

CITY OF MOBILE
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

Minutes of the Meeting
February 5, 2007

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m. by Chair, Bunky Ralph.

MHDC Staff Aileen de la Torre called the roll as follows:

Members Present: Tilmon Brown, Harris Oswalt, Bunky Ralph, Joe Sackett,, Jim Wagoner, alternate David Barr.

Members Absent: Robert Brown, Cameron Pfeiffer, David Tharp.

Staff Members Present: Aileen de la Torre, Anne Crutcher, Devereaux Bemis.

Staff Members Absent: John Lawler.

<u>In Attendance</u>	<u>Mailing Address</u>	<u>Item Number</u>
Jennifer Clark	222 S. Dearborn St.	006-07-CA
Chance George	17 N. Monterey St.	009-07-CA
Justin Smith (Saad & Vallas)	3601 Spring Hill Bus Pk.	135-06-CA
Alan & Sharlyn Jones	263 N. Joachim St.	010-07-CA
Ryan Friesen	20 N. Reed Ave.	008-07-CA &009-07-CA
Kevin Shaw	P.O. Box 16834, 36616	014-07-CA
Ron Wiggins	3729 Cherokee Ford, Gainesville, GA 30506	135-06-CA
Peter Wallace	1122 Palmetto St.	007-07-CA
Douglas Kearley	10 Wisteria Ave.	007-07-CA
Amy Hamilton	1157 Palmetto St.	007-07-CA
Nick Holmes, Jr.	257 N. Conception St.	015-07-CA
Cher Cooper/Sean Lynch		013-07-CA
Crosby Latham		013-07-CA

Tilmon Brown moved to approve the minutes of the last meeting as emailed. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswalt and unanimously approved.

Tilmon Brown moved to approve the mid-month Certificates of Appropriateness. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswalt and unanimously approved.

MID-MONTH APPROVALS

- Applicant's Name:** Stanley Roofing
Property Address: 213 Levert Avenue
Date of Approval: January 8, 2007
Repair roof. New shingles to match existing in profile, color and dimension.
- Applicant's Name:** A-1 Roofing
Property Address: 117 Beverly Court
Date of Approval: January 9, 2007
Re-roof building with materials to match existing in profile, color and dimension.
- Applicant's Name:** Patrick and Regina Finnegan
Property Address: 1306 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: January 10, 2007
Repair/replace rotted wood with materials to match existing. Paint to match existing. Repair roof with shingles to match existing. Straighten and stabilize damaged/sagging front porch.
- Applicant's Name:** Wayne Dean

Property Address: 1064 Palmetto Street

Date of Approval: January 11, 2007

Replace rotten wood as necessary with materials to match existing in profile and dimension.
Repaint in existing color scheme.

5. **Applicant's Name:** Sandy Ellis

Property Address: 1001 Church Street

Date of Approval: January 12, 2007

Replace rotten wood as necessary with materials to match existing in profile and dimension.
Install sunbrella square awning over front window and rear door, style 47-55 in an Umber dark brown/salmon stripe. Repaint in the following color scheme:

- Body – Olé
- Trim – Puritan Beige
- Shutters – Amber Brown

6. **Applicant's Name:** Alecia Harold

Property Address: 207 Dexter Avenue

Date of Approval: January 18, 2007

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

7. **Applicant's Name:** Slate and Tile Roofing Company

Property Address: 1656 Dauphin Street

Date of Approval: January 18, 2007

Remove existing tile to repair roof decking. Replace with the same tile.

8. **Applicant's Name:** American Roofing and Construction

Property Address: 264 McDonald Avenue

Date of Approval: January 18, 2007

Re-roof with 3 tab fiberglass shingles in dark grey.

9. **Applicant's Name:** Mobile County

Property Address: 153 Government Street

Date of Approval: January 22, 2007

Install a temporary (one year only) 6' chain-link construction fence around the property. Remove louvers on the south elevation and create an opening on the east elevation to remove debris during interior demolition.

NOTICES OF VIOLATION and MUNICIPAL OFFENSE TICKETS

No NoVs or MoTs were written during this time period.

OLD BUSINESS

1. **003-07-CA:**109 Chatham Street

Applicant: Mr. and Mrs. Kevin Egan

Request: Replace Ludowici tiles with Decra stone-coated metal tiles.

WITHDRAWN. APPLICATION WILL BE ON FEBRUARY 27th AGENDA.

2. **135-06-CA:**1507 Springhill Avenue

Applicant: Charter South Inc.

Request: Demolish existing building and build a convenience store with six gas pumps under a canopy.

APPROVED AS AMENDED. Certified Record attached.

NEW BUSINESS

3. **006-07-CA:**1138 Montauk Avenue

Applicant: Jennifer Clark, Hilda Clark and Larry Clark

Request: Restore the exterior and rebuild the rear of the residence.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

4. **007-07-CA:**1122 Palmetto Street

Applicant: Mary Wallace

Request: Construct new 12'-0" x 12'-0" rear porch. Modify front porch layout. Replace Bungalow-style front porch columns with new wood columns and handrail.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

5. **008-07-CA:**20 North Reed Street

Applicant: Ryan Friesen

Request: Construct rear addition.

APPROVED Certified Record attached.

6. **009-07-CA:**17 North Monterey Street

Applicant: T. Chance and Jarita George

Request: Extend roof of garage/storage structure by 28'-0" to create a carport.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

7. **010-07-CA:**263 North Joachim Street

Applicant: Alan and Sharlyn Jones

Request: Build a wall along the south property line and raise the entry gate to 6'-0".

APPROVED wall. TABLED gate. Certified Record attached.

8. **011-07-CA:**1402 Government Street

Applicant: RBC Centura Bank/Florida Certified Sign Erectors

Request: Install new signage.

APPROVED WITH THE EXCEPTION OF MONUMENT SIGN. Certified Record attached.

9. **012-07-CA:**261 Marine Street

Applicant: Barry and Stevi Gaston

Request: Replace windows, doors, gable siding and porch ironwork. Square off picket fence tops. Install privacy fence.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

- 10. 013-07-CA:**1318 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Sean Michael Lynch
Request: Replace the front door. Install new lighting, repaint and remove the iron rail on the front porch. Remove the tree stump. Extend the fence. Replace a non-historic extension with a new addition.

APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. Certified Record attached.

- 11. 014-07-CA:**1052 New St. Francis Street
Applicant: Keven Shaw
Request: Replace the rear of the residence that was removed by the previous owner with a new addition to allow for a finished 3/2 home.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

- 12. 015-07-CA:**153 Government Street
Applicant: Mobile County
Request: Remove the exterior of the courthouse annex for future development.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

135-06-CA: 1507 Springhill Avenue
Applicant: Charter South Inc.
Received: 12/27/06 (+45 Days: 02/10/07)
Meeting: 01/08/07
Resubmitted: 01/22/07 (+45 days: 03/08/07)
Meeting: 02/05/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-2
Project: Demolish existing building and build a convenience store with six gas pumps under a canopy.

BUILDING HISTORY

This is currently the Heritage Pharmacy. A part of the rear of the property is within Old Dauphin Way. Recently, Volunteers of America considered the site for a long-term shelter for Veterans, but later withdrew the application.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 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. This application was originally tabled to allow the applicant to meet with a Design Review Subcommittee.
- B. The Subcommittee recommended several changes to the building design (please see attached minutes).
- C. The Subcommittee recommended several site changes (please see attached minutes).
- D. Since the original application, staff has received phone calls from Old Dauphin Way neighbors who are concerned about the dumpster.

RECOMMENDATION

Per a phone conversation with Mr. Justin Smith of Saad and Vallas Realty Group, the applicants intend on moving the dumpster closer to Catherine Street behind the Master Cleaners (the site plan shows the dumpster on the Providence Street side). Mr. Smith has also contacted the applicants regarding additional information on the canopy, tenant window, iron fence and floodlights, which they intend to supply at the Board meeting (please see the attached email).

Staff recommends approval of Item B if the applicant has sufficiently addressed the building design concerns of the Board. Additionally, staff recommends approval of Item C if the applicant has sufficiently addressed the site concerns of the Board.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Justin Smith of Saad & Vallas and Ron Wiggins were present to discuss the application. They explained that the dumpster would be moved closer to Catherine Street and the dumpster enclosure would be sheathed in the same brick as the building with a wood gate.

Mr. Wiggins explained that there would be a 10 ft. landscaping buffer and that a 6 ft. iron fence is proposed for this area. They would also be willing to do a 6 ft. wood privacy fence. Staff noted that an 8 ft. fence would be possible, since it divided commercial from residential development.

The developers explained that the roof pitch of the building has been reduced and a dimensional shingle will be used.

A photo of a canopy with signage that will have brick piers was presented. The applicants agreed to place shields on the lights to direct light downward instead of into the neighborhood. Shields will also be placed on the parking lot lights. A drawing of a monument sign was also presented.

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

Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the fact that it would rather have the iron fence than the wood privacy fence.

FINDING OF FACT

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion was seconded by Jim Wagoner and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board and the amendments to the plans listed above, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued with the fence being iron as presented. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswalt and unanimously approved.

Following the Board's decision, Mr. Wiggins checked on the requirements placed on the project by the Planning Commission. A 6 ft. wood fence is required. The Board then agreed to that requirement.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 02/05/08.

APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS CERTIFIED RECORD

006-07-CA: 1138 Montauk Avenue

Applicant: Jennifer P. Clark, Hilda C. Clark and Larry H. Clark

Received: 01/15/07 (+45 Days: 03/01/07)

Meeting: 02/05/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way

Classification: Contributing

Zoning: R-1

Project: Restore exterior and rebuild the rear of the residence.

BUILDING HISTORY

This one-story frame Neo-Classical Revival residence was built circa 1904. The original rear section of the building was demolished at an undetermined date and a wood and concrete block addition replaced it. This unsympathetic expansion was removed in 2000. The residence is currently vacant.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 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. This residence has been vacant for several years; its exterior elements are in fair to poor condition. This application is a re-submittal of an approved proposal from August 2001 for the previous owners.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state that new additions “shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be...compatible with the massing, size, scale and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.”
- C. The proposed improvements include the following:
 1. Patch, repair or replace as required the rotted wood throughout the exterior – to include siding, trim, molding, columns, pilasters and any other wood elements – with materials that match existing in material, profile and dimension.
 2. Patch, repair or replace as required the asbestos roof shingles with materials that match existing in profile and dimension.
 3. Repair as required the existing wood doors and windows to maintain proper working condition.
 4. Retain the existing architectural elements of the building.
 5. Add a 32’-5” x 22’-0” extension with two bedrooms, a kitchen, a bath and a utility room at the rear of the residence.
 6. Match the materials and details on the new addition with the existing elements.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information contained in the application, the proposed work does not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district.

The proposed improvements in Item C1 consist of typical deferred maintenance issues. Item C2 seeks to sympathetically reconstruct a section of the building that was lost some time ago.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Catherine Clark was present to discuss the application. She expressed her intent to bring the house in conformity with the neighborhood. These are the same plans that were approved by the Board in 2001. The asbestos shingles on the existing roof will remain, however, gray shingles will be used on the new portion of the building. New wood windows will match those on the existing house.

When asked about the lack of windows on the right side/east elevation, she responded that there had been no windows on that side in the original house.

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

Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion was seconded by Jim Wagoner and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Jim Wagoner and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 02/05/08.

APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS CERTIFIED RECORD

007-07-CA:1122 Palmetto Street

Applicant: Mary Wallace

Received: 01/17/07 (+45 Days: 03/03/07)

Meeting: 02/05/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden

Classification: Contributing

Zoning: R-1

Project: Construct new 12'-0" x 12'-0" rear porch. Modify front porch layout. Replace Bungalow-style front porch columns with new wood columns and handrail.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to a previous survey from 1986, this two-story frame American Four-Square residence was built in 1895 for use as a rental property for Lawrence C. Crump. The exterior of the building was updated in 1920.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 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. This residence has a non-historic stepped wood deck at the rear surrounded by lush landscaping. The front porch, due to its heavy block columns on brick plinths, appears to have been updated in the Craftsman era and have since achieved historic significance.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state "historic porches should...reflect their period." Furthermore, although the rear deck is non-historic, its "form and shape...[and] materials should blend in with the style of the building."
- C. The proposed improvements include the following:
 1. Construct new 12'-0" x 12'-0" rear porch
 - a. The deck will be partially enclosed with a screen, wood columns and wood rail per submitted plans.
 - b. There will be a screen door on the north elevation of the new porch.
 - c. The roof will be extended forward and will match the existing pitch.
 - d. The remaining deck and surrounding landscape will be reworked per the submitted plans.
 2. Modify front porch layout to improve traffic flow
 - e. The existing masonry steps at the center bay will be removed.
 - f. Wood steps will be built at the left side bay (in front of the door) per the submitted plans.
 - g. A new Old Mobile brick sidewalk will be installed per the submitted plans.
 3. Replace Craftsman-style front porch columns with new wood columns and handrail
 - h. The existing columns will be replaced with new wood columns on wood piers per submitted plans.
 - i. A handrail will be added per submitted plans.
 - j. Decorative elements reminiscent of the Victorian era will be added to the front porch.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information contained in the application, the proposed work does not impair the historic integrity of the district. However, staff feels there are elements to the request that will impair the integrity of the building.

The proposed improvements in Item C1 affect an existing non-historic deck at the rear of the property. Item C2 is an unusual request and should be considered carefully. Although the Board has normally not approved moving front steps, the porch layout as it is hinders the usable space. Not only are two bays taken up by traffic flow, but also porch steps are typically in front of the door. The new layout will improve traffic flow and create a more useable porch; however, staff feels the historic Craftsman masonry steps should be rebuilt on the left-side bay rather than replaced by wood steps. Furthermore, the Craftsman columns outlined in Item C3 are a historic update of the residence that does not detract from its overall massing, scale and features.

Staff recommends approval of Item C1 as submitted. Staff recommends amending Items C2 and C3 to maintain the Craftsman elements, but still allow for moving the steps to improve traffic flow and installing a handrail.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Owner Peter Wallace and architect Douglas Kearley were present to discuss the application. They explained that the house has been Italianate in style originally and was not a Foursquare as described in MHDC files. They showed pictures of the Coleman House on Charles Street that looked very similar to the Wallace house prior to its renovations.

Staff explained that the Craftsman elements on the house dating from c.1920 are now historic.

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

Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record.

The Board questioned Staff regarding changes to the rear elevation. Staff had no objections to those changes since the deck was a new feature on the house.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

Harris Oswalt moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion was seconded by Jim Wagoner and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Harris Oswalt moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Joe Sackett and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 02/05/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

008-07-CA: 20 North Reed Street
Applicant: Ryan Friesen
Received: 01/18/07 (+45 Days: 03/04/07)
Meeting: 02/05/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Construct rear addition.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to a previous historic resource survey conducted in 1992, this one-story frame residence was built in 1926 as a source of rental income for Marie Van Antwerp. There was a one-story frame secondary structure on the property that was demolished in 2000.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 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. This residence currently has 1236 SF of living space. The rear yard, which abuts a common alley between North Reed and North Monterey, is very deep.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state that new additions “shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be...compatible with the massing, size, scale and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.”
- C. The proposed construction of a one-story rear addition with a side porch includes the following:
 - 1. Add a 972 SF extension at the rear that will rest on a 3’-0” continuous brick foundation.
 - 2. Match all materials and details to the existing elements, which includes pine lap siding with drip ledge, wood sash windows with true divided lights, a wood door, decorative gable brackets and a black shingle roof.
 - 3. Install a porch on the new north elevation with 5¼ wood decking on a 2x10 wood deck structure, round fiberglass columns and wood steps with rails at the right bay. The design of the rail has not been specified.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information contained in the application, the proposed work does not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district.

The proposed improvements in Item C are typical and common updates to increase living space in historic buildings. These improvements are compatible with the massing, size, scale and architectural features of the existing residence. However, staff will need more information on the design of the rail.

Staff is requesting more information on Item C3 and will be happy to provide the applicant with the MHDC stock rail design. Staff recommends approval of Items C1-2 as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Ryan Friesen was present to discuss the application. He explained that wood sash windows would match the existing windows. He stated that he would prefer to do brick steps on the addition, but that if he used wood steps, he would use a standard MHDC rail design.

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

Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, amending C3 to read: "Install a porch on the new north elevation with 5/4 wood decking on a 2 x 10 wood deck structure, round fiberglass columns and brick steps or wood steps with MHDC rail design at the right bay. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswalt and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswalt and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 02/05/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

009-07-CA: 17 North Monterey Street
Applicant: T. Chance and Jarita George
Received: 01/19/07 (+45 Days: 03/05/07)
Meeting: 02/05/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Extend the roof of the garage/storage structure by 28'-0" to create a carport.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to a previous historic resource survey conducted in 1981, Joseph P. Weatherbee built this two-story Neo-Classical Revival residence circa 1908.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 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. There is currently a non-historic garage/storage structure on the south side of the property. The driveway is extensively paved with concrete.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state that accessory structures "shall be measured by the guidelines applicable to new construction [and] should complement the design and scale of the main building."
- C. The plan for the garage/storage structure proposes to extend the roof 28'-0" to the north to create a two-car carport.
 - 1. The gable pitch will be maintained.
 - 2. The roof will rest on 6x6 pressure-treated wood posts.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the plan for the structure will negatively affect the integrity of the district.

The proposed improvement in Item C seeks to add additional unsympathetic elements to the driveway area south of the residence. Staff would also like to point out that although MHDC records show a 2002 approval for a crushed limestone driveway, the area has been significantly altered, enlarged and completely paved over with concrete.

Staff recommends denial of the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Chance George and his contractor, Ryan Friesen were present to discuss the application. Mr. George stated that he had concreted the back yard in 2002 when the fence was put up. The total structure will be approximately 57ft.

There are several large garages adjacent to the property. Once the gate fence is repaired, the structure would not be visible.

Mr. Friesen added that the posts will be wrapped and detailed, shingles will match the existing roofing material. There was no one else to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

James Wagoner moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswald and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Jim Wagoner moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswald and passed with Joe Sackett voting in opposition.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 02/05/08.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF COMMENTS

010-07-CA: 263 North Joachim Street
Applicant: Alan and Sharlyn Jones
Received: 01/22/07 (+45 Days: 03/08/07)
Meeting: 02/05/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: DeTonti Square
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: RB
Project: Build wall along the south property line. Raise existing gate to 6'-0".

BUILDING HISTORY

According to a previous historic resource survey from 1977-78, this two-story Queen Anne was built in 1894 as the rectory of Trinity Episcopal Church. This residence was attached to an existing two-story brick building constructed circa 1857 by Robert Greig.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 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. This residence sits next to the NSA Agencies office at 261 North Joachim. There had been some landscaping within the small green space at the rear of the two properties; however, it was removed at the request of the agency. There is already a masonry wall partially separating the properties.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state that fences, walls and gates "...should compliment the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic Districts."
- C. The proposed improvements include the following:
 - 1. Construct a masonry wall along the south property line per the submitted plans
 - a. The wall will be 8" concrete blocks with 16x16 pilasters set every 8'-9' on concrete footing.
 - b. It will be finished with stucco and antique white paint.
 - c. It will be capped with Old Mobile or similar brick.
 - d. The wall will begin 40' from the curb.
 - e. It will extend west for 30' at a height of 6'.
 - f. It will extend west a further 55' at a height of 8'.
 - 2. Raise the existing gate to 6' with materials to match existing.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information contained in the application the proposed work does not impair the historic integrity of the district. However, staff feels that there are elements to the request that will impair the historic integrity of the building.

The proposed wall in Item C1 complements the building, and these types of walls are common in this district. Conversely, staff feels that Item C2 – raising the wood picket-style privacy gate to a height of 6' – would detract from the building and suggests that either keeping the current gate or installing a 6' open ironwork gate would be a more suitable alternative.

Staff recommends approval of Item C1 and denial of Item C2.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

The owners were present to discuss the application. Mr. Jones explained that there are other similar walls in the neighborhood and that its construction will block the commercial building next door. He intends to build a block wall and seal it so that the blocks will not show. The wall will also have a cap in order to prevent water infiltration into the wall. He stated that there is about 2'5" from the adjoiningadjoining house at the front and 2'3" at the rear.

Board members suggested using a fiberglass mesh over the blocks to mask the lines of the blocks. Board members also suggested using an iron gate rather than a board gate.

Mr. Jones commented that an iron fence, although it may be appropriate, will not afford the privacy that he and his wife are seeking. It would also be as expensive as the entire wall construction. The Board asked the owners if they would work with Staff to find a more appropriate gate solution and they consented.

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

Staff had no comments from the public, including the owner of 261 N. Joachim, or city departments to read into the record.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board expressed extreme concern about the finish on the concrete block. It was the members' opinion that concrete block walls were not appropriate for the historic districts if the lines of the wall showed through the finish. The Board asked staff what type of enforcement was available to ensure that the finish on the wall completely covered the joints. Staff noted that if the covering of the joints was a requirement of the Board, a ticket could be issued if the finish did not meet that standard. Tilmon Borwn pointed out that the wall on Canal Street in Church Street East did not have that condition and it was an impairment to the historic character of the neighborhood.

FINDING OF FACT

Tilmon Brown motioned that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswalt and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application for the wall does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued contingent upon a stucco like finish being used that will hide all the cmu lines. In addition, he moved to table the application for the gate in order that the applicant could work with Staff and return to the Board with the design. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswalt and unanimously approved

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: wall-02/05/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

011-07-CA: 1402 Government Street
Applicant: RBC Centura Bank/Florida Certified Sign Erectors
Received: 01/22/07 (+45 Days: 03/08/07)
Meeting: 02/05/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-2
Project: Replace AmSouth signs with RBC Centura signs.

BUILDING HISTORY

This masonry commercial building was built in the latter half of the twentieth century. A drive-thru canopy was added in 2000.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 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. This building is currently an AmSouth, which has recently been bought out by RBC Centura.
- B. The Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile state that signs shall “not obscure the architectural features or openings of a building...shall relate to the design of the principal building on the property...shall be in proportion to the building and the neighboring structures and signs...should match the historic materials of the building...[and] shall use focused, low intensity illumination.”
- C. The proposed sign package includes the following:
 - 1. Install a 50 SF (25 SF per face) double-faced, high-density polyfoam monument sign with either aluminum or high-density PVC letters at location one.
 - 2. Install two 18 SF wall signs with individually mounted aluminum letters at locations two & three, totaling 36 SF.
 - 3. Install two 3 SF single-faced aluminum free standing signs at locations five & six, totaling 6 SF.
 - 4. Install a 1 SF aluminum wall sign at location seven with no commercial message.
 - 5. Install a 6 SF aluminum wall sign at location eight with no commercial message.
 - 6. Install an 8 SF (4 SF per face) double-faced aluminum monument sign at the entrance (Dir 1) with no commercial message.
 - 7. Install a 4 SF single-faced aluminum monument sign at the exit (Dir 2) with no commercial message.
 - 8. Install three small adhesive vinyl signs totaling approximately 2 SF at the front door.
 - 9. Install two small adhesive vinyl signs totaling approximately 2 SF at the drive-thru window with no commercial message.
 - 10. Place the new signs at the locations of the current signs per submitted plans. All will be unlit.
 - 11. The total sign package is approximately 94 SF; the Board cannot approve more than 64 SF.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the plan for the building will not negatively affect the historic integrity of the building or the district.

The signs in Item C1-9 will be replacing the previous AmSouth signs, located at the same points and unlit.

Staff recommends that the Board approve the sign materials and design, and support the total square footage. The applicant will need to receive a variance from the Board of Zoning Adjustment.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Neither the applicant nor his representative was present to discuss the application. There was no one else to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board did not feel that the high density foam chosen for the monument sign was appropriate and perhaps the ironwork from the existing AmSouth signs could be incorporated in the design.

FINDING OF FACT

Jim Wagoner moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswald and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines, with the exception of the monument sign noted in C.1., and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued for all signs except the monument sign. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswald and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 02/05/08.

APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS CERTIFIED RECORD

012-07-CA: 261 Marine Street
Applicant: Barry and Stevi Gaston
Received: 01/22/07 (+45 Days: 03/08/07)
Meeting: 02/05/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Replace windows and doors. Replace gable siding. Replace lacy porch ironwork. Square off picket fence tops. Install privacy fence.

BUILDING HISTORY

This one-story frame Bungalow was built in the first half of the twentieth century.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 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. This residence is currently vacant.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines call for new exterior materials, finishes and elements – such as windows and doors – to reflect the age and style of the building.
- C. The proposed improvements include the following:
 1. Replace the porch ironwork with 10x10 square wood posts with capitals and a wood rail (per MHDC stock design).
 2. Replace the Jalousie and aluminum awning windows on the sides and rear with framed wood 6/6 sash windows with true divided lights.
 3. Replace each Chicago window on the front with three wood, 30”, 15-light French doors with true divided lights.
 4. Replace the front door with an antique Oak single-light door.
 5. Replace the gable lap siding with wood shingles and add brackets to the porch gable.
 6. Repair, sand and paint the remaining lap siding (colors to be decided later).
 7. Square off the tops of the existing picket fence.
 8. Install a 6’ wood privacy fence at the south boundary to match the one at the north boundary.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the plan for the residence will not negatively affect the historic integrity of the building or the district.

The difficulty with Items C1-8 is that many of the old updates are now historic. Nonetheless, staff feels that most are incompatible and appropriately removed. The delicate-looking ironwork on the front porch conflicts with the heavy feel of a Bungalow. Furthermore, both the Jalousie and aluminum awning-style windows and the doors appear awkward on this building. The fences are non-historic.

Staff recommends approval of Items C1-4 and C6-8 as submitted. Staff recommends denial of Item C5, which seeks to apply “historical” elements where none previously existed.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Neither the applicant nor his representative was present to discuss the application. There was no one else to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board questioned Staff regarding the shingles proposed for the gable end. Staff reported that the shingles are curved.

FINDING OF FACT

David Barr moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswalt and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Jim Wagoner moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswalt and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 02/05/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

013-07-CA: 1318 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Sean Michael Lynch
Received: 01/22/07 (+45 Days: 03/08/07)
Meeting: 02/05/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Replace the front door. Install new lighting, repaint and remove the iron rail on the front porch. Remove the tree stump. Extend the fence. Widen driveway. Replace a non-historic extension with a new addition.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to a historic resource survey from 1985, this one-story frame Classical Revival residence was built in 1894 for Ella Spotswood. The present façade is a circa 1910 alteration.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 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. This residence is currently vacant. The present owners plan on renovating it as their residence. The current driveway is very narrow and poses a safety concern for those wishing to enter or exit.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines call for new exterior materials, finishes and elements – such as windows and doors – to reflect the age and style of the building.
- C. The proposed plan includes the following:
 - 1. Extend the 6’ privacy fence around the property perimeter and add a 2’ lattice trim at the top.
 - 2. Replace the front door with a new door per the submitted drawing.
 - 3. Replace the globe wall sconces with new lights.
 - 4. Install new can lights in the porch ceiling.
 - 5. Remove the iron rails on the front steps.
 - 6. Repaint the porch ceiling, deck and steps per the submitted colors.
 - 7. Remove the tree stump and rebuild that section of the privacy fence.
 - 8. Widen the driveway.
 - 9. Replace the non-historic addition and carport with a new addition and garage per the submitted plans.
 - a. The residence will rest on brick piers and match the Classical features of the main residence to include a hipped roof, Classical columns, French doors with transoms and true divided lights, and sash windows with true divided lights.
 - b. The new addition will include a rear porch with steps. Details of the rail design have not been specified.
 - c. The garage will sit on a sloped concrete pad.
 - d. A breezeway will connect the residence to the garage.
 - e. All exterior materials will match existing materials.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that there are elements to the request that will impair the historic integrity of the building and the district.

Although the proposed front door is an attractive and appropriate option, staff remains guarded about removing the current historic door as well as the wall sconces. Also, the Design Review Guidelines only allow 6' privacy fences in residential areas unless the residence abuts a commercial property. The proposed improvements call for a 6' fence with a 2' decorative trim, which would raise the fence to 8'.

The proposed addition is a sensitive extension of the main residence, which will increase living space for the applicant, and the proposed garage is a sensitive replacement of the current non-historic carport. Widening the driveway would make entering and exiting the property safer. The proposed can lights, paint and rail removal will not adversely affect the residence.

The applicant has not specified the design of the handrail or the garage doors. Staff will be happy to provide the applicant with the MHDC stock rail design. The applicant has also not specified the proposed replacements for the globe wall sconces at the front porch.

Staff recommends approval of Items C4-9 (with the inclusion of appropriate rail and garage door design). Staff recommends denial of Items C2-3. Staff recommends amending Item C1 to a total of 6'.

The applicant will need to contact Urban Forestry regarding a tree that may be affected by the wider driveway. The applicant will also need to contact Traffic Engineering about widening the curb cut.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Cher Cooper and Sean Michael Lynch, in addition to Crosby Latham, were present to discuss the application. Ms. Cooper explained that she had wanted to keep the entrance door sidelights and fanlight and have the lead cams repaired. Looking at many houses in the adjacent area, she felt that the door should have the same leaded glass pattern. In fact, the existing door is not the original door.

Crosby Latham explained the need to widen the existing 10 ft. driveway even as much as 2 ft. since it was difficult to turn into the drive and the existence of a large oak made visibility exiting the drive impossible.

Ms. Cooper explained that the lot went north behind numerous properties on N. Julia Street that were in varying degrees of disrepair. The request for a 6 ft. privacy fence with 2 ft. of lattice on top is an effort to both visually block out these properties and provide privacy.

Board members suggested limiting the fence to 6 ft. at the front of the house and beginning the 8 ft. fence at the addition. The applicants felt they could agree to the compromise.

Board members requested that the garage doors be wood or mimic wood doors and stated that there are many series of doors available today that would be appropriate to the district.

Urban Development Department will have to be contacted regarding the tree and Traffic Engineering consulted regarding increasing the size of the curb cut.

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

Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report amending fact 8 to read: "Widen the driveway to a maximum of 12 ft." The motion was seconded by David Barr and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued conditioned upon the fence remaining 6 ft. tall at the front and rising to 8 ft. at the point of the addition. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswald and failed on a 3 to 3 tie vote.

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued conditioned upon the fence being 6 ft. in height. The motion was seconded by David Barr and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 02/05/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

014-07-CA: 1052 New St. Francis Street
Applicant: Keven Shaw
Received: 01/22/07 (+45 Days: 03/08/07)
Meeting: 02/05/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Replace the rear of the residence that was removed by the previous owner with a new addition to allow for a finished 3/2 home.

BUILDING HISTORY

Although previous research on this Creole Cottage is inconclusive, it has been dated to circa 1920 due to the number of updates and modifications it has endured. However, this is an older section of the city, and records show that a one-story frame residence built as a source of rental income for the Warley-Rondeau family was here as early as 1862.

Previous owners demolished the rear section of the house in 2006 during an attempted restoration after Hurricane Katrina. The house is currently vacant.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 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. This one-bedroom/one-bath residence is currently in fair to poor condition and has been vacant for at least two years.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state that new additions “shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be...compatible with the massing, size, scale and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.”
- C. The proposed construction of a one-story rear addition includes the following:
 - 1. Add a two-bedroom/one-bath extension at the rear that will rest on brick piers to match existing.
 - a. All exterior trim will be wood to match existing.
 - b. The windows will be painted aluminum/vinyl and similar to existing in style.
 - c. The siding will be Hardiplank that mimics the existing reveal.
 - 2. Reclad the entire roof (both existing and proposed) with 30-year Timberline shingles.
 - 3. Paint the residence with Benjamin Moore Hampshire Gray (body), Benjamin Moore Cream Silk (trim) and black (shutters, window sashes and foundation).

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information contained in the application, staff feels that some of the material choices will impair the historic integrity of the building.

The proposed improvements in Item C seek to sympathetically reconstruct a section of the building that was recently lost. Nonetheless, aluminum or vinyl windows with artificial muntins are inappropriate for additions to historic buildings. Furthermore, while Hardiplank siding is not specifically called out in the Guidelines, the Board has only approved this material for new construction in historic districts.

Staff recommends approval of Items C2-3 as submitted. Staff recommends amending Item C1 to install wood siding and wood sash windows with true divided lights.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Keven Shaw was present to discuss the application. Mr. Shaw explained that he would prefer to use Hardiboard, particularly on the side close to the neighbor, but that he would use wood if it were required. He also stated that he had located a source for wood windows with true divided lights and would use those rather than the aluminum or vinyl windows originally proposed. The front windows would become 2/2 windows to match the remaining windows on the building.

There was no one else to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report with the following amendments: siding to be wood, windows to be wood with true divided lights, front windows to be 2/2 wood to match the remaining windows on the building. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswald and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board in the staff report and in the public hearing, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswald and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 02/05/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

015-07-CA: 153 Government Street (alternately 109 Government and 151 Government)
Applicant: Mobile County/Holmes and Holmes, Architects
Received: 01/22/07 (+45 Days: 03/08/07)
Meeting: 02/05/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Contributing (Levert House), Non-Contributing (Court Annex Building)
Zoning: B-4
Project: Remove the exterior of the courthouse annex for future development.

BUILDING HISTORY

The courthouse annex was a part of the larger courthouse complex, which was demolished last year. The building was constructed around the circa 1856 Levert House, an important historical landmark of the city. The Levert House is currently the home of the Mobile Bar Association.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 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 interior of the annex is currently being demolished for the proposed building expansion.
- B. The plan calls to remove the façade of the court annex building and the surrounding trees (the building itself will not be demolished) for the proposed renovation and expansion.
- C. The courthouse annex is not considered historic and is a non-contributing building in the district.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information contained in the application, the proposed work does not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district.

The courthouse annex is exempt from city jurisdiction save for the MHDC, which has authority based on State enabling legislation. Therefore, all proposed improvements for this address must come through the Architectural Review Board. Because the Board is the only entity responsible for the ultimate plans for the property, staff feels it necessary to emphasize certain aspects of the project not usual in most applications.

Staff is concerned about the physical impact (vibration, etc) that demolition and construction of this scale may have on nearby historic buildings – particularly the Levert House, which sits on the property and on which the MHDC holds an easement. Staff feels the Board should require an assurance from the applicants that every care will be taken to protect the surrounding historic properties.

Staff is also very concerned about the Oak trees on the property. The proposed improvements call for removing the trees; however, staff feels that their removal would impair Government Street and the surrounding neighborhood. The applicants must be encouraged to maintain and protect them.

Staff recommends approval of the application with assurances for the protection of the trees and surrounding historic resources.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Tyler Martin representing Mobile County, Susan Gallagher from Goodwyn, Mills and Cawood, Inc. and Nick Holmes Jr. were present to discuss the application.

Mr. Holmes stated that he was concerned for the structural integrity of adjacent buildings. With that in mind, auger cast pilings will be drilled to minimize vibration. Drainage problems exist on the site that will become worse as the existing trees grow. He asked to be able to remove the trees since relocation elsewhere on the site will not be possible. In consultation with the Urban Forester, David Daughenbaugh commented that the trees had root decay, die back and that half of the tree canopy will be lost as a result of the proposed construction.

Mr. Holmes stated that there are 2 basic design schemes—the one shown at the meeting and one that is more traditional.

Board members inquired whether the applicants would work with a Design Committee on the building design. The applicants agreed.

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

Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Bunky Ralph set up a Design Committee consisting of Tilmon Brown, Jim Wagoner and Harris Oswalt. Staff will set up the Committee meeting.

FINDING OF FACT

James Wagoner moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswalt and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Harris Oswalt moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by David Barr and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 02/05/08.