

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD AGENDA
September 21, 2011 – 3:00 P.M.
Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. Roll Call
2. Approval of Minutes
3. Approval of Mid Month COAs Granted by Staff

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS

1. **Applicant:** Raoul Porto for American Roofing and Construction, LLC
 - a. Property Address: 1108 Oak Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/30/11
 - c. Project: Reroof the building to match the existing. Replace a door to match the existing.
2. **Applicant:** Stacey Wellborn
 - a. Property Address: 1054 Palmetto Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/30/11
 - c. Project: Remove rotten wood, replace per existing and repaint. Remove and replace tongue and groove decking as existing. Repair damaged corner board and siding.
3. **Applicant:** Big Zion AME Zion Church
 - a. Property Address: 110-112 South Bayou Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/30/11
 - c. Project: Install a six foot double aluminum gate to the north of the parsonage. The gate will extend from a line not beyond the front plane of the body of the house. Install a six foot aluminum fence. The fence will extend along the western portion of the northern lot line, then extend along a setback of approximately 1 to 2 feet along South Jefferson Street, and tie in at the southeast corner of the fellowship hall.
4. **Applicant:** Anchor Signs
 - a. Property Address: 900 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/31/11
 - c. Project: Replace the existing canvas awning with a new canvas awning. The awning will fit the existing canopy armature.
5. **Applicant:** Hancock Roofing Inc.
 - a. Property Address: 56 ó 58 South Conception Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/30/11
 - c. Project: Reroof to match the existing.
6. **Applicant:** Don Bowden
 - a. Property Address: 1657 Spring Hill Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/6/11
 - c. Project: Repair and/or replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile and dimension. Paint per the submitted Sherwin Williams color scheme. The body will be Gauntlet Gray. The porch floors and shutters will be Anew Gray. The lattice underpinning will be Thunder Gray. The trim will be Oyster White. The porch ceiling will be Tidewater.
7. **Applicant:** WJC, LLC
 - a. Property Address: 1757 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/6/11
 - c. Project: Perform exploratory demolition on rear kitchen addition to determine the extent of damage to the roof. Repair the roof to match the 1940s photo utilizing materials to

match the hipped original that is under the current roof. Repair leaks on main roof maintaining the original tile roof, replacing with matching as necessary.

8. Applicant: All Phase Roofing

- a. Property Address: 58 Bradford Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 9/7/11
- c. Project: Reroof the house with architectural shingles.

9. Applicant: Joseph Smith

- a. Property Address: 450 Dexter Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 9/9/11
- c. Project: Paint the house per the submitted color scheme. The body will be a grayish green and the trim will be white.

10. Applicant: Southeast Management Services

- a. Property Address: 659 Government Street
- b. Date of Approval: 9/12/11
- c. Project: Repair stuccowork on the building. Repaint the stuccowork to match the existing color scheme. Remove a temporary section of wooden railing located within the western fence. Install a replacement iron railing in the aforementioned location. Paint the railings and posts.

11. Applicant: Walter Cumbie

- a. Property Address: 172 Hannon Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 9/9/11
- c. Project: Install exterior storm windows to fit existing window openings.

12. Applicant: Daniel Morris

- a. Property Address: 207 Roper Street, Apt. 5
- b. Date of Approval: 9/9/11
- c. Project: Install 30 year weathered wood asphalt shingles. Repair rafters and decking at rear damaged by tree.

13. Applicant: John Hale Landscapes

- a. Property Address: 161 Macy Place
- b. Date of Approval: 9/12/11
- c. Project: Install a metal storage shed in the fenced backyard. Said shed will be painted in a color scheme matching that of the house.

14. Applicant: Eastern Shore Construction

- a. Property Address: 1650 Government Street, A
- b. Date of Approval: 9/12/11
- c. Project: Repair and replace deteriorated woodwork and detailing to match the existing in profile dimension and material. Repaint the house per the submitted color scheme.

15. Applicant: Davis Roofing

- a. Property Address: 65 Government Street
- b. Date of Approval: 9/13/11
- c. Project: Reroof to match the existing.

16. Applicant: Thomas Roofing

- a. Property Address: 51 South Hallet Street
- b. Date of Approval: 9/13/11
- c. Project: Reroof to match the existing.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2011-62-CA: 1757 Government Street

- a. Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley for Mr. William Cutts

b. Project: Restoration, Repair & Replacement, and Partial Demolition ó Remove later alterations; repair and replace deteriorated features; and demolish a later rear addition.

2. 2011-63-CA: 10 South Ann Street

a. Applicant: Caldwell Whistler

b. Project: Partial Demolition ó Demolish the later rear portion of a contributing residence.

3. 2011-64-CA: 155 South Monterey Street

a. Applicant: Eric and Kim Boone

b. Project: Rehabilitation and New Construction - Remove a façade dormer, construct a façade dormer, install siding, construct a rear addition, and paint the house.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF REPORT

2011-62-CA: 1757 Government Street
Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley
Received: 9/6/11
Meeting: 9/21/11

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Leinkauf
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-1
Project: Restoration, Repair and Replacement, and Partial Demolition ó Remove later alterations; repair and replace deteriorated features; and demolish a later rear addition.

BUILDING HISTORY

With its Southern Colonial Revival portico, stone-faced walls, and terracotta roofing tiles, this early 20th-Century residence is among the most eclectic residences located on the western portion of Government Street.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states öthe Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the changeí 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 districtí ö

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The owner/applicant proposes the removal of later alterations, repair & replacement of deteriorated features, and the demolition of a later rear addition.
- B. With regards to demolition, the Guidelines read as follows: öProposed demolition of a building must be brought before the Board for consideration. The Board may deny a demolition request if the building's loss will impair the historic integrity of the district.ö However, our ordinance mirrors the Mobile City Code, see §44-79, which sets forth the following standard of review and required findings for the demolition of historic structures:
 - 1. *Required findings; demolition/relocation.* The Board shall not grant certificates of appropriateness for the demolition or relocation of any property within a historic district unless the Board finds that the removal or relocation of such building will not be detrimental to the historical or architectural character of the district. In making this determination, the Board shall consider:
 - i. The historic or architectural significance of the structure;
 - 1. This house is one the most imposing historic residential buildings located along western Government Street. Constructed some time before the First World War, the eclectic design adopted forms and finishes associated with several academic and picturesque revival styles. The later concrete block addition is of no architectural significance.

- ii. The importance of the structures to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;
- 1. This building is one of the most notable properties included in the 2009 Leinkauf Historic District expansion. The later rear addition does not contribute to the streetscape. Said largely engulfs the two-story building's original single story kitchen.
 - iii. The difficulty or the impossibility of reproducing the structure because of its design, texture, material, detail or unique location;
- 1. The mass produced fire damaged building materials are capable of being reproduced.
 - iv. Whether the structure is one of the last remaining examples of its kind in the neighborhood, the county, or the region or is a good example of its type, or is part of an ensemble of historic buildings creating a neighborhood;
- 1. Later unsympathetic additions of this type were commonly constructed to the rear of historic residences during the latter half of the 20th Century. A number of western Government Street's surviving large scale homes received unsympathetic rear additions when they were adapted to business and/or commercial functions.
 - v. Whether there are definite plans for reuse of the property if the proposed demolition is carried out, and what effect such plans will have on the architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological, social, aesthetic, or environmental character of the surrounding area.
- 1. If granted demolition approval, the applicants would demolish the house's later rear addition and reconfigure the original kitchen's rear elevation. Plans were not submitted for the rear elevation on account of lack on information regarding the condition and appearance of the former kitchen's rear elevation. Upon dismantling the rear elevation, the applicant's representative will be better able to determine what design and intervention to propose to the Board.
 - vi. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
- 1. The owner/applicant purchased the house on September 1, 2011 for \$75,000.
 - vii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
 - viii. The property owner/applicant is demolishing the rear addition and restoring the house as a single family residence
 - ix. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
- 1. The property has been purchased for restoration.
 - x. Description of the options currently held for the purchase of such property, including the price received for such option, the conditions placed upon such option and the date of expiration of such option;
- 1. NA.
 - xi. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
- 1. See submitted materials.
 - xii. Financial proof of the ability to complete the replacement project, which may include but not be limited to a performance bond, a letter of credit, a trust for completion of improvements, or a letter of commitment from a financial institution; and
- 1. Application submitted.
 - xiii. Such other information as may reasonably be required by the Board.
 - 1. See submitted materials.
- 3. *Post demolition or relocation plans required.* In no event shall the Board entertain any application for the demolition or relocation of any historic property unless the applicant also presents at the same time the post-demolition or post-relocation plans for the site.ö

- C. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
1. "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 reflect the age and style of the building."
 2. "The type, size, and dividing lights of windows and their location and configuration (rhythm) on the building help establish the historic character of the building. Original window openings should be retained as well as original window sashes and glazing."
 3. "The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture. Historic porches should be maintained and repaired to reflect their period."
 4. "Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive features, the new shall match the old in design, color, texture and other visual qualities and where possible, materials. Replacement of missing feature shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence."
- D. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
1. Remove the glazed and framed infill enclosing the façade's monumental portico.
 2. Reinstall glazed and framed sidelights within the façade's front door opening.
 3. Install a glazed door within the front door bay.
 4. Reinstall French doors in the bays to either side of the façade's front door.
 5. Repair and replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and composition.
 6. Repair and when necessary replace window sashes and glazing to match the existing.
 7. Remove a handicap access ramp and a flight of steps located off the east elevation.
 8. Remove the canvas covered porte-cochere.
 9. Demolish the later rear addition.
 10. Remove the wooden pergolas located to the east of the house.
 11. Remove portions of the asphalt paving located to the east of the house.
 12. Remove a fire escape from the West Elevation.

Clarifications

1. What is the design of the door?
2. Will there be any landscaping installed?

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application calls for the removal of later alterations, the repair & replacement of deteriorated features, and the demolition of later rear addition.

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation call for physical, documentary, and pictorial evidence when removing later alterations. As documented by historical photographs, this building's monumental portico originally did not feature glazed infill. The same photograph depicts the façade's fenestration treatment. The front door's jamb moldings survive intact thereby fixing the dimension of the door and transoms. Two of the French doors that flanked the central entrance have been located. These doors will guide the replication of additional doors. Based on the physical evidence surviving on the site and archival photograph provided by the architect, Staff does not believe the removal of the porch infill and the replication of the reinstallation of façade installation will impair the architectural or the historical integrity of the building.

The removal of the later handicap access ramp, side steps, the porte-cochere, pergolas, fire escape, and portions of paving would recapture additional historical integrity and improve the streetscape. Staff does not believe the removal of these later features will impair the architectural or the historical integrity of the building or the district.

The house's original single story kitchen is engulfed by a later rear addition. The addition was heavily damaged in a recent fire. Applications calling for partial demolition of a contributing building entail consideration of the following factors: the architectural significance of the building, the architectural significance of the area to be demolished; the physical condition of the area to be demolished; the affect the demolition would have on the rest of the building; the affect of the demolition on the streetscape; and the nature of any proposed redevelopment. The later two-story addition is not of the same architectural caliber as the historic building. The fire-damaged area extends around two sides and over the building's original kitchen. Said addition detracts from the historical integrity of the side and rear elevations.

On account of the location and configuration of the later rear addition, the presence of any surviving components and treatments of the rear elevation remains unknown. If granted partial demolition approval, the removal of rear addition would proceed so the applicant's representative can determine what survives of the rear elevation. Upon ascertaining more information regarding the fabric, configuration, and treatment of the subject area, the project would reappear before the Board. Staff does not believe the proposed demolition will impair the architectural or the historical integrity of the building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-3) and C (1-4), Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the building. Staff recommends approval of this application, but reminds the owners that the original portion of the kitchen wing should be preserved until renovation plans are submitted.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF REPORT

2011-63-CA: **10 South Ann Street**
Applicant: **Caldwell Whistler**
Received: **8/26/11**
Meeting: **9/21/11**

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Partial Demolition Request ó Demolish the later rear portion of contributing residence.

BUILDING HISTORY

Staff files date this single-story residence to 1896. The building does not appear in the 1904 Sanborn Map. It is possible that the gabled surmounted northern wing is a vehicular shed shown in the 1904 image, but the possibility is doubtful at best. The footprint of the older portion of the present building is present on the 1955 Sanborn Map. A rear addition was constructed in the 1970s.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states öthe Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the changeí 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 districtí ö

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The owner/applicants propose the demolition of a non-conforming rear addition to the contributing residence.
- B. The regards to demolition, the Guidelines read as follows: öProposed demolition of a building must be brought before the Board for consideration. The Board may deny a demolition request if the building's loss will impair the historic integrity of the district.ö However, our ordinance mirrors the Mobile City Code, see §44-79, which sets forth the following standard of review and required findings for the demolition of historic structures:
 - 1. *Required findings; demolition/relocation.* The Board shall not grant certificates of appropriateness for the demolition or relocation of any property within a historic district unless the Board finds that the removal or relocation of such building will not be detrimental to the historical or architectural character of the district. In making this determination, the Board shall consider:
 - i. The historic or architectural significance of the structure:
 - 1. Staff files date this single story cottage to 1896. The 1904 Sanborn Map does not depict a structure matching the footprint of the older portion of the existing building. It is possible that a vehicular shed identified on the 1904 Sanborn comprises the house's northern wing. The house's massing and siding lead Staff to suggest a 1930s or 1950s construction

- date. The later 1970s rear addition to the house is not of same design caliber and structural quality as the main house.
- ii. The importance of the structures to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;
 1. Setback from the street and located behind two late 19th-Century houses, the house in question is part of larger familial compound, one of the few remaining in the historic districts. The demolition of the house's rear wing would not adversely affect the historic integrity of the building, complex, and the surrounding district.
 - iii. The difficulty or the impossibility of reproducing the structure because of its design, texture, material, detail or unique location;
 1. The building materials are capable of being reproduced.
 - iv. Whether the structure is one of the last remaining examples of its kind in the neighborhood, the county, or the region or is a good example of its type, or is part of an ensemble of historic buildings creating a neighborhood;
 1. Later unsympathetic additions of this type were commonly constructed to the rear of historic residences during the latter half of the 20th Century.
 - v. Whether there are definite plans for reuse of the property if the proposed demolition is carried out, and what effect such plans will have on the architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological, social, aesthetic, or environmental character of the surrounding area.
 1. If granted demolition approval, the applicants would demolish the house's 1970s rear addition and rebuild the western wall.
 - vi. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
 1. The property was inherited by the owner/applicants.
 - vii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
 1. The property owner/applicants are demolishing only a portion of the building. The main residence will remain intact.
 - viii. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
 1. The property has not been listed for sale.
 - ix. Description of the options currently held for the purchase of such property, including the price received for such option, the conditions placed upon such option and the date of expiration of such option;
 1. NA.
 - x. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
 1. NA.
 - xi. Financial proof of the ability to complete the replacement project, which may include but not be limited to a performance bond, a letter of credit, a trust for completion of improvements, or a letter of commitment from a financial institution; and
 1. Application submitted.
 - xii. Such other information as may reasonably be required by the Board.
 1. See submitted materials.
3. *Post demolition or relocation plans required.* In no event shall the Board entertain any application for the demolition or relocation of any historic property unless the applicant also presents at the same time the post-demolition or post-relocation plans for the site.ö

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):

1. Demolish the later addition located the rear of the contributing building.

2. Said addition is to the west of the north/south gable and to the south of the east/west gable.
3. Reconstruct those portions of the main house's South Elevation and West Elevations that were covered by the addition.
4. The walls will be faced in wooden siding.
5. The small portion of re-exposed South Elevation will feature a six-over-six wooden window.
6. The re-exposed West Elevation will feature a pair of six-over-six windows (matching the existing) and a sixteen light window.
7. The eaves will be boxed like those found on the façade.
8. The work will be painted to match the existing color scheme.

REQUESTS/CLARIFICATIONS

1. Provide existing and reconfigured plan drawings.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the demolition of a later addition to a contributing dwelling. Partial demolition applications entail consideration of the following factors: the architectural significance of the building, the architectural significance of the area to be demolished; the physical condition of the area to be demolished; the affect the demolition would have on the rest of the building; the affect of the demolition on the streetscape; and the nature of any proposed redevelopment.

The exact date of construction of this contributing dwelling is unknown. Staff files record an 1896 construction date. Sanborn Maps do not corroborate such an early date. It is possible that the northern wing of the building dates around the turn of the century, but this seems unlikely given that the location of the northern wing does not exactly accord with placement on outbuilding depicted in earlier maps. The body of the main house is sheathed in siding installed sometime from the 1930s to 1950s. The siding and massing lead Staff to date the house's construction from the 1920s to the 1950s. The house's later addition cannot be seen from the public right of way. Said addition is neither of the same construction nor design quality as the existing house. The roof has collapsed and the walls have buckled. The location and placement of windows conforms to an earlier interior layout. The house currently features asbestos siding. The wooding siding proposed for the affected area will differentiate the old and the new work while simultaneously blending with the historic context.

Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical integrity of the building, complex, or district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-3), Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the building. Pending the above request, Staff recommends approval of this application.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF REPORT

2011-64-CA: 155 South Monterey Street
Applicant: Eric and Kim Boone
Received: 9/2/11
Meeting: 9/21/11

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Rehabilitation and New Construction - Install a façade dormer, construct a rear addition, install siding, and paint a house.

BUILDING HISTORY

This hipped roof bungalow once featured a full length gallery. In its original form, the house resembled numerous other high end bungalows located throughout the confines of the present day Old Dauphin Way Historic District.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The owner/applicants propose the removal of a façade dormer, the construction of new façade dormer, the installation of siding, and the construction of a small rear addition.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. A roof is one of the most dominant features of a building. Original roof forms, as well as the original pitch of the roof should be maintained.
 - 2. “The exterior material of a building helps define its style, quality and historic period.”
 - 3. “Where windows cannot be replaced, new windows must be compatible to the existing. The size and placement of new windows for additions and alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.”
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. Remove the façade’s dormer
 - 2. Construct a new dormer
 - a. The centrally placed dormer will measure 10’ in length and 5’ in height. (The existing dormer is 6’ in length and 4’ in height.)
 - b. The dormer will be 12’ deep.
 - c. The dormer’s hipped roof will be located below the apex of the house’s gabled roof.
 - d. The dormer will feature wooden siding matching that found on the main house.
 - e. The dormer will feature three one-over-one wooden windows.

- f. The roofing shingles will match those found elsewhere on the building.
2. Face the walls of the infilled portion of the front porch with wooden siding to match that found elsewhere on the house.
3. Construct a rear addition.
 - a. The addition will both infill and extend from a rear porch.
 - b. Said addition will square out the northeast corner of the house.
 - c. The addition will rest atop brick foundation piers of the same height as those supporting the body of the house.
 - d. The addition's northern wall will measure 9' in length.
 - e. The addition's rear or east wall will measure 14' in length.
 - f. The addition's wall will be faced with wooden siding matching that found on the body of the house.
 - g. The addition's east (rear) elevation will feature a bank of three one-over-one windows matching the rear elevation's other window fenestration as well as a single glazed and paneled wooden door. A flight of wooden steps will access the door.
 - h. The addition's roof will continue the same downward and be in plan with the southeast section of the rear elevation's roof.
 - i. The addition will feature the same rafter and eave treatment as that employed elsewhere on the rear elevation.
 - j. The addition's roofing shingles will match the existing.
4. Paint the house per the submitted Glidden color scheme.
 - a. The body will be Pinwheel.
 - b. The trim and decorative details will be High-Hiding.
 - c. The porch decking will be Garden Path.
 - d. Other details will be Garden Path.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the removal of a façade dormer, the construction of a new dormer, the installation of siding, the construction of a rear addition, and the painting of the house.

This single story bungalow has undergone numerous alterations. That said the roof form and features remain intact. The hipped roof is one of the characters defining features of the house. The façade's dormer survives intact. While the proposed new dormer would be based upon design of and utilization of the same materials as the existing dormer, the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that original roof forms should be maintained. The proposed dormer would be larger than the existing thus altering the proportion and massing of the building. On account of the intact condition and prominent location of the dormer, Staff believes the removal of the original dormer and its replacement with a larger dormer would impair the architectural and historical integrity of the building.

The front porch was infilled during the latter half of the 20th Century. The walls of the infill are faced with plywood-like siding. Batten-like strips cover the vertical junctures. The applicant's propose facing the walls of the porch infill with wooden siding. The plywood would be removed. The siding would match that employed on the body of the house with regard to both profile and dimension. It would be installed in such a manner as to be in plane with and not project beyond the main house's siding. As long as the easternmost corner boards remain in situ thereby allowing the infill to read as a later alteration, Staff does not believe the installation of wooden siding will impair the architectural or historical integrity of the building, but on account of the quality of the drawings Staff cannot recommend approval of the work for reason of lack of information.

The rear elevation of this inner block property is not visible from the street. The southeast corner of the rear elevation appears takes the form of slightly projecting ell. This ell was a later addition. The applicants propose squaring out rear elevation through the construction of a northeast addition. The addition would feature foundation, siding, window, and roofing treatments that would match the existing. The roof would continue the downward pitch established by the southeast corner ell. Staff does not believe rear addition would impair the architectural or the historical interiority of the building, but on account of the quality of the submitted drawings cannot recommend approval of the work for reason of lack of information.

The proposed color scheme, while not objectionable, is not appropriate for an Arts and Crafts-influenced house. Staff does not recommend approval of the color scheme.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1), Staff believes both the removal of the dormer and painting per the submitted would impair the architectural and historical character of the building and the district. Staff does not recommend approval of the aforementioned portion of the scope of work.

Based on B (2-3), Staff does not believe the installation of wood siding on the porch infill and the construction of a rear addition will impair the architectural or the historical character of the building or the district, but does not recommend approval of the aforementioned work for reason of lack of information.