

CITY OF MOBILE
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

Minutes of the Meeting
June 25, 2007

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:03p.m. by Chair Bunky Ralph.

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

Members Present: Robert Brown, Tilmon Brown, Carlos Gant, Harris Oswalt, Bunky Ralph, Craig Roberts, Barja Wilson.

Members Absent: Michael Mayberry, Cameron Pfeiffer, Jim Wagoner.

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

<u>In Attendance</u>	<u>Mailing Address/Email Address</u>
Pam Sterrett	P.O. Box 1606 Daphne 36526
Maria Goolsby	118 N. Julia St. 36604
Mona Mathurin	121 N. Julia St. 36604
Mike Cowart	1776 Independence Court Ste. 102, Birmingham 35216
Jim Torbert	108 N. Julia St. 36604
Marina and Stuart Clotworthy	8 N. Reed Ave. 36604
Scott Gonzalez	4 St. Emanuel St. 36602
William S. Benbow	304 Little Flower 36606 billb@dpgulfcoast.com
Norman Pharr	510 Monroe St. 36602
Wayne Goolsby	118 N. Julia St. 36604
Roger Franz	207 S. Cedar St. 36602
Donna Franz	207 S. Cedar St. 36602
Douglas Kearley	120 Wisteria Ave. 36607
Gabriel Tynes	20 Kenneth St.
Janine Stebbins	1056 Government St. 36604

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:** Affordable Roofing
Property Address: 1004 Charleston Street
Date of Approval: May 30, 2007
Install new architectural shingle roof, charcoal in color.
- Applicant's Name:** Wesley Blackshear (executor of the estate of Harriet C. Strong)
Property Address: 10 South Lafayette Street
Date of Approval: May 31, 2007
Recall the roof with Owens Corning 3-tab shingles in either Estate Gray or Quarry Gray. Repair/replace rotted wood elements throughout the exterior with materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Repaint the residence in the following Behr Premium colors:

 - Body (including the previously painted Brick Chimney and Columns) – Koala Bear, 780D4
 - Trim – White
 - Concrete Pillar Tops, Porch Decking – Witch Hazel, 780D6

3. **Applicant's Name:** David Rasp
Property Address: 72 South Royal Street
Date of Approval: June 1, 2007
Install temporary fencing: 6x8 posts with lattice infill. Fence to be removed within six months or a permanent Certificate of Appropriateness obtained from the Architectural Review Board. Fence to be erected along the south side and rear property line.

4. **Applicant's Name:** Malloy, Rubenstein, Rosenthal and Ezell LLC
Property Address: 109 North Pine Street
Date of Approval: June 1, 2007
Repair rotted wood as necessary with new materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Paint the building in the following Sherwin Williams colors:
 - Body – Colonial Revival Yellow, SW2830
 - Trim – White

5. **Applicant's Name:** Malloy, Rubenstein, Rosenthal and Ezell LLC
Property Address: 108 North Pine Street
Date of Approval: June 1, 2007
Repair rotted wood as necessary with new materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Paint the building in the following BLP colors:
 - Body – Hazlet House, RC8
 - Trim – White

6. **Applicant's Name:** Preston Bolt/Fred South Construction
Property Address: 162 South Georgia Street
Date of Approval: June 4, 2007
Repair the porch roof – open up tar and gravel roof over front porch where there is a hole, determine extent of the damage, assess cost of repairs, temporarily cover opened area until repairs can be made and remove debris from site.

7. **Applicant's Name:** Yolanda Riddick
Property Address: 504 St. Francis Street
Date of Approval: June 5, 2007
Repair rotted wood as necessary with new materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Paint the residence in the existing color scheme.

8. **Applicant's Name:** Callie Andrade's
Property Address: 21 South Julia Street
Date of Approval: June 6, 2007
Repair/replace rotten porch deck with new 1x4 tongue and groove. Paint new materials to match existing color scheme.

9. **Applicant's Name:** Don Salter
Property Address: 1201 New St. Francis Street
Date of Approval: June 7, 2007
Remove the remaining non-historic shed that was damaged in Katrina. Construct a basic carport structure per MHDC stock plans with one car bay and a storage area (Floor Plan #3).

10. **Applicant's Name:** Neuse Properties
Property Address: 51 North Julia Street
Date of Approval: June 7, 2007
Repaint the residence in the existing color scheme.

11. **Applicant's Name:** Gulf Construction
Property Address: 57 North Broad Street
Date of Approval: June 7, 2007
 Repair roof with materials to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Repair/replace rotten wood with new materials to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Paint new materials to match existing color scheme.
12. **Applicant's Name:** Louis Felids
Property Address: 206 South Broad Street
Date of Approval: June 8, 2007
 Repair roof with materials to match existing slate roof in profile and dimension. Repair water damaged wood on fascia and siding as necessary with materials to match existing in profile and dimension. Paint new materials in existing color scheme. This is a renewal of the COA dated February 21, 2005.
13. **Applicant's Name:** Oren Kickliter
Property Address: 31 South Lafayette Street
Date of Approval: June 11, 2007
 Repaint building in the existing color scheme.
14. **Applicant's Name:** Earline Dennis
Property Address: 208 South Dearborn Street
Date of Approval: June 11, 2007
 Repair/replace rotten wood with materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Repaint to match the existing colors. Install a new 3-tab shingle roof in Charcoal.

NOTICES OF VIOLATION and MUNICIPAL OFFENSE TICKETS

1. No NOVs or MOTs were issued.

OLD BUSINESS

1. **071-07-CA:**115-117 North Julia Street
Applicant: Springhill Avenue Corporation
Request: New construction.

APPLICANT REFERRED TO DESIGN COMMITTEE. Certified Record attached.

NEW BUSINESS

2. **087-07-CA:**13 Common Street (Withdrawn)
Applicant: Shari Webster
Request: Approve existing privacy fence.

APPLICATION WITHDRAWN. Fence approved by Urban Development Department.

3. **088-07-CA:**1005 Government Street
Applicant: Bill and Leslie Cutts
Request: Install metal awnings at the carriage doors.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

4. **089-07-CA:66 South Royal Street**
Applicant: Mike Cowart of Cowart Hospitality Services LLC
Request: Install shutters on the north elevation. Clean and repair the north wall.

TABLED. Certified Record attached.
5. **090-07-CA:1564 Blair Avenue**
Applicant: Cynthia Karns
Request: Replace the chain link fence with a privacy fence.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.
6. **091-07-CA:1750 Government Street**
Applicant: Paul and Sheila Gerhardt
Request: Extend the existing privacy fence. Repair/repave the existing driveway and walkway.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.
7. **092-07-CA:4 St. Emanuel Street**
Applicant: Scott Gonzalez
Request: Repair windows on upper floors. Temporarily board the storefronts. Repaint.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.
8. **093-07-CA:56 North Monterey Street**
Applicant: Gene and Teresa Coleman
Request: Construct a rear garage.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.
9. **094-07-CA:207 South Cedar Street**
Applicant: Norman Pharr
Request: Replace the existing front door.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.
10. **096-07-CA:20 Kenneth Street**
Applicant: Jean Ellen and Gabriel Tynes
Request: Install a privacy fence.

APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. Certified Record attached.
11. **097-07-CA:1056 Government Street**
Applicant: Janine Stebbins
Request: Replace the existing damaged roof with new cast-cement tiles.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.
12. **098-07-CA:8 North Reed Avenue**
Applicant: Stuart Clotworthy
Request: Replace the existing fence. Repaint in the existing colors. Demolish the shed.

APPROVED AS AMENDED. Certified Record attached.

13. 099-07-CA:400 Michigan Avenue

Applicant: June Chambliss/Norman Pharr

Request: Expand rear addition, reconfiguring gable. Add access ramp.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

OTHER BUSINESS and ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Tabled items. Items that are tabled by the Board will be heard no sooner than two meetings following the tabling. This is due to the fact that submissions to the Board are due the same day as a meeting.
2. There will be a Traditional Building Conference and Exhibition in New Orleans October 17-20. Mark your calendars for this event.
3. The Board looked at a sample Kolbe and Kolbe window that approximated true divided lights that was hurricane rated. The Board felt this could be appropriate for new construction.
4. Bill Benbow of Distinctive Products was present and stated that he would like to work with the ARB on developing standards for hurricane protective shutters—for example, shutters with a flat finish would appear more like wood than the shiny finish put on most hurricane shutters.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

071-07-CA: 115-117 North Julia Street
Applicant: Springhill Avenue Corporation
Received: 05/10/07 (+45 Days: 06/26/07)
Meeting: 05/24/07
Resubmitted: 06/07/07
Meeting: 06/25/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-1
Project: Construct 8 new townhouses.

BUILDING HISTORY

There is currently a vacant lot on these two properties.

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. As mentioned above, this is currently a vacant lot. Staff has received many calls of concern regarding the proposed construction.
- B. The Guidelines for New Residential and Commercial Construction state “the goal of new construction should be to blend into the historic district but to avoid creating a false sense of history.”
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
 - 1. Construct eight new affordable townhouses – two buildings with four residences each – per the submitted plans.
 - a. The buildings will sit in an L-shape on the lot per the submitted plans and have floating slab foundations.
 - b. They will be clad in Hardiplank siding per the submitted plans.
 - c. The front doors will be wood with a fan light and four decorative panels per the submitted plans.
 - d. The rear doors will be steel fiberglass or wood with six decorative panels per the submitted plans.
 - e. The windows will be vinyl-clad wood 1/1 sashes per the submitted plans.
 - f. There will be a stoop with three steps leading to each of the paired front and rear doors per the submitted plans.
 - g. Ornamentation will be minimal, consisting of a water table and iron vents at the foundation, lintels at the windows and handrails, which have not been defined.

- h. There will be 16 parking spaces on a lot in the center of the property; the lot will be asphalt or a concrete aggregate per the submitted plans.
- 2. Extend the existing privacy fence on the south side per the requirements of Urban Development.

RECOMMENDATION

Although the applicant altered the building significantly from the original design in order to better fit the neighborhood, staff believes that, based on the new information submitted in the proposal, the proposed construction will still impair the historic integrity of the district.

The proposed construction does not follow the setback and orientation pattern of residences in the vicinity. The two buildings are oriented in an L-shape in order to fit them on the lot, which leaves a side elevation facing the street. There is very little ornamentation to connect it to the streetscape. The massing and scale of the buildings, including the first-floor heights and the roof pitches, are not proportional to the buildings typical of the street. Although, per a previous suggestion, the applicant did install taller windows on the first floor in order to give the illusion of height, there is still a dis-connect between the scale of this building to the rest of the street. Other ornamentation such as the front stoops, 4x4 wood porch posts, doors and window lintels have little connection to the existing housing stock on the block.

There are many elements that staff feels should be changed in order to better blend into the district, some of which are increasing the height of the floors, adding decorative features to the 4x4 posts such as caps and bases, defining the handrail, enlarging the overhang, altering the pitch of the roof, installing a wider fascia and reconfiguring the side elevation that faces the street.

Staff recommends denying the application and suggests that the owner meet with the design committee.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

The applicant, Pam Sterrett, was present to discuss the application. She requested that her application be referred to the Design Committee, as recommended in the Staff report,

There were numerous residents who lived adjacent to the proposed project who wished to speak in opposition to it. The Board heard comments from these residents.

Mr. Torbert from 108 N. Julia stated that there were too many units proposed for the site. With little parking on site, overflow parking would fill the adjacent streets.

Wayne Goolsby of 118 N. Julia Street felt that there were too many units and the design was incompatible with the neighborhood.

Those residents present felt that one single family house on each lot would be more appropriate to the neighborhood. There was also commentary concerning the need for a design professional to improve the current design.

In response to neighbor comments, Ms. Sterrett stated that she employed a draftsman in the early stages of the project, but that a different professional would be hired later in the project's development.

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

There was no finding of fact.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Chair Bunky Ralph appointed a Design Committee consisting of Craig Roberts, Tilmon Brown and Carlos Gant. Staff member Aileen de la Torre will set up a Design Committee meeting with the applicant.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

087-07-CA: 13 Common Street
Applicant: Shari Webster
Received: 05/22/07 (+45 Days: 07/06/07)
Meeting: 06/25/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Approve the existing 10'-0" privacy fence.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this one-story frame Sidehall residence was built circa 1907 for Alida Parker. The Italianate handrail was added in 1976 when the building was renovated. The rear deck was added in 1996.

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 an 8'-0" fence that sits on the rear deck, which is raised 2'-0" from the ground. Therefore, the total fence height is 10'-0". Urban Development recently cited Ms. Webster regarding the height of the fence. The MHDC has also received complaints regarding the height of the fence.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, "[Fences] should complement the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District. The height of solid fences in historic districts is generally restricted to six feet, however, if a commercial property or multi-family housing adjoins the subject property, an eight-foot fence may be considered. The finished side of the fence should face toward public view. All variances required by the Board of Zoning Adjustment must be obtained prior to issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness."
- C. The proposed work asks to approve the existing 10'-0" wood privacy fence.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the proposed work will impair the historic integrity of the building and the district. The existing fence is 10'-0" tall, which is above the 6'-0" height limit maintained by the Board. Moreover, it is above the 8'-0" limit allowed per the City's Zoning Ordinance.

Staff recommends that the fence be reduced to a total height of 6'-0".

This application has been withdrawn. Urban Development has allowed Ms. Webster to keep the fence after she signed an affidavit stating the fence has been there since 1996.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

088-07-CA: 1005 Government Street
Applicant: Bill and Leslie Cutts
Received: 05/30/07 (+45 Days: 07/14/07)
Meeting: 06/25/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-2
Project: Install metal awnings at the carriage doors.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, George Cox built this residence circa 1865 for George Rapelje. Some exterior modifications were by George Rogers in 1906. The rear Carriage House is contemporary with the main building, having been constructed in 1865 with exterior modifications done in 1906. By the 1980s, Rogers' additions to the Carriage House had severely deteriorated and subsequent renovations removed much of it.

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 are currently no awnings on the Carriage House. As mentioned above, it has gone through a number of major alterations throughout the years, including the removal of the Rogers addition.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines call for renovations to be sympathetic to the age and style of the building. The Guidelines also state, "Awnings will be reviewed on a case by case basis."
- C. The proposed work will install 3'-4" by 2'-0" standing seam copper awnings at the carriage doors per the submitted plans and specifications.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the proposed work will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district. The proposed awnings, which are minor and sympathetic additions to the property, will be located on a secondary structure that has undergone a number of modifications located behind the main residence.

Staff recommends approving the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Architect Douglas Kearley was present to discuss the application. He explained that the proposed carriage house awnings would be copper.

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 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 and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswald and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 06/25/08.

APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS CERTIFIED RECORD

089-07-CA: 66 South Royal Street
Applicant: Mike Cowart of Cowart Hospitality Services LLC
Received: 06/04/07 (+45 Days: 07/19/07)
Meeting: 06/25/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Install shutters on the north elevation. Clean and repair the north wall.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this two-story commercial building with an ornamental concrete block façade was built circa 1899. An iron balcony was added in 1999 based on historic maps of the property. The building has been a number of things, including a clothing store and a leather goods store. It is now a bar/restaurant.

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. Cowart Hospitality Services LLC, which is building a Hampton Inn next to this building, will be locating their pool/courtyard area next to Veets’ north wall. Therefore, they have obtained an easement from Veets to decorate and maintain it. This wall currently has a number of bricked-in windows and is in need of cleaning and minor repairs.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “Blinds and shutters were integral functional components of historic buildings. Blinds and shutters should be sized to fit the reveal of the window opening precisely. Operable units, hung with appropriate hinges are encouraged. Where blinds or shutters must be fixed, they should be hung on the window casing in a manner to replicate those that are operable.” The Guidelines also state that because mortar mixtures are significantly different today, “particular care must be taken with masonry [when exterior repair is needed, and applicants must] consult with staff concerning the mortar mixture for repointing historic brick. Bricks and mortar should match the original in color, finish (strike) and thickness.”
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
 - 1. Install non-operable wood shutters on the north elevation of the building per the submitted drawings and specifications.
 - 2. Clean and repair the north wall to include removing vegetation and unused conduit, repairing and repointing the masonry and repainting.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the changes will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district. Although the shutters will be fixed, they will be sized to fit within the window openings and be hung to appear operable. The remaining work is basic repair and maintenance, although, as mentioned above, an appropriate mortar mixture must be used.

Staff recommends approving the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mike Cowart was present to discuss the application. He explained that he was representing the Hampton Inn. The Inn has an easement on the north wall of 66 N. Royal Street and it is the hotel's intention to clean the side of the building. He stated that the brick would not be sandblasted. Staff offered that a Preservation Brief explained the safe methods of brick cleaning and that a copy would be provided to the applicant. Mr. Cowart agreed to retain the ghost of an old Coca Cola sign visible on the wall.

Mr. Cowart further explained that the windows on the north wall would be shuttered in order to provide privacy for the new pool area. Shutters would be installed with an 8 inch offset to provide light into the building.

The Board began a dialog with Mr. Cowart regarding the need to make the shutters appear authentic by adding hardware and placing them within the window opening.

Mr. Cowart responded that an alternative to shuttering the windows would be to construct a wall to obscure the north side of 66 N. Royal Street.

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 tabling the application.

FINDING OF FACT

There was no finding of fact.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Tilmon Brown moved to table the application pending the submission of alternate ways of shuttering the windows. The motion was seconded by Bobby Brown and unanimously approved.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

090-07-CA: 1564 Blair Avenue
Applicant: Cynthia Karns
Received: 06/06/07 (+45 Days: 07/21/07)
Meeting: 06/25/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Replace the chain link fence with an 8'-0" and 6'-0" privacy fence.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this one-story brick residence was built in 1981.

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 damaged chain link fence around the rear yard. The back property line abuts an apartment complex.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, "[Fences] should complement the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District. The height of solid fences in historic districts is generally restricted to six feet, however, if a commercial property or multi-family housing adjoins the subject property, an eight-foot fence may be considered. The finished side of the fence should face toward public view."
- C. The proposed work will replace the current metal chain link fence with an 8'-0" dog-eared wood privacy fence along the north boundary and a 6'-0" dog-eared wood privacy fence along the east and west boundaries to the back corners of the residence. There will be 6'-0" tall wood gates at the south lines of the fence.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the proposed work will not impair the historic integrity of the district. As mentioned above, the rear property line abuts an apartment complex, whose residents often cut through Ms. Karns' yard; therefore, the 8'-0" fence for the rear boundary would be appropriate. The remaining fence falls within the standards of the Design Review Guidelines.

Staff recommends approving the application.

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

There was no Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

Harris Oswald 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 Tilmon Brown and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Harris Oswald 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 Tilmon Brown and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 06/25/08.

APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS CERTIFIED RECORD

091-07-CA: 1750 Government Street
Applicant: Paul and Sheila Gerhardt
Received: 06/06/07 (+45 Days: 07/21/07)
Meeting: 06/25/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-3
Project: Extend the existing privacy fence. Repair and repave the existing driveway and walkway.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this two-story brick apartment building was built circa 1930.

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 6’-0” dog-eared privacy fence that surrounds the rear yard of the property. There is an existing gravel driveway on the east side of the property leading to the rear parking area and a walkway in the front yard leading from the sidewalk to the building.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “[Fences] should complement the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District. The height of solid fences in historic districts is generally restricted to six feet, however, if a commercial property or multi-family housing adjoins the subject property, an eight-foot fence may be considered. The finished side of the fence should face toward public view.” The Design Review Guidelines also state, “[I]t is important that the design, location and materials [of drives and walks] be compatible with the property.”
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
 - 1. Extend the existing 6’-0” privacy fence forward approximately 32’-0” to the southeast corner of the building; the new fence will match existing.
 - 2. Repave the existing driveway with light-colored concrete, adding a small raised curb (approximately 6”) along the east property line for a future iron fence.
 - 3. Repair the existing front walkway and add a walkway in the back leading to the parking area with materials to match existing in material, profile and dimension.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the changes will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district. The new fence is an extension of the existing fence, which falls within the standards of the Design Review Guidelines. Also, the proposed work for the drive and walkways are essentially minimal changes to existing elements that will not significantly alter the characteristics of the property.

Staff recommends approving the application.

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 discussed where the fence would end. Staff assured the Board that it would not extend in front of the porch.

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 Bobby Brown 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. Bobby Brown seconded the motion that was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 06/25/08.

APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS CERTIFIED RECORD

092-07-CA: 4 St. Emanuel Street
Applicant: Scott Gonzalez
Received: 06/07/07 (+45 Days: 07/22/07)
Meeting: 06/25/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street Commercial
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Repair windows on upper floors. Temporarily board up the storefronts. Repaint.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this three-story brick commercial building was constructed circa 1869. A change in the fenestration and surface treatment of the building occurred in the 1930s. The first-floor storefronts have been altered a number of times.

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 building is currently vacant and boarded. Mr. Gonzalez was recently cited for lack of maintenance; however, he is in the process of renovating the building.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “The type, size and dividing lights of windows and their location and configuration (rhythm) on the building help establish the historic character of a building. Original window openings should be retained as well as original window sashes and glazing. Where windows cannot be repaired, new windows must be compatible to the existing. The size and placement of new windows for additions or alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.” The MHDC’s guide to mothballing buildings state, “Mothballing buildings is important...to secure the building from threat, either manmade or natural, and to ensure the health, safety and welfare of the general public...[T]he quality of materials and the installation of those materials is critical to a successful project.”
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
 - 1. Repair the existing windows on the upper floors of the building, replacing when necessary with materials that match existing in material, profile and dimension.
 - 2. Temporarily board up the storefront with sheets of 4x8 plywood and batten strips per the submitted drawing.
 - 3. Repaint the building in colors to be determined at a later date.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the proposed work will not impair the historic integrity of the building and the district. The majority of the proposed work consists of basic repairing and maintenance. The boards placed on the storefront are temporary until the first floor is renovated.

Staff recommends approving the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Scott Gonzales was present to discuss the application. He explained that this will be a temporary boarding condition. Bruce Knodel is working on drawings for the building that will have retail downstairs and either office or residential upstairs. The boarding up would begin immediately. He will attempt to restore the original 6/6 windows, many of which are inside the building. Plywood panels will be painted. He stated that there will be no roof work anticipated since it is not leaking. Mr. Gonzales stated that the city has approved the preliminary plans. He anticipates that the building will be mothballed for no more than a year. Staff pointed out to the Board that this is the first mothballing case the Board has heard. As outlined in the ordinance, the ARB must review mothballing plans.

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 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 and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswald and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 06/25/07.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

093-07-CA: 56 North Monterey Street
Applicant: Gene and Teresa Coleman
Received: 06/07/07 (+45 Days: 07/22/07)
Meeting: 06/25/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

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

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, Victoria Houston built this one-story frame bungalow circa 1910.

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. Mr. and Mrs. Coleman recently received a Certificate of Appropriateness to build a garage per MHDC stock plans. However, they have found it necessary to modify the plans to better fit their needs.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “The appropriateness of accessory structures shall be measured by the guidelines applicable to new construction [and the] structure should complement the design and scale of the main building.”
- C. The proposed work will construct a rear garage on the property using stock MHDC plans with some alterations per the submitted plans and specifications. The alterations include enlarging the unit to 20’-0” by 22’-0” and moving the garage openings to the long side of the structure.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the changes will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district. As mentioned above, the garage structure mainly follows the stock plans on file at the offices of the MHDC.

Staff recommends approving the application.

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

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 Bobby Brown 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 Oswald and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 06/25/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

094-07-CA: 207 South Cedar Street
Applicant: Norman Pharr
Received: 06/08/07 (+45 Days: 07/23/07)
Meeting: 06/25/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Replace the existing front door with a new front door.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this two-story frame Victorian residence was built in 1889. Formerly located at 103 Jefferson, the residence was moved approximately twenty years ago to its present site at 207 South Cedar Street. The existing Gothic front doors were taken from another building, possibly a church, and installed on the house in the 1980s.

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 set of double-leaf wood doors with decorative Gothic panels at the front, which are not original to the building. The residence was recently sold to Mr. and Mrs. Franz with the stipulation that these existing front doors will go with the former owner.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “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 respect the age and style of the building. Doors with leaded or art glass may be appropriate when documentation exists for their use, or when they are compatible with the design and style of the structure.”
- C. The proposed work will replace the existing doors with new double-leaf wood doors with decorative panels and leaded glass per the submitted drawings.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the work will impair the historic integrity of the building. The proposed door contains leaded glass panels, which are more appropriate to buildings of a later vintage such as Colonial Revival. It is suggested that a simpler glass panel or wood paneled doors be used. Some decorative etching of the glass could be appropriate.

Staff recommends installing doors that are more appropriate to the style of the residence.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Norman Pharr was present to discuss the application. He stated that the previous owners had exempted the doors in the sales contract. They had not been original to the house and were obtained from a house in Spring Hill. He showed numerous photos of houses from the turn of the century with stained or leaded glass. He explained that Bell Stained Glass would do the work.

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, but explained that Victorian doors tended to be half glass. Leaded glass was a later feature found in Colonial Revival examples.

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 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 Carlos Gant and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 06/25/08.

APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS CERTIFIED RECORD

096-07-CA: 20 Kenneth Street
Applicant: Jean Ellen and Gabriel Tynes
Received: 06/11/07 (+45 Days: 07/26/07)
Meeting: 06/25/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Install a 6'-0" privacy fence.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this one-story frame cottage with classical detailing was built circa 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. There is currently a chain link fence around the rear of the property, which sits on the corner of Kenneth and New Hamilton.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, "[Fences] should complement the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District. The height of solid fences in historic districts is generally restricted to six feet, however, if a commercial property or multi-family housing adjoins the subject property, an eight-foot fence may be considered. The finished side of the fence should face toward public view."
- C. The proposed work will replace the existing chain link fence with a 6'-0" wood privacy fence on three sides of the property per the submitted specifications. The fence will run approximately 20'-0" along the west side, 100'-0" along the north side and 50'-0" along the east side.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the proposed work will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district. The fence falls within the standards of the Design Review Guidelines and, although staff would prefer to not have 6'-0" fences along the sidewalk, there are a number of 6'-0" fences along this street. However, Mr. and Mrs. Tynes will need to clear any possible setback issues along New Hamilton Street with Urban Development before installation.

Staff recommends approving the application on the condition that the top of the fence is no taller than the windowsills of the residence per the submitted plans.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Gabriel Tynes was present to discuss the application. He stated that his house faced Kenneth Street and that the fence will be set 25 ft. behind the sidewalk.

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 Bobby Brown 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 conditioned on the fence being no taller than the window sills. The motion was seconded by Bobby Brown and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 06/25/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

097-07-CA: 1056 Government Street
Applicant: Janine Stebbins
Received: 06/11/07 (+45 Days: 07/26/07)
Meeting: 06/25/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-1
Project: Replace the existing damaged roof with new cast-cement tiles.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this Neo-Classical residence, one of the best surviving examples of the residential design of Rudolph Benz, was built in 1901 for Charles Hearin and later sold to lumber magnate John Blacksher. For many years it was used as the Abba Temple Shrine. In 1991, it was returned to use as a single-family residence.

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 current tile roof was damaged in Hurricanes Ivan and Katrina.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “A roof is one of the most dominant features of a building. Original or historic roof forms, as well as the original pitch of the roof should be maintained. Materials should be appropriate to the form and pitch and color.”
- C. The proposed work will replace the existing damaged diamond-shaped asbestos roof tiles with rectangular cast cement tiles (Monier Lifetile) in Stone Mountain Gray; repair/replace the damaged decking as needed.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the work will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district. The current roof is not original to the home, having been installed in the 1940s, and damaged from Ivan and Katrina. Although the new roof tiles will be rectangular rather than diamond-shaped, they will still maintain the tiled appearance of the current material.

Staff recommends approving the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Janine Stebbins was present to discuss the application. She brought a sample of a rectangular glazed terracotta tile that she also wanted the Board to consider. The Monier tiles were less expensive than the terracotta tiles.

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 an amendment to C. to read: "The proposed work will replace the existing damaged diamond shaped asbestos roof tiles with rectangular cast cement tiles (Monier Lifetile) in Stone Mountain Gray or rectangular glazed terracotta tiles in gray; repair/replace the damaged decking as needed." 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 and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Bobby Brown and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 06/25/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

098-07-CA: 8 North Reed Avenue
Applicant: Stuart Clotworthy
Received: 06/11/07 (+45 Days: 07/26/07)
Meeting: 06/25/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Replace the existing fence. Repaint residence in the existing colors. Demolish the shed.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this two-story frame Sidehall residence was built circa 1908. The Sanborn Maps on file show an accessory structure at the rear of the property since the main residence was built; however, because more recent maps show the structure at a slightly different location, it is unclear whether the current shed is the same one.

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 rotted wood privacy fence surrounding the rear yard. In addition, the existing shed is in poor condition.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state, “[Fences] should complement the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District. The height of solid fences in historic districts is generally restricted to six feet, however, if a commercial property or multi-family housing adjoins the subject property, an eight-foot fence may be considered. The finished side of the fence should face toward public view.” The Guidelines also state that accessory structures should “complement the design and scale of the main building.”
- C. The proposed work includes the following:
 - 1. Replace the existing rotted wood privacy fence with a new 8’-0” wood privacy fence consisting of 6’-0” wood planks topped with a 2’-0” wood lattice screen.
 - 2. Demolish the existing shed.
 - 3. Repaint the residence in the existing colors.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information submitted in the proposal, staff feels that the proposed fence will impair the historic integrity of the district. The height of the proposed fence is 8’-0” tall, which is above the 6’-0” height limit maintained by the Board. Staff feels the remaining items will not impair the historic integrity of the building or

the district. The rear shed is a secondary structure in poor condition and, as mentioned above, it is unclear whether it is original to the property. Also, the residence is being repainted in the existing colors.

Staff recommends amending Item C1 to install a 6'-0" fence. Staff recommends approving the remainder of the application

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. and Mrs. Clotworthy were present to discuss the application. They stated that 3 alleyways border their lot. There is a problem with traffic through the alleys and difficulty in keeping them clean. There is also an issue with privacy, since they can see over the fences of the neighbors when sitting outside on their rear porch. They stated that the property to the south has an 8 ft. fence similar to the one they propose.

There was discussion about dropping the fence to 6 ft. in height and about beginning the fence at 6 ft. and stepping up to 8 ft. in the rear of the property.

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. However, Staff reminded the Board that the guidelines restrict fence heights to 6 ft. except in the case where a residential property abuts a commercial property.

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 C. 1 "Replace the existing rotted wood privacy fence with a new 6' wood privacy fence." The motion was seconded by Bobby Brown 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 Oswald and unanimously approved as amended.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 06/25/08.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

099-07-CA: 400 Michigan Avenue
Applicant: June Chambliss/Norman Pharr
Received: 6/11/07 (+45 Days: 07/26/07)
Meeting: 06/25/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Leinkauf Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Extend rear addition, reconfigure access ramp and add code approved handrail.

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

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff’s judgment, the proposed work complies with the Design Review Guidelines and will not impair the historic integrity of the structure and the district.

A. Extension of rear addition

1. 400 Michigan Avenue is a two story American Foursquare frame residence with classical details constructed in 1907.
2. The rear of the house has a small addition housing the kitchen and a den included under an uneven gable roof.
3. The proposed porch infill would increase the size of the existing kitchen by 8’ and the den by 12’.
4. The gable roof will be reconfigured and spaced evenly over the addition.
5. This change will be visible from the street above the existing fence, however the rear elevation will be regularized.
6. Existing windows will be relocated to the new west wall; the existing rear door will be reused in the new location. One window will be added on the north elevation
7. All existing materials and details will be duplicated on the addition.
8. All new elements will be painted to match the existing color scheme.

B. Construction of new handicap access ramp

1. The existing ramp extends from the driveway and turns east to the rear door.
2. The proposed ramp will be located parallel to the rear elevation and turn to the west with a landing provided for turning the wheelchair.
3. The proposed configuration of the new ramp will free up backyard space occupied by the current ramp.
4. The railing will be wood and constructed to meet code.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Norman Pharr and the project contractor were present to discuss the application. Mr. Pharr explained that the applicant's husband required constant care and that an elderly aunt was moving into the house. As a result, additional room was required. The contractor explained that he could match the 105 siding on the house with a cedar siding that duplicated the profile.

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 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 and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswald and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 06/25/08.