

CITY OF MOBILE
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Minutes of the Meeting
December 17, 2007

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Bunky Ralph called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. MHDC Staff member Aileen de la Torre called the roll as follows:

- **Members Present:** Tilmon Brown, Carlos Gant, Tom Karwinski, Michael Mayberry, Harris Oswalt, Bunky Ralph, Jim Wagoner and Barja Wilson.
- **Members Absent:** Robert Brown, Cameron Pfeiffer and Craig Roberts.
- **Staff Present:** Aileen de la Torre, Anne Crutcher and Devereaux Bemis.

<u>In Attendance</u>	<u>Mailing Address/Email Address</u>
-----------------------------	---

Nick Holmes III
Forrest McCaughn
Joe Ruffer
Marie Dyson

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

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

MID-MONTH APPROVALS

1. **Applicant's Name:** Greg Rawls
Property Address: 1412 Eslava Street
Date of Approval: December 4, 2007
Foundation repairs to visible brick to match existing in profile, dimension and material.
2. **Applicant's Name:** Greg Rawls
Property Address: 1410 Eslava Street
Date of Approval: December 4, 2007
Repair/replace wooden windows and siding with materials to match existing in profile, dimension and material.
Foundation repairs to visible brick to match existing in profile, dimension and material.
3. **Applicant's Name:** Tuan Titlestad
Property Address: 301 Marine Street
Date of Approval: December 5, 2007
Paint exterior in the following Sherwin-Williams colors:
 - Body – Studio Taupe, SW 2071
 - Trim – Roycroft Vellum
 - Porch Deck and Lattice – Black
4. **Applicant's Name:** Stauter Construction/R Robertson
Property Address: 171 South Georgia Avenue
Date of Approval: December 6, 2007
Undertake repair work to include: foundation repair to porch sill and foundation piers. Repair/replace as needed rotten wood with new wood to match existing. Repair cheek walls, stairs and flower boxes as necessary.
5. **Applicant's Name:** DoRight Construction/Katie Jernigan
Property Address: 27 Hannon Avenue
Date of Approval: December 6, 2007
Replace rotten wood as necessary to match existing in profile, dimension and material.

6. **Applicant's Name:** Big Bear Construction
Property Address: 309 West Street
Date of Approval: December 7, 2007
Install new roof, removing existing tile portions. Install new architectural shingles color to match tile sections. Install tiles to match existing portions. Remove canvas awnings. Replace rotten wood with new material to match existing. Replace rear wood steps and rotten wood to match existing.
7. **Applicant's Name:** Mr. & Mrs. William E. Jones
Property Address: 1122 Montauk Avenue
Date of Approval: December 7, 2007
Replace rotten wood on porch, column bases to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Repaint building to match existing color scheme.
8. **Applicant's Name:** Jeff Mizell Contracting
Property Address: 1721 Laurel Street
Date of Approval: December 10, 2007
Reroof residence with 25-year 3tab shingles in Grey.

OLD BUSINESS

9. **153-07-CA:** 153 Government Street
Applicant: Mobile County/Goodwin, Mills and Cawood
Request: Construct a new courthouse annex building.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.
10. **205-07-CA:** 202 Government Street
Applicant: Zito Russell Architects
Request: Install a coiling metal garage door as opposed to the proposed aluminum one.

DENIED. Certified Record attached.
11. **222-07-CA:** 9 North Cedar Street
Applicant: Casey Ginn
Request: Rebuild the removed addition.

APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. Certified Record attached.

NEW BUSINESS

12. **223-07-CA:** 1105 Selma Street
Applicant: Chris Bowen
Request: Allow chain link fence to remain.

APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. Certified Record attached.
13. **224-07-CA:** 958 Augusta Street
Applicant: Forrest McCaughn
Request: Extend existing fence.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.
14. **225-07-CA:** 167 State Street
Applicant: Devereaux Bemis
Request: Perform general repairs.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

15. **226-07-CA:** 167 South Georgia Avenue
Applicant: Hali Whetstone
Request: Add pergola to cover back patio.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

16. **227-07-CA:** 1721 Laurel Street
Applicant: Jeff Mizell
Request: Reroof with galvanized 5V crimp metal panels.

APPLICATION WITHDRAWN

OTHER BUSINESS and ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. In the new year, beginning on January 2nd, the Review Board will be meeting on the first and third Wednesdays of each month at 3:00 p.m.
2. Nick Holmes III spoke about changes in the Angus Cooper project in Ashland Place. The Board decided to let Staff approve changes on a mid-month basis. Any changes Staff considers beyond the scope of a mid-month will be brought back to the Board.

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

153-07-CA: 153 Government Street (alternately 109 Government and 151 Government)
Applicant: Mobile County/Goodwin, Mills and Cawood
Received: 08/27/07 Resubmitted: 12/07/07
Meeting: 09/10/07 Meeting: 12/17/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Contributing (Levert House), Non-Contributing (Court Annex Building)
Zoning: B-4
Project: Build a new courthouse annex using the existing building shell.

BUILDING HISTORY

The courthouse annex was a part of the larger courthouse complex, which was demolished last year. The building was constructed around the 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 courthouse is currently being expanded for offices and county court archives. A Design Review Subcommittee met on 03/28/07 in order to address concerns regarding new construction for this property. A new plan was submitted and denied. Another Design Review Subcommittee met on 08/22/07 in order to address the new concerns, but again the application was denied. A subsequent meeting with the County, the Mayor, members of the Review Board and the Architects on 11/30/07 resulted in more changes to the original design. A copy of the email with the points of the meeting is included in the supplemental materials.
- 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 will add three stories to the existing building shell at 153 Government per the submitted plans, which includes the following:
 - 1. A CMU and steel structure with an exterior finish of brick with pre-cast concrete ornamentation.
 - 2. A metal standing seam pitched roof and membrane covered flat roof.
 - 3. Aluminum windows with pre-cast concrete sills and headers with a monumental entry facing Government.

RECOMMENDATION

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 ARB. As mentioned above, there have been several meetings held in order to address concerns regarding the construction of such a large and prominent building. A final meeting with the County, the Mayor, members of the Review Board and the Architects on 11/30/07 has resulted in what staff feels is an acceptable compromise for the design of this building. Due to the difficulty of understanding how the courthouse will fit within the context of the area using only two-dimensional plans, three-dimensional renderings are being used for the new application.

Staff feels that the applicants have addressed the primary issues about which the Board had concerns. The extreme regularity and proportions of the elements on the façade have been softened by the smaller fourth floor windows, which have also been lowered so that they do not abut the cornice. The south (rear) elevation is better detailed and will mimic the front through its features. Staff believes that the rear bay should not be fully stuccoed (option 1), but rather bricked with pilasters (option 2). A more pedestrian scale will be emphasized through the removal of parking spaces and additional lighting. The east, west and south elevations will have three story windows to break up the expanses of the space. Staff recommends approving the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Nick Holmes III was present to discuss the application. Mr. Holmes stated that he was fairly certain that ongoing negotiations between the License Commissioner and the County Commission would result in eliminating parking spaces at the rear of the building.

Jim Wagoner stated that he preferred Option 2 that did not have stucco. Nick Holmes concurred.

Councilman William Carroll thanked the Board for working with the County Commission architects to arrive at an acceptable design. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to enter into the record.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no further 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

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 with option 2 the preferred option. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswalt and approved with Tilmon Brown dissenting. Applicant will return with brick sample. **CoA Expiration Date: 12/17/08.**

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

205-07-CA: 202 Government Street
Applicant: Zito Russell Architects
Received: 10/30/07 Resubmitted: 11/19/07 Resubmitted: 12/05/07
Meeting: 11/19/07 Meeting: 12/03/07 Meeting: 12/17/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Change the garage door.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this mid-twentieth century building was originally the Southern Bell Telephone and Telegraph Building. It has undergone a number of alterations throughout the years.

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 will be the office of Sullivan-St. Clair. An application was approved on 12/03/07 for an aluminum garage door on Conception. However, for a number of reasons, they will not be able to install it. All other work, including the approved iron gates on Government and the iron vents, will remain the same.
- B. The Guidelines state, “garage doors should be simple in design and compatible with the main building.”
- C. The applicant is proposing to install a coiling metal door on Conception. The color will match the brick.

RECOMMENDATION

The Board has generally denied coiling garage doors.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Angie Odom was present to discuss the application. She stated that the sectional door approved for Conception was too costly, in the neighborhood of \$10,000. She had photographed examples in the downtown area where coiled doors were used. Ms Odom further stated that there were time issues with this door since the owner wanted to occupy the space before February 1st. Board members cautioned that the doors may not have been approved and that every case is judged upon its individual merits. They continued to stress that other types of doors would work in this situation and that coiling doors would function poorly with approximately 75 uses per day for 19 parking spaces. Board members also stressed that perhaps the owners should appear before the Board to hear their concerns. There were no comments from the public for the record. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments for the record.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no further 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 Carlos Gant and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Harris Oswalt 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 the application be denied. The motion was seconded by Tilmon Brown and unanimously approved. Board members invited the applicant to return with the owners of the building.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

222-07-CA: 9 North Cedar Street
Applicant: Casey Ginn
Received: 11/19/07 **Resubmitted:** 12/04/07
Meeting: 12/03/07 **Meeting:** 12/17/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Rebuild the removed addition.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this one-story frame Creole Cottage was constructed circa 1834.

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. Ginn received a COA to repair damaged wood; however, the damage proved to be extensive and the addition was removed. He also received an emergency roof repair COA on 12/04/07.
- B. The Guidelines call for rehabilitations and new additions to respect the age and style of the building.
- C. Mr. Ginn is proposing to rebuild the cabinet-style rear addition to match the removed addition.
 - 1. The new addition will be one foot shorter than the original one.
 - 2. Design and materials will match what was removed in material and profile to include the wood sash windows, four-panel door, roofline, roofing, foundation and other decorative features, but with the exception of the siding.
 - 3. The proposed siding will be board and batten.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff feels that the proposed new addition will not impair the historic integrity of the building or the district and recommends approving the application. It will be a reconstruction of the removed addition.

Mr. Ginn is proposing complementary rather than matching siding to differentiate the new addition from the original residence. While board and batten is a historic type of exterior cladding and staff does not object to using it, the Board has generally voted to have siding in new additions match the original siding.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

The applicant was present to discuss the application. He stated that he had done emergency roof repairs to the rear of his house on Cedar Street. He stated that he would not use plywood but real board and batten. He would like the option of being able to use lap siding to match the existing siding if the board and batten proved too expensive. He prefers board and batten because he has been told that moisture can be an issue with buildings that have lap siding.

There were no comments from the public for the record.

Staff had no comments from the public or city departments for the record.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no further 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 fact C3 amended to read: "The proposed siding will be true board and batten or lap siding to match the existing siding." The motion was seconded by Carlos Gant 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 Carlos Gant and unanimously approved. **CoA Expiration Date: 12/17/08.**

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

223-07-CA: 1105 Selma Street
Applicant: Chris Bowen
Received: 11/26/07 (+45 Days: 01/10/08)
Meeting: 12/17/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Repair/replace existing chain link fence.

BUILDING HISTORY

This apartment complex was constructed in the latter half of the twentieth century.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states, “the Board shall not approve an application proposing 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 district...”

STAFF REPORT

- A. After complaints from several neighborhood residents, Urban Development issued a Notice of Violation to Chris Bowen, the owner. The chain link already existed, albeit at a more typical 5’-0” height. The new fence, however, is 8’-0” tall.
- 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...the finished side of the fence should face toward public view.”
- C. Mr. Bowen is requesting the Board allow the 8’-0” chain link fence to remain.

RECOMMENDATION

Although the Board typically does not approve chain link in the districts, this fence already existed. Therefore, Staff recommends approving the chain link at its original height. However, this is a multi-family property and as such the Guidelines allow an 8’-0” fence. If Mr. Bowen would like to maintain the current height, Staff recommends an alternate type, such as iron, wood or perhaps an ornamental wire fence like the one proposed for 805 Church Street. Another option Staff would recommend is painting the fence Bellingrath Green or a similar dark color (though not black).

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Chris Bowen was present to discuss the application. He wanted the Board to understand he began repairs to the existing fence to deter crime at the complex. It became more than anticipated due to its deteriorated condition and about 75% was replaced. There is a 5’ section that can be seen from George. It cannot be seen from Selma, but is visible along Elmira though it faces largely vacant houses. He is willing to paint the fence a dark green to make it visually disappear.

There were no comments from the public for the record.

Staff had no comments from the public or city departments for record. Staff did explain the repair was going to be a mid-month, but since the replacement was more than 50%, Staff brought the application to the Board.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no further Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

Jim Wagoner moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and the meeting, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report amending them to include: "D. Applicant will paint the fence Bellingrath Green." The motion was seconded by Tilmon Brown and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Jim Wagoner moved that, based upon the amended facts, the work does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district and a CoA be issued. The motion was seconded by Tilmon Brown and unanimously approved. **CoA Expiration Date: 12/17/08.**

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

224-07-CA: 958 Augusta Street
Applicant: Forrest McCaughn
Received: 12/06/07 (+45 Days: 01/20/07)
Meeting: 12/17/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Extend fence.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this one-story frame Shotgun was built circa 1906.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states, “the Board shall not approve an application proposing 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 district...”

STAFF REPORT

- A. There is currently a fence in the back.
- B. The 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 District. The height of solid fences in historic districts is generally restricted to six feet...the finished side should face toward public view.”
- C. The owner is proposing to fill in the gaps of the current fence to enclose the back yard with fencing to match existing in material, profile, dimension and color.

RECOMMENDATION

The proposed work does not impair the historic integrity of the building or district. Staff recommends approval.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Forrest McCaughn was present to discuss the application. He explained that the portion of the fence to be constructed is at the interior of the lot and will not be visible. The fence will be 6’ to match the existing expanse of fencing. There were no comments from the public for the record. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments for the record.

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 Tilmon Brown and unanimously approved. **CoA Expiration Date: 12/17/08.**

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

225-07-CA: 167 State Street
Applicant: Devereaux Bemis
Received: 12/06/07 (+45 Days: 01/20/07)
Meeting: 12/17/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: DeTonti Square
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-B
Conflicts: Staff member Devereaux Bemis left the room for discussion and voting on the application.
Project: Perform general repairs.

BUILDING HISTORY

Constructed in 1839, this Federal-style building is one of three two-story row houses built as rental units, two of which remain. It was used as a grocery store for a number of years.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states, “the Board shall not approve an application proposing 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 district...”

STAFF REPORT

- A. Mr. Bemis is in the process of restoring his home.
- B. The Guidelines call for rehabilitations and new additions to respect the age and style of the building.
- C. The proposed work includes general repairs to the residence:
 - 1. Repair fence, installing a gate to match existing.
 - 2. Repair doors and windows, replacing sash as needed with materials to match existing.
 - 3. Repair gutters with materials to match existing.
 - 4. Stain rear steps with Behr Moon Tan.
 - 5. Paint doors, door and window frames and sashes in green to match existing.

RECOMMENDATION

The proposed work does not impair the historic integrity of the building or district. Staff recommends approval.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Neither the applicant nor his representative was present to discuss the application. There were no comments from the public for the record. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments for the record. Staff did explain that, although the repairs could have been approved on a mid-month, the decision was made to bring it to the Board since a Staff member owns the property.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board asked to see the color of the brown stain. Staff provided the color.

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 Tilmon Brown 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 unanimously approved. **CoA Expiration Date: 12/17/08.**

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

226-07-CA: 167 South Georgia Avenue
Applicant: Hali Whetstone
Received: 12/07/07 (+45 Days: 01/21/07)
Meeting: 12/17/07

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Add a pergola to cover the back patio.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to previous records, this two-story frame residence was built circa 1914.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states, “the Board shall not approve an application proposing 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 district...”

STAFF REPORT

- A. The Whetstones recently removed a non-historic rear deck to create a rear courtyard with pool.
- B. The Guidelines state, “accessory structures should complement the design and scale of the main building.”
- C. Mrs. Whetstone is proposing to add a one-story pergola over the back patio per the submitted information:
 - 1. It will extend 8’-0” from the house on the south side, 12’-0” on the north and 16’-0” at the center.
 - 2. It will have a wood deck.
 - 3. It will be attached to the residence with copper flashing.
 - 4. It will be partially covered by standing seam metal panels.
 - 5. There will be 12’-0” tall columns (12” in diameter) that match those at the front.
 - 6. The columns will match the trim color and the rafters will be black to match the color of the shutters.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the submitted plans, staff feels the proposed work does not impair the historic integrity of the building or district. The pergola is part of a landscape plan for the rear yard and it will only be minimally attached to the residence. The design of the structure (columns etc) will match existing and it will not be seen from the street. Staff recommends approving the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Neither the applicant nor his representative was present to discuss the application. There were no comments from the public for the record. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments for the record.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Following Board questioning, Staff clarified that the pergola would be built of wood.

FINDING OF FACT

Michael Mayberry 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

Michael Mayberry moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, 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. **CoA Expiration Date: 12/17/08.**