicant: Martin Vergessen
    a. Property Address: 366 Michigan Avenue
    b. Date of Approval: 12/19/13
    c. Project: Install an 8’ x 10’ ancillary building within the backyard. The building will be located in compliance with setback requirements. Said structure will be minimally visible from the public view.

11. Applicant: Phillip Davenport
    a. Property Address: 556 Escalava Street
    b. Date of Approval: 12/19/13
    c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repaint per the existing color scheme.

12. Applicant: Paul Howen
    a. Property Address: 1551 Old Shell Road
    b. Date of Approval: 12/19/13
    c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork and windows to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repaint per the existing color scheme.

13. Applicant: Bill Appling
    a. Property Address: 12 South Conception St. (also listed as 18 S. Conception St.)
    b. Date of Approval: 12/18/13
    c. Project: Install an overhanging sign. The sign will meet the height requirements for pedestrian passerby. The approximately 4’ x 4’ wooden sign will feature the name of the establishment and will pivot on an L-bracket.

14. Applicant: David Keeler
    a. Property Address: 54 Le Moyne
    b. Date of Approval: 12/18/13
    c. Project: Add 8 feet to existing storage building so that it will be 16 by 8 feet. Added space will match structure. Paint to match.

15. Applicant: Tony Jones
    a. Property Address: 221 South Dearborn Street
    b. Date of Approval: 12/30/13
    c. Project: Reissue of COAs dating from October 7th and 10th of 2011. The COAs call for the construction of a second-story atop a garage, the construction of a wall, and the repair & repainting of woodwork.

16. Applicant: Beauty and More
    a. Property Address: 1500 Government Street
b. Date of Approval: 12/30/13

c. Project: Install aluminum sign featuring the name of the establishment. The backlit sign will measure 2’ in height by 9’ 6” in length.

17. Applicant: Richard Brown with Building and Maintenance
a. Property Address: 11 Common Street
b. Date of Approval: 12/30/13
c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repaint the affected areas per the existing color scheme.

18. Applicant: Mack Lewis
a. Property Address: 1257 Government Street
b. Date of Approval: 12/30/13
c. Project: Replace existing awning canopy over rear porch and handicap ramp and over car park area. Fabric to be Forest Green. Also install 70 feet of white aluminum gutter above awning at second story fascia.

19. Applicant: Wendell Quimby
a. Property Address: 714 Dauphin Street
b. Date of Approval: 12/30/13
c. Project: Install three canvas awnings.

20. Applicant: Randolph Wilson
a. Property Address: 1004 Elmira Street
b. Date of Approval: 1/2/14
c. Project: Repair and when necessary replace foundation sills. Install additional foundation piers (not visible) beneath the house. Make repairs to existing foundations piers. The brickwork will be repaired to match.

21. Applicant: Pete Alcocer
a. Property Address: 1559 Blair Avenue
b. Date of Approval: 1/2/13
c. Project: Tuck point ten piers and add piers beneath the house.

22. Applicant: Jim Walker
a. Property Address: 19 South Conception Street
b. Date of Approval: 1/2/14
c. Project: Install overhanging sign. The sign will be extend over the sidewalk at height commiserate with code-related height requirements. The double-faced neon sign (appropriate for a modern building) will measure of total of 40 square feet in size.

23. Applicant: Chad Miles for John Pickron
a. Property Address: 1365 Brown Street
b. Date of Approval: 1/8/14
c. Project: Renew a Certificate of Appropriateness issued on 21 March 2012 which called for the construction a rear addition, demolition of an old garage, construction of a new garage, alteration of the rear portion of the drive, and construction of new steps.

24. Applicant: Historic Mobile Preservation Society
a. Property Address: 300 Oakleigh Place
b. Date of Approval: 1/8/14
c. Project: Patch the roof of the Minnie Mitchell Archives Building. Replaced deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile and dimension. Repaint per the existing color scheme.

25. Applicant: Nyla W. Smith
a. Property Address: 957 Palmetto Street
b. Date of Approval: 1/9/14
c. Project: Install a simple iron railing on the front steps.
C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2014-CA-01: 1051 Elmira Street
   a. Applicant: Nelson Patterson
   b. Project: Addition-Related - Construct a rear addition.
      APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

2. 2014-CA-02: 202 George Street
   a. Applicant: Tam Williams
   b. Project: New Construction - Construct an ancillary building according to altered plans.
      APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

3. 2014-CA-03: 454 South Broad Street
   a. Applicant: LeRoy and Charles Anderson
      CONCEPT APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Discussion
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2014-01-CA: 1051 Elmira Street
Applicant: Nelson Patterson
Received: 12/16/13
Meeting: 1/22/14

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Construct a rear addition.

BUILDING HISTORY

This single-story frame side hall with wing dwelling dates circa 1881. The façade’s main and secondary porches feature Queen Anne style derived posts and picketed friezes.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

A. This property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. With this application, the owner proposes the construction of a rear addition.

B. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Rehabilitation and the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:

1. “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy the historic materials that characterize a 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.”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans, elevations, and photographs):

1. Construct a rear addition.
   a. The addition will extend from the west side of the South Elevation.
   b. The addition will measure 5' 5 ¼” in depth and 12’ in width.
   c. The addition will rest atop a continuous CMU-faced foundation that will match that found on an earlier rear addition.
   d. A corner board will be employed on the addition’s West Elevation.
   e. The wooden siding will match that found on an earlier rear addition.
   f. The South Elevation will feature a six-over-six wooden window.
   g. A shed roof extending (in slightly broken form) from the earlier addition’s shed roof will cover the addition.
   h. The roofing shingles will match those employed on the body of the house.
STAFF ANALYSIS

This application calls for the construction of a rear addition. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Rehabilitation state that additions should 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 (See B-1). The shed-roofed addition would extend from an earlier shed-roofed addition. The proposed foundation treatment, siding, window type, and roofing shingles would match the existing. The staff has two concerns. The first is the ability of the roof to shed water. The second is continuing an inappropriate foundation. Though the CMU foundation exists on the previous, should an inappropriate foundation treatment be continued or should a foundation appropriate to the house be utilized?

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

While Staff has concerns regarding the long-term viability of the pitch of the roof and the foundation, staff believes that if the Board thinks these are approvable then based on B (1), Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the building or the district. Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

No one was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Roberts noted that the addition was an addition of addition off an addition.

FINDING OF FACT

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 1/22/15
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2014-02-CA: 202 George Street
Applicant: Tam Williams for David L. Sanders
Received: 12/17/13
Meeting: 1/22/14

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Construct an ancillary building according to altered plans.

BUILDING HISTORY

This Queen Anne residence dates circa 1890. The house’s façade features a corner porch and a projecting bay.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on December 14, 2004. At that time, the Board approved the construction of an ancillary building of the same dimensions as that which is proposed, but of slightly different design. With this application, the applicant’s representative submits a design featuring altered elevations for the previously approved ancillary construction.

B. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Rehabilitation and the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:

1. “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy the historic materials that characterize a 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.”

2. “An accessory structure is any construction other than the main building on the property. It (the category) 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. Scope of Work (per submitted plans and elevations):

1. Construct a previously approved ancillary structure according to altered plans.
   a. The building will measure 44’ in width and 24’ in depth.
   b. The building will rest atop a slab foundation.
c. The two-story building will be faced with hardboard siding.
d. Two-over-two wooden windows and operable louvered shutters matching those found on
   the main residence will be employed.
e. The building will be surmounted by a north-south gable roof.
f. Standing seam metal roofing panels will sheath the roof.
g. East Elevation
   i. A three bay, two-tiered gallery will extend the length of the East Elevation.
   ii. The squared section columnar piers defining the porch bays will match those
        employed on the main house’s front porch.
   iii. An exterior stair will allow for access to and from the upper-story.
   iv. The upper gallery will be enclosed by wooden railings matching those employed
        on the house’s front porch. The stairs will feature the same type of railing.
   v. A multi-light transom window flanked by two pairs of multi-light (one fixed)
        wooden French doors will comprise the lower-story’s fenestration.
   vi. Three pairs of French doors will comprise the upper-story’s fenestration.
h. South Elevation
   i. A double French door and a two-over-two window will comprise the South
      Elevation’s fenestration.
i. West Elevation
   i. A single upper-story multi-light transom window will comprise the West
      Elevation’s fenestration.
j. North Elevation
   i. Two two-over-two windows will comprise the North Elevation’s fenestration.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application calls for the construction of a two-story ancillary building. On December 13, 2014, the
Board approved the construction of a building occupying the same footprint as the structure up for
review. The building has been reoriented from an east-west orientation to north-south orientation and the
elevations have been altered.

The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state that ancillary construction should
complement the design and scale of the main building (See B-2.). The ceiling heights and dimensions
would result in a massing and proportions that would be in keeping with the principle dwelling. The
proposed building would feature siding, windows, shutters, columnar supports, railings, eave treatments,
and other details that would match those employed on the main house.

Staff suggests that the applicant consider adding additional fenestration to the Rear Elevation’s upper-
story.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2), Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical
character of the building. Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Tam Williams was present to discuss the application.
BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant’s representative. He asked Ms. Williams if she had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make. Ms. Williams stated that Mr. Blackwell had addressed the application in full. She concurred with his observations regarding the fenestration on the rear elevation.

Mr. Roberts addressed Ms. Williams and Mr. Blackwell. He noted that the ancillary building’s proposed windows matched those on the principle dwelling, but the proposed multi-light French door utilities seemed unrelated to the house and disproportion to the building. He also suggested the use of paired posts. Ms. Williams provided further insight as to the proportional relationship of the windows. She stated that the owner already owned the doors and would like to employ them on the new construction. Mr. Roberts asked if the windows were existing features, i.e. salvaged components from the property. Ms. Williams and Mr. Stone answered no. Mr. Blackwell explained that the rear elevation has glazed doors. Noting the plan, he stated that the number of panes would not be noticeable once the building was completed on account of the experience of plan and elevation. Ms. Williams further explained the overall combination and spacing of vertical elements.

Mr. Ladd asked if any other Board members had questions to ask the applicant’s representative. No further Board discussion ensued.

FINDING OF FACT

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the facts as approved 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: 1/22/15
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2014-03-CA: 454 South Broad Street
Applicant: LeRoy and Charles Anderson
Received: 1/3/14
Meeting: 1/22/14

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-2

BUILDING HISTORY

A circa 1923 Arts & Crafts inspired bungalow occupied this lot. Two fires gutted the residence. The proposed building was approved for and recently underwent demolition.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on December 19, 2012. At that time, the Board authorized Staff to issue a midmonth approval allowing the demolition of the fire-gutted residence. The application up for review calls for the construction of a duplex on the currently vacant lot.

B. The Guidelines for New Residential Construction in Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
   1. “Placement has two components: setback the distance between the street and a building; and spacing, the distance between its property lines and adjacent structures. New construction should be placed on the lot so that setback and spacing approximate those of nearby buildings. New buildings should not be placed too far forward or behind the traditional “façade line”, a visual line created by the fronts of buildings along the street.”
   2. “Building mass is established by the arrangement and proportion of its basic geometric components – the main building, wings and porches, the roof and the foundation. Similarity of massing helps to create a rhythm along a street, which is one of the most appealing aspects of historic districts. Therefore, new construction should reference the massing of forms of nearby historic buildings.”
   3. “The foundation, the platform upon which a building rests, is a massing component of a building. Since diminished foundation proportions have a negative effect on massing and visual character, new buildings should have foundations similar in height to those of nearby buildings.” Pier foundations are encouraged for new residential buildings. When
raised slab foundations are constructed, it is important that the height of the foundation relate to that of nearby historic buildings.”

4. “The main body of the building may be one or two stories (in height). Secondary elements, usually porches or wings extend from the main building. Interior floor and ceiling heights are reflected on the exterior of a building and should be compatible with nearby historic buildings.”

5. “A building’s roof contributes significantly to the massing and to character of the surrounding area. New construction may consider, where appropriate, roof shapes, pitches and complexity similar to or compatible with those of adjacent historic buildings. Additionally roof designs of buildings may incorporate eave overhang and trim details as those of other buildings.’

6. “Facade elements such as porches, entrances, and windows make up the “face” or façade of a building. New construction should reflect the use of façade elements of nearby historic buildings.”

7. “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture. In order to coexist in harmony with adjacent structures in the historic districts, porches are encouraged. Porches often create a visual cadence along the street. Designs for new porches should also reference historic porch location, proportion, rhythm, roof form, supports, steps, rails and ornamentation. New porches should also be similar in height and width to porches on nearby historic buildings. Proper care should be taken with the detailing of new porches. Scale, proportion and character of elements such as porch columns, corner brackets, railings, pickets, etc., should be compatible with adjacent historic structures. Wood or a suitable substitute material should be used. In addition, elements such as balconies, cupolas, chimneys, dormers, and other elements can help integrate a new structure with the neighborhood when used at the proper scale.

8. “Depending on the character and style of new construction and its relation to surrounding historic structures, similar gable elements should be used.”

9. “The number and proportions of openings – windows and entrances – within the façade of a building creates a solid-to-void ratio (wall-to-opening). New buildings should use windows and entrances that approximate the placement and solid-to-void ratio of nearby historic buildings. In addition, designs for new construction should incorporate the traditional use of window casements and door surrounds. Where the side elevation is clearly visible from the street, proportions and placement of their elements will have an impact upon the visual character of the neighborhood and must be addressed in the design.”

10. “The goal of new construction should be to blend into the historic district but to avoid creating a false sense of history by merely copying historic examples. The choice of materials and ornamentation for new construction is a good way for a new building to exert its own identity. By using historic examples as a point of departure, it is possible for new construction to use new materials and ornamentation and still fit into the historic district.”

11. “Historic buildings feature the use of a variety of materials. In new buildings, exterior materials – traditional and modern – should closely resemble surrounding historic examples. Buildings in Mobile’s historic districts vary in age and architectural styles, dictating the materials to be used for new construction. Modern materials which have the same textural qualities and character as materials of nearby historic buildings may be acceptable.”

12. “The degree of ornamentation used in new construction should be compatible with the degree of ornamentation found on nearby historic buildings.”

13. “The type, size and dividing lights of windows, and their location and configuration (rhythm) help establish the character of a building and compatibility with adjacent
structures. Traditionally designed window openings generally are recessed on masonry buildings and have a raised surround on frame buildings. New construction should follow these methods in the historic districts as opposed to designing windows flush with the walls.”

14. “Blinds, shutters and awnings can be integral parts of new construction, just as they are in historic applications. Blinds and shutters should fit proportionally over either window or door openings with appropriate overlap at the sides. Operable blinds and shutter units, hung with appropriate hinges, are encouraged. Where blinds or shutters are fixed, they should be hung on window casings in a manner to replicate those which are operable.”

15. “Often one of the most important decorative features, doorways can help establish the character of a building and compatibility with adjacent facades. Some entrances in Mobile’s historic districts have special features such as transoms or decorative elements framing the openings. Careful consideration should be given to incorporating such elements in new construction.”

16. “New materials that are an evolution of historic materials, such as Hardiplank concrete siding (used in place of lap siding) or a simulated stucco finish (instead of true stucco) should suggest profile, dimension and finish of historic materials. True materials such as brick, wood siding, or true stucco are encouraged. Some synthetic materials, such as fiberglass porch columns may be appropriate individual cases.”

17. “Foundation screening should be recessed from the front of the foundation piers. Lattice, if used, should be hung below the skirt board or siding and framed with trim. Lattice secured to the face of the building is unacceptable. Solid infill should be recessed and screened with landscaping.”

18. “Modern paving materials are acceptable in historic districts. However, it is important that the design, location and materials should be compatible with the property. Landscaping can often assist in creating an appropriate setting.”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans and elevations):
   1. Obtain conceptual approval for the construction of multi-family (duplex) dwelling.
      a. The building will observe the “façade line” of the previous residence that occupied the site.
      b. The building will be setback 13’ from southern lot line and 6’ from the northern lot line.
      c. The building ground floor will measure a total of 1180 square feet.
      d. The building will measure 33’ in width 48’ in depth.
      e. The building will rest atop a 3’ high foundation.
      f. The walls will be faced with wooden siding.
      g. The building will feature four-over-one windows.
      h. Vertical Board shutters will flank the window units.
      i. The gable roof will be sheathed with asphalt shingles.
      j. The house will feature bracketed eaves.
      k. The façade (East Elevation) will feature a four bay porch and two gabled wall dormers.
      l. Wooden steps extending the length of the porch’s two innermost bays will flanked by picketed railings and terminal newels.
      m. The two part porch supports will be comprised of a pedestal-like foundation piers surmounted by tapered posts.
      n. Picketed railings matching those employed on the steps will enclose the porch bays.
      o. The first-story lazed and paneled “Craftsman” doors with surmounting transoms and outer flanking four-over-one windows
      p. The second-story’s wall dormers will feature four-over-one windows.
q. The North and South (side) elevations will feature three four-over-one windows on the first-story and no fenestration on the second-story.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the conceptual approval for new construction. The proposed plans call for the construction of a duplex featuring Arts & Crafts inspired elements and details. The Design Review Guidelines for New Residential Construction call for new construction to blend with and complement the old. The Guidelines take into account the following considerations: placement (setback and spacing); mass; façade elements; details; materials; and siting.

Placement involves setback and spacing. The submitted materials note that the building’s setback (from the sidewalk) would be the same as the preceding structure (thereby adopting the traditional “façade line”) and that the spacing would be commiserate with nearby residential buildings (See B-1). A site plan is required for final approval.

The building’s mass, the proportional relationship between the building parts (foundation, porch, body of house, roof structure, etc.), references the massing of traditional buildings (see B 2.5.). The elevation drawings provided with the final submission should note the lower-story’s ceiling heights.

The façade elements reflect the similar motifs found on nearby historic buildings (See B-6).

The proposed new construction calls for a full-length front porch. Clarification would be needed as to the scale, proportion and character of elements such as porch columns, corner brackets, railings, pickets, etc. (See B-7).

Based on the rendering of the proposed façade and the locations of openings as depicted in the floor plans, the number and placement of windows is approximate to that of nearby historic building (See B-9). The composition of the windows must be provided with the final submission.

The proposed building materials which have been clarified in the imagery and the scope of work are in keeping with the historic district (See B 10, 11, & 16.). The final submission must note the treatment of the foundation (See B-17.), the aforementioned clarifications regarding the windows, the composition of the porch decking, and the paving materials.

Details, such as the bracketed eaves, pier-post supports, etc., are ornamented in manner compatible with nearby historic buildings (See B-12.). Renderings of the aforementioned should be submitted for final approval.

The proposed four-over-one windows are appropriate for a bungalow inspired dwelling. However, the applicant should be aware that the Board requires true divided light in the windows. To reiterate, further clarification would be required as to the type of window (material). Clarification would also be required to the type and appearance of the shutters (See B 13-14.).

Without a site plan, Staff cannot assess the paving surfaces and parking areas (See B-18.).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

In concept, Staff does not believe the proposed residential construction would impair the Oakleigh Garden Historic District or the Broad Street Corridor. On account of lack of side elevations, a rear elevation, site plan, and detail drawings, Staff cannot recommend approval of the construction, but does recommend approval of the project in concept.
PUBLIC TESTIMONY

No one was present to discuss the application. After a general discussion of the points mentioned in the Staff's presentation (traditional spacing, setback, observation of the “façade line”, massing, etc...), the Board discussed how best to proceed with the application. The Board spoke favorable as to the idea and possibility of new residential construction on Broad Street. It was noted that clarifications would be required for final approval. Mr. Roberts stated that the Staff Report contained a listing of clarifications. Mr. Blackwell and Ms. Coumanis both noted that the approval was not binding, but conceptual and that follow ups would be required. Ms. Coumanis likened the process to a Design Review Committee exercise.

BOARD DISCUSSION

After a general discussion of the points mentioned in the Staff’s presentation (traditional spacing, setback, observation of the “façade line”, massing, etc...), the Board discussed how best to proceed with the application. The Board spoke favorable as to the idea and possibility of new residential construction on Broad Street. It was noted that clarifications would be required for final approval. Mr. Roberts stated that the Staff Report contained a listing of clarifications. Mr. Blackwell and Ms. Coumanis both noted that the approval was not binding, but conceptual and that follow ups would be required. Ms. Coumanis likened the process to a Design Review Committee exercise.

FINDING OF FACT

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Stone moved that, based upon the facts as submitted to the Board, the application as a concept does not impair the historic integrity of the district, but final approval would be subject to the submission and approval of full plans, elevations, and details.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 1/22/15