

CITY OF MOBILE
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Minutes of the Meeting
January 9, 2006

CALL TO ORDER

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

Ed Hooker, MHDC Architectural Engineer, called the roll as follows:

Members Present: Robert Brown, Tilmon Brown, Douglas Kearley, Cindy Klotz, Harris Oswalt, Bunky Ralph, Joe Sackett, David Tharp.

Members Absent: Michael Mayberry, Cameron Pfeiffer.

Staff Members Present: Ed Hooker, Anne Crutcher, Devereaux Bemis, John Lawler.

<u>In Attendance</u>	<u>Mailing Address</u>	<u>Item Number</u>
David Dexter	118 N. Royal #100	024-05/06-CA
John Fillingim	118 N. Royal #100	024-05/06-CA
Keith Jarvis	1059 Church St.	026-05/06-CA
Larry Carroll	1066 Church St.	022-05/06-CA

Douglas Kearley moved to approve the minutes of the last meeting as emailed. The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph and unanimously approved.

Douglas Kearley moved to approve the mid-month Certificates of Appropriateness. The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph and unanimously approved.

MID-MONTH APPROVALS:

1. Applicant's Name: New Beginning Construction
Property Address: 358 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 12/5/05 weh
Work Approved: Repair windows to match existing in materials, profile and dimension. Where windows cannot be repaired, replace with new wood windows to match existing in materials, profile and dimension. Re-deck existing balconies. Re-roof with 26 gauge standing seam metal roof, silver in color.
2. Applicant's Name: K.V. Fordham
Property Address: 1611 Government Street
Date of Approval: 12/5/05 weh
Work Approved: Repair columns, capitals and fascia on front porch. Capitals to be repaired using existing pieces of capitals and by inserting hand cast plaster where necessary. Porch to be supported by a temporary transverse beam while fascia repairs are being done.
3. Applicant's Name: Harris Oswalt
Property Address: 301 West Street
Date of Approval: 12/5/05 weh

- Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary with new materials to match existing in profile, dimension and material.
Repaint to match existing color scheme.
4. Applicant's Name: Heather Guidry
Property Address: 1504 Church Street
Date of Approval: 12/5/05 weh
Work Approved: Re-roof building with 3 tab fiberglass shingles, charcoal in color.
 5. Applicant's Name: Fred South
Property Address: 1112 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 12/6/05 weh
Work Approved: Remove secondary front door and infill with siding to match existing in material, profile and dimension, restoring the front façade to its original appearance. Remove cedar shake infill in attic dormer to reveal keyhole window. Reglaze keyhole window.
 6. Applicant's Name: A-1 Services
Property Address: 31 South Lafayette Street
Date of Approval: 12/6/05 weh
Work Approved: Re-roof building with architectural shingles, sablewood elk in color.
 7. Applicant's Name: Caldwell and Osborne
Property Address: 951 Selma Street
Date of Approval: 12/6/05 jdb
Work Approved: Re-roof building with 3 tab fiberglass shingles, black in color.
 8. Applicant's Name: Charles Bowen
Property Address: 1414 Brown Street
Date of Approval: 12/7/05 asc
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary with new materials matching existing in profile, dimension and material. Repaint building in existing color scheme.
 9. Applicant's Name: Jose Attar
Property Address: 1200 Government Street
Date of Approval: 12/8/05 weh
Work Approved: Repair or replace damaged wood siding with materials matching existing in materials, profile and dimension. Repaint to match existing.
 10. Applicant's Name: George Borne
Property Address: 306 George Street
Date of Approval: 12/8/05 weh
Work Approved: Construct carport using MHDC stock plan. Materials to be hardiplank siding (house has aluminum); roof pitch, cornice, soffit and fascia to match that of the main house.

11. Applicant's Name: Theresa Powe
Property Address: 1009 New St. Francis Street
Date of Approval: 12/9/05 weh
Work Approved: Re-roof building with 3 tab fiberglass shingles, charcoal in color.
12. Applicant's Name: Custom Remodeling
Property Address: 109 South Monterey Street
Date of Approval: 12/12/05 weh
Work Approved: Re-roof with 3 tab shingles, onyx black in color.
13. Applicant's Name: First Church of Christ, Scientist
Property Address: 1151 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 12/12/05 weh
Work Approved: Re-roof with architectural grade shingles, either black or gray in color. Turn sign to be perpendicular with the street.
14. Applicant's Name: TCM Remodelers
Property Address: 251 St. Anthony Street
Date of Approval: 12/13/05 jss
Work Approved: Repair storm damaged brick wall by reinstalling fallen old brick and with old brick to match existing in profile, dimension and color. Repair or replace wooden fascia, sills and gutters to match existing in profile, dimension and color. Re-attach shutters. Re-roof storm-damaged roof portion with new materials to match existing in profile, dimension and color. Repaint wooden materials to match existing color scheme.
15. Applicant's Name: Teri Williams
Property Address: 253 St. Anthony Street
Date of Approval: 12/13/05 jss
Work Approved: Re-roof with charcoal gray shingles.
16. Applicant's Name: Larry M. Crawley
Property Address: 303 South Ann Street
Date of Approval: 12/14/05 weh
Work Approved: Re-roof with timberline, black architectural shingles.
17. Applicant's Name: Jeff Medlin
Property Address: 1258 Texas Street
Date of Approval: 12/15/05 weh
Work Approved: Re-roof building with Timberline shingles, slate gray in color.
18. Applicant's Name: Sims Family Properties/ Town Court Apartments
Property Address: 1111 Church Street
Date of Approval: 12/15/05 weh
Work Approved: Install 6' high wood fence around dumpster.

19. Applicant's Name: Yolanda Garcia
Property Address: 224 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 12/15/05 jdb
Work Approved: Re-paint current signs for new business as per the submitted plans.
20. Applicant's Name: Keith Lott
Property Address: 1104 New St. Francis Street
Date of Approval: 12/16/05 weh
Work Approved: Re-roof building with architectural shingles, brown in color.
21. Applicant's Name: Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund
Property Address: 256 Marine Street
Date of Approval: 12/20/05 weh
Work Approved: Rehabilitate historic structure as per submitted plans. Remove rear wing and repair areas where wing is removed. Repair or replace all rotten siding with materials matching existing in profile and dimension. Repair or replace windows and doors with materials matching existing in profile, materials and dimension. Re-roof with architectural grade shingles. Repair or replace porch elements with materials matching existing in profile and dimension. Paint in historic color scheme – to be submitted at a later date.
22. Applicant's Name: Decora Smith
Property Address: 302 Congress Street
Date of Approval: 12/20/05 weh
Work Approved: Repaint building in existing color scheme.
23. Applicant's Name: Fred South Construction
Property Address: 1054 Old Shell Road
Date of Approval: 12/21/05 weh
Work Approved: Re-roof with architectural grade shingles, gray in color.
24. Applicant's Name: Steve Weiss
Property Address: 1135 Montauk Street
Date of Approval: 12/21/05 weh
Work Approved: Stabilize foundation.
25. Applicant's Name: Parker & Poynter/ Sign Pro
Property Address: 305 North Joachim Street
Date of Approval: 12/21/05 weh
Work Approved: Install wood sign with painted graphics, measuring 2' x 3', double sided, or 12 sf, on 50" 4x4 post as per illustration provided.

NEW BUSINESS:

- 1. 022-05/06-CA** 1066 Church Street
Applicant: L. Lawrence Carroll
Nature of Request: Erect 6’ wood privacy fence along west property line as per submitted site plan.

APPROVED Certified Record attached.
- 2. 023-05/06-CA** 1456 Church Street
Applicant: James LaGrave
Nature of Request: Install metal roof as per submitted information.

DENIED Certified Record attached.
- 3. 024-05/06-CA** 202 Government Street
Applicant: City Government LLC
Nature of Request: Install iron galleries at Government and Conception Street facades. Install roll-up doors at each side. Add additional wood windows at north side. Stucco Conception Street façade to match Government Street façade, all as per submitted plans.

APPROVED except roll up doors. Certified Record attached.
- 4. 025-05/06-CA** 1310 Old Shell Road
Applicant: Richard Tapscott
Nature of Request: Install 8’ and 6’ wood privacy fence in rear yard as per submitted site plan. Install 4’ metal fence around front yard as per submitted site plan. Install 5 v crimp metal roof.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.
- 5. 026-05/06-CA** 205 George Street
Applicant: David Ayers
Nature of Request: Construct rear addition on existing rear deck; roof over existing deck, all as per submitted plans.

TABLED for lack of information. Certified Record attached.

OTHER BUSINESS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS:

1. Election of Board Chair and Vice Chair
Bunky Ralph was nominated as chair and unanimously approved.
Cameron Pfeiffer was nominated as vice chair and unanimously approved.
2. Appeal of decision on 109 Bradford Avenue
Date of appeal has not yet been set. Chair Klotz suggested that it would be helpful in arguing the case before Council to have photographs of similar

apartment buildings with rear porches. Staff responded that in addition, the porches are indicated on the Sanborn Fire Insurance maps of 1925.

3. Harris Oswalt felt that our policy on the use of metal roofs should be consistent with other cities. Staff will investigate how other cities deal with metal roofs.
4. The next NAPC meeting that Board members are invited to attend will be held in late July in Baltimore.

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

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

022-05/06-CA 1066 Church Street
Applicant: L. Lawrence Carroll
Received: 12/09/05 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 1/23/06 1) 1/9/06 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Nature of Project: Install 6’ high wood privacy fence as per submitted plans.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
3	Fences, Walls & Gates	Install 6’ privacy fence

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, 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. The Guidelines state that “These should compliment the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District.”
1. The subject structure is a 1 one and one-half story Victorian cottage.
 2. The subject structure was moved from Springhill Avenue and restored by the Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund.
 3. The subject structure is located on the northeast corner of Church and George Streets.
 4. The applicants have received a variance from the Board of Adjustment to construct the 6’ fence where proposed at the sidewalk.
 5. Currently there is a 4’ high wood picket fence around the front and side of the property.
 6. The proposed fence would begin at the north property line and run a distance of 25’, then turn west and run a distance of 20’ to the sidewalk then turn south and run to within 36’ of the sidewalk at Church Street, then turn east and die into the house.
 7. The existing 4’ fence is proposed to be reused on the east of the property to close off the rear yard from the front yard, as shown on the site plan.

Staff recommends approval of the request as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Carroll was present and had no additions to his application. The Board questioned the setback from Church Street and whether the fence would be left natural to weather or be painted. The owner replied that the fence will be set back 36 ft. from Church Street. He has not decided if the fence will be painted, however, if it is painted, it will be Oakleigh Green. 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 enter into the record.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no additional 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 adopt the facts in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Douglas Kearley and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph moved, that based upon the facts adopted 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: 01/09/07.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

023-05/06-CA 1456 Church Street
Applicant: Jim LaGrave
Received: 12/09/05 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 1/23/05 1) 1/9/06 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Leinkauf Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Nature of Project: Install metal roof on residence as per submitted sample.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
3	Roofs	Re-roof with metal roofing

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, 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 does not comply with the Design Review Guidelines and will impair the historic integrity of the structure and the district.

- A. The Guidelines state that “A roof is one of the most dominant features of a building. Original or historic roof forms, as well as the original pitch, should be maintained. Materials should be appropriate to the form and pitch and color.”
 - 1. The subject structure is a ca. 1927 Bungalow with an end gable roof.
 - 2. The existing roof is a asbestos shingle.
 - 3. The proposed roof is a steel panel emulating five v-crimp tin, gray in color.
 - 4. Historically, Bungalows in Mobile were constructed with either wood shakes or asbestos tile roofs.
 - 5. Historically, Bungalows in Mobile were not constructed with metal roofs.
 - 6. Metal roofs are examined on a case-by-case basis and allowed where appropriate.
 - 6. Due to the configuration of the roof, the roofing material will be highly visible from public view.
 - 7. In this case, the metal roof does impair the integrity of the historic residence.

Staff recommends denial of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

No one was present 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 whether a sample was submitted. Staff responded that a sample was not submitted, only the printed material given to the Board. The Board discussed that the profile was industrial rather than residential in nature.

FINDING OF FACT

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board adopt the facts in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Douglas Kearley and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the facts adopted by the Board, that the proposed work does impair the historic integrity of the building and the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be denied. The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph and unanimously approved.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

024-05/06-CA 202 Government Street
Applicant: City Management LLC
Received: 12/27/05 Meeting Date (s):
 Submission Date + 45 Days: 2/10/05 1) 1/9/06 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East Historic District
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-4, General Business
Conflict of Interest: Douglas Kearley recused himself from discussion and voting on the application.
Nature of Project: Install iron galleries at Government and Conception Street facades. Install roll-up doors at each side. Add additional wood windows at north side. Stucco Conception Street façade to match Government Street façade, all as per submitted plans.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
3	Porches and Canopies	Install iron galleries

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, 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 does not comply with the Design Review Guidelines and will impair the historic integrity of the structure and the district.

- A. GALLERIES - The Guidelines state that “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture…Particular attention should be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions and decorative details.”
1. The subject structure, the former Southern Bell Telephone and Telegraph Building, was constructed after 1904 and has facades on both Government Street and South Conception Street.
 2. The subject structure is listed as Non-Contributing in the National Register Nomination.
 3. The proposed balconies are 8’ deep on Government Street and 6’ deep on Conception Street.
 4. The components of the balcony have yet to be determined by the architect.
 5. The City of Mobile’s Right-of-Way Department will need to approve the pole placement on the sidewalk.
 6. Historically a number of buildings in the immediate area had some type of porch or balcony.
 7. The LaClede Hotel in the block to the east has a set of double balconies.

8. Balconies would not impair the historic integrity of the district.
- B. **ROLL-UP DOORS** – The Guidelines state that “Replacement (doors) should respect the age and style of the building.”
1. The subject structure is detailed in the Federal style as noted in the National Register nomination.
 2. The proposed doors are 10’ high by 12’ wide plain metal garage doors.
 3. There is no precedent for garage doors opening onto Government Street.
 4. Similar situations in New Orleans and other cities utilize decorative gates instead of metal garage doors.
 5. The installation of garage doors on Government and Conception Streets would impair the historic integrity of the neighborhood.
- C. **ADDITIONAL WINDOWS** – The Guidelines state that “The size and placement of new windows for additions should be compatible with the general character of the building.”
1. Currently the Government Street façade of the building has three door-length windows.
 2. The proposed elevation will add 3 more door/windows to allow access onto the new balcony.
 3. Currently the Conception Street façade of the building has a row of ribbon windows at the second floor level.
 4. The proposed elevation will remove these windows and install 4 door/windows to allow access onto the new balcony.
 5. Additional wood windows are proposed for the north elevation.
 6. There is a common alley between the subject property and the property directly to the north.
 7. Neither façade is considered contributing.
 8. Alteration of the facades will blend with the nearby historic buildings and not impair the historic integrity of the neighborhood.
- D. **STUCCO CONCEPTION STREET ELEVATION** – The Guidelines state that “The exterior material of a building helps define its style, quality and historic period... The finish and scoring of new stucco should match the original.”
1. Currently the Conception Street façade is faced in brick.
 2. The proposed change is to stucco the façade to match that of the Government Street façade.
 3. The current brick is not typical of the historic buildings nearby.
 4. Stuccoing the Conception Street façade will make the building blend with those of the neighborhood.

Staff recommends the approval of work items A, C and D. Staff recommends that the Board consider approving work item B with decorative gates instead of metal roll-up doors.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

David Dexter was present to discuss the application. He explained that the roll up doors were intended to shield parking on the first floor. There will be 15-17 parking places and he wants to provide secure parking.

The Board suggested other types of doors or gates that might be more compatible with the building and the neighborhood. There are many types of doors available to fit this particular situation and talking with one of the local iron fence companies would be advisable. An automated decorative iron, steel or aluminum gate, such as the one at 62 S. Conception Street or at the new FBI building would be possible solutions. A gate would give the effect of a courtyard.

The applicant stated that he had not been aware of the variety of solutions and would be willing to investigate other possibilities.

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 enter into the record.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed approving parts A, C and D of the application that included the gallery, additional windows and stuccoing of the Conception Street elevation.

FINDING OF FACT

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board adopt the facts in the staff report. The motion was seconded by David Tharp and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the facts adopted by the Board, that the application does impair the historic integrity of the building and the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued for sections A,C, and D of the application with the applicant returning to the Board with a more compatible door solution. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswalt and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 01/09/07.

8. Six foot wooden fences are generally allowed in rear yards.

B. ROOFING – The Guidelines state that “A roof is one of the most dominant features of a building. Original or historic roof forms, as well as the original pitch, should be maintained. Materials should be appropriate to the form and pitch and color.”

1. The subject structure is a ca. 1886 two story Victorian with a monolithic end gable roof.
2. Currently the roof is sheathed in fiberglass shingles.
3. The applicants are proposing a 26 gauge 5 v-crimp metal roof, silver in color.
4. Metal roofs are examined on a case-by-case basis.
5. Metal roofs were often used as early replacement roofs on Victorian houses.
6. In this case, the metal roof does not impair the historic integrity of the historic residence.

Staff recommends approval of the request as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board questioned staff regarding the location of the 8 ft. portion of the fence. Staff explained that the applicant has request that the east property line fence, adjacent to a doctor’s office, be 8 ft. The remainder of the fence will be 6 ft. and the fence at the front of the lot will be 4 ft. in height.

FINDING OF FACT

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board adopt the facts in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Joe Sackett. Douglas Kearley amended the motion to include a modification to fact A 3: The applicant is requesting to construct an 8’ high fence section on the property line adjoining a building currently used as a doctor’s office and 6 ‘ fencing on the remaining north and west property lines. The motion was unanimously approved as amended.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the facts adopted 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: 01/09/07.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

026-05/06-CA 205 George Street
Applicant: David Ayers
Received: 12/27/05 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 2/10/06 1) 1/9/06 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Nature of Project: Construct rear addition on existing rear deck; roof over existing deck, all as per submitted plans.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, 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.

1. The subject structure is a ca. 1887 one story Classical Revival residence with a monolithic side gable roof and an end gabled front portico.
2. Currently there is a rear addition and L-shaped deck at the rear of the property.
3. The applicant is requesting to construct an addition over the long side of the existing deck, and roof over the short side of the existing deck to create more living space and a covered deck.
4. Foundation, walls and roofing will match that of the existing addition.
5. Windows and doors will be wood to match the existing.
6. Deck railing will match existing, which is MHDC Stock Design number 1.
7. Column details will match that on the front porch.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

The applicant was not present to discuss the proposed work.

Staff explained that the addition will match existing materials on the house and will contain a bedroom and bath. The new addition replaces an existing poorly designed addition. The scale of the provided drawing is ¼ inch.

Keith Jarvis, a neighbor residing on Church Street, was present to speak in opposition to the application. He presented photographs of the addition to the Board. He questioned whether the addition had proper footings and wondered whether there was a site coverage issue posed by the addition. The lot is small and the house occupies a large portion of it. He also testified that work was continuing on the addition despite a stop work order and the lack of a building permit.

Staff responded that the foundation had been augmented to support an addition and that the foundation had passed inspection by Urban Development. The addition will be approximately 8 ft. from the rear property line. The Historic District Overlay Ordinance will allow the addition to be located where proposed and will resolve any site coverage issues. In fact, the Overlay Ordinance will probably mean that future additions in the districts will be closer to the property line that they have been allowed previously.

Looking at the photographs, Board members could not reconcile the submitted drawing with the structure that had been built.

Chair Cindy Klotz considered that the application was incomplete, making an informed Board decision impossible. This met with general agreement from other Board members.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no additional Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

There was no finding of fact.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and at the public hearing, that the application be tabled pending submission of additional information. This would include a site plan, drawings with dimensions indicated, and reconciliation of the drawings with the actual construction. The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph and approved with David Tharp voting in opposition to the motion.

Staff will visit the site to take additional photos and talk to the owner.