

**CITY OF MOBILE**  
**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD**

Minutes of the Meeting

January 23, 2006

**CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 3:01 p.m. by Chair, Bunky Ralph.

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

**Members Present:** Tilmon Brown, Douglas Kearley, Harris Oswalt, Cameron Pfeiffer, Bunky Ralph, Joe Sackett, David Tharp, Jim Wagoner.

**Members Absent:** Robert Brown, Cindy Klotz, Michael Mayberry.

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

<u>In Attendance</u>	<u>Mailing Address</u>	<u>Item Number</u>
Paul Landry	205 George Street	026-05/06-CA
David Ayers	205 George Street	026-05/06-CA
Justin Lucas	TAG	027-05/06-CA
Grey Redditt	P.O. Box 2568	028-05/06-CA
John Lockett	P.O. Box 2568	028-05/05-CA
Jane Ellis	ASMS	027-05/06-CA
Ralph Hargrove	210 S. Washington Ave.	029-05/06-CA

Tilmon Brown moved to approve the minutes of the last meeting as emailed. Joe Sackett seconded the motion that was unanimously approved.

Tilmon Brown moved to approve the mid-month Certificates of Appropriateness. Cameron Pfeiffer seconded the motion that was unanimously approved.

**MID-MONTH APPROVALS**

1. 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" high 4x4 post as per illustration provided.
2. Applicant's Name: William Graham  
Property Address: 1760 Dauphin Street  
Date of Approval: 12/28/05 jss  
Work Approved: Repair roof with materials to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Replace rotten and/or storm-damaged wood on fascia with new materials to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Paint new material to match existing color scheme.
3. Applicant's Name: Ramada Inn/Tripp Construction  
Property Address: 255 Church Street  
Date of Approval: 12/28/05 asc  
Work Approved: Repair storm damaged brick veneer south wall with

original bricks and new bricks to match original in color, profile and dimension.

4. Applicant's Name: Terri Williams  
Property Address: 253 State Street  
Date of Approval: 12/13/05 jss  
Work Approved: Re-roof with charcoal gray shingles.
5. 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.
6. Applicant's Name: Steven Brown  
Property Address: 202 South Catherine Street  
Date of Approval: 1/3/05 weh  
Work Approved: Prep house for painting. Relocate secondary front door to rear of front porch. Infill door at left of porch with siding feathered to match existing.
7. Applicant's Name: Stewart Peyton  
Property Address: 115 North Ann Street  
Date of Approval: 1/3/06 asc  
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood with materials to match existing in profile, material and dimension. Repaint building in existing color scheme.
8. Applicant's Name: Helen Buttram/ Salazar Roofing  
Property Address: 315 South Monterey Street  
Date of Approval: 1/4/06 asc  
Work Approved: Install new 50 year architectural shingle roof, sablewood in color.
9. Applicant's Name: David McConnell/Traditional Services  
Property Address: 6 North Jackson Street  
Date of Approval: 1/5/06 weh  
Work Approved: Repair storm damaged portion of roof with new materials to match existing in profile, materials and dimension.
10. Applicant's Name: Custom Remodeling  
Property Address: 128 Macy Place  
Date of Approval: 1/5/06 weh  
Work Approved: Re-roof with 3 tab fiberglass/asphalt shingles, onyx black in color.
11. Applicant's Name: Willie E. Shaw  
Property Address: 456 Charles Street  
Date of Approval: 1/5/06 asc  
Work Approved: Re-roof to match existing, 3 tab fiberglass, black in color. Repair storm-damaged eave wood if necessary to match existing in profile, material and dimension.

12. Applicant's Name: Joe and Carolyn Utsey  
Property Address: 160 South Warren Street  
Date of Approval: 1/6/06 asc  
Work Approved: Repair to rotten wood as necessary with new wood to match existing in dimension and profile. Paint exterior in the existing colors, except body to be BLP Monticello.
13. Applicant's Name: Margie Crawford/Do Right Construction  
Property Address: 104 North Julia Street  
Date of Approval: 1/6/06 asc  
Work Approved: Repair hurricane damage to roof and chimney. Repair siding on rear elevation and paint to match existing. All repairs to roof, chimney and siding to match existing in dimension and profile.
14. Applicant's Name: Virginia Sigler  
Property Address: 500 Canal Street  
Date of Approval: 1/9/06 weh  
Work Approved: Re-roof with materials matching existing in profile and color. Repair windows damaged by storm. Repair front porch woodwork. Repaint to match existing color scheme.
15. Applicant's Name: Bailey DuMont  
Property Address: 162 Roberts Street  
Date of Approval: 1/9/06 asc  
Work Approved: Renewal of expired CoA. Carport repair; repair/replace columns to match existing. Paint ceiling, doors and columns white. Repairs to main house: caulk and repaint steel casement windows; repaint portico and shutters to match existing. Minor repair to chimney and paint top of chimney white.
16. Applicant's Name: George Boone  
Property Address: 306 George Street  
Date of Approval: 1/9/06 weh  
Work Approved: Change of wording of CoA from CARPORT to GARAGE. Construct Garage using MHDC stock plans, as per submitted design.

**OLD BUSINESS:**

1. **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.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

- 1. 027-05/06-CA**                      1255 Dauphin Street  
Applicant:                              Alabama School of Math and Science/TAG Architects  
Nature of Request:                      Renovation of the existing first floor lobby, recreation area, and second floor library with an adjacent addition to provide space for expanded lobby, recreation and library. An overhead walkway to the existing administration building. Erect monument sign at Caroline Street elevation.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.
  
- 2. 028-05/06-CA**                      401 Church Street  
Applicant:                              Christopher E. Peters, P.C.  
Nature of Request:                      Replace hurricane damaged, non-historic wood windows with Kolbe & Kolbe clad windows with snap-in muntins, as per submitted photographs.

DENIED. Certified Record attached.
  
- 3. 029-05/06-CA**                      210 South Washington Avenue  
Applicant:                              Hargrove and Associates  
Nature of Request:                      Install 5' metal fencing around property as per submitted site plan.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

**OTHER BUSINESS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

1. Staff noted that the next NAPC meeting will be held in July in Baltimore. Save the date for this important conference.
2. Staff reported that it is working with Jeanelle Calla looking for an appropriate way to mitigate the circular drive that was constructed contrary to the ARB approved design.
3. Staff informed the Board that it is looking into the way other cities treat metal roofing. This question has been placed on the National Trust Forum list serve.

**There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:40 p.m.**

**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) 1/23/06            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. The subject lot measures 58' x 100'.
3. Currently there is a rear addition measuring 21' wide by 18' long and an L-shaped deck at the rear of the property.
4. The current addition has a lower pitched roof and meets the main house below the historic roof line.
5. The applicant is requesting to construct an addition over the north side of the existing deck, and roof over the east side of the existing deck to create more living space and a porch.
6. The addition occurs at a distance of 58' from the street.
7. The existing side north side setback is 6' -6".
8. The proposed side north setback is maintained at 6' -6".
9. The Historic District Overlay Ordinance allows additions to structures in historic districts to be able to maintain lines established by the historic structures.
10. The existing east side setback is approximately 15'.
11. The proposed east side setback is approximately 8' -3".
12. The minimum required rear setback for residential construction is 8'.
13. The existing lot coverage is 31%.

14. The proposed lot coverage is 38%.
15. The Historic District Overlay Ordinance allows the site coverage to increase from 35% to 50%.
16. Foundation will be brick piers, matching that of the main house and the existing addition.
17. Windows will be wood, double hung, six-over-six, matching those in the main house and the existing addition.
18. Doors will be wood French doors.
19. The cornice will be a simplified version of that on the main house.
20. The roof is an extension of the existing roof, maintaining the existing pitch, which differentiates the addition from the main structure.
21. Deck railing will match existing, which is MHDC Stock Design number 1, and will be painted white with green handrail.
22. Column details will match that on the front porch.
23. The corner board will be left in place at the main house to differentiate between the historic structure and the addition.
24. The work is in compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards numbers 9 and 10, which state:
  - a. 9 - New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.
  - b. 10 - New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

#### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Owners David Ayers and Paul Landry were present to respond to any Board questions. They had no additions to the application.

Board members questioned the pitch of the roof. Staff responded that the pitch on the addition is approximately 5/12 while the roof pitch of the main house is 9/12. However, the lower pitch is necessary due to the existing addition.

There was a question concerning site coverage and whether the Historic District Overlay Ordinance would allow the addition. Staff responded in the affirmative and noted that any setback issues would also be allowable under the ordinance.

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 additional Board discussion.

### **FINDING OF FACT**

Joe Sackett moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing, that the Board adopts 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 application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. Jim Wagoner seconded the motion that was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 01/23/07.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
CERTIFIED RECORD**

**027-05/06-CA**            1255 Dauphin Street  
**Applicant:**            Alabama School of Mathematics and Science/TAG Architects  
**Received:**            1/05/06                            **Meeting Date (s):**  
Submission Date + 45 Days: 2/19/06                            1) 1/23/06    2)    3)

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:**        Old Dauphin Way Historic District  
**Classification:**        Contributing  
**Zoning:**                    B-1, General Business, Buffer Business  
**Nature of Project:**      Renovation of the existing first floor lobby, recreation  
area, and second floor library with an adjacent addition to provide space for  
expanded lobby, recreation and library. Construct an overhead walkway to the  
existing administration building. Erect a monument sign at Caroline Street  
elevation. Rework existing parking lot.

**APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT**

*Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts*  
*Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts and Government Street*

**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.

**PROJECT SYNOPSIS:** This project involves four parts – the construction of a new entry and additional interior space along Caroline Street, the construction of a walkway bridge at the interior of the property, the erection of a monument sign, and the reworking of existing parking.

The focal point of the addition is a pedimented block with a modern version of a pedimented portico. The pedimented block measures 36'-6" x 20'-6". The ridge height of the pedimented block is 49'-8". The pedimented portico at the entry is constructed using a combination of rock face cmu at the base of the columns, a bull nose moulding, and smooth face cmu as the shaft. The pedimented block intersects an arc created by two rows of cast in place concrete columns. To the right of the pedimented block, the inner row of columns works with a storefront system to create the exterior wall of the addition. To the left of the pedimented block, the arc becomes a colonnade maintaining the symmetry of the overall piece. The outer band of columns pierce the second floor level and become bollards with spheres, integrated into the second floor railing system. The height of the addition measures 29'-4".



The walkway bridge is located at the interior of the school complex, and is proposed to connect the second floor of the new addition to the first floor of the existing administration building. The walkway is constructed on cylindrical columns matching those used in the addition. The 10' wide walkway starts at the addition at 11' and slopes down to 5'-11" to intersect a landing at the administration building. The walkway parallels the existing courtyard. The roof of the walkway is proposed to be standing seam. The walkway will not be visible from public view.

A monument sign is proposed to be placed along Caroline Street adjacent to the new parking area. The sign measures 10'-11" wide, 7'-5" high, and 2' thick. The sign is constructed on a concrete base with brick matching that of the existing buildings. Metal letters spell the name of the complex.

The existing rectangular parking lot is being reconfigured into an arc-shaped to reflect the design of the building addition. Ample planting areas are proposed around the parking area, however, no plants are specified.

I. ADDITION –

- Foundation – slab on grade
- Exterior materials – Brick veneer matching existing buildings
  - Rock faced cmu
  - Smooth face cmu
  - Cast in place concrete, painted limestone in color
- Windows – impact resistant storefront with insulating glass
  - finish – Heirloom white to match brick
  - glazing – solar green
- Doors – metal storefront doors
- Roof – Built-up flat roof
  - Standing seam metal roof
- Ornamental Ironwork – patina green in color

II. WALKWAY BRIDGE –

- Columns – cast in place concrete lower
  - Tubular steel upper
- Railing – tubular steel
- Roof – standing seam metal

III. MONUMENT SIGN -

A. Mounting and Placement:

1. The sign is located so as not to obscure the architectural features of the buildings.
2. The sign is not located in the right-of-way.
3. The sign is not an off-premise sign.
4. The height of the sign exceeds 5'.

B. Design:

1. The overall design of the signage relates to the design of the buildings on the property.
2. The sign utilizes the same materials and colors of the buildings on the property.

C. Size:

1. The total allowable square footage for the display area of a monument sign is (50) fifty square feet.
2. The total proposed signage square footage for the display area is approximately 18.25 square feet.
3. Typically, the Board limits the height of monument signs to 5'.

4. The height of the proposed sign is 7'-6".
5. Given the massing and scale of the buildings in the complex, a 7'-6" sign would not be out of character.
6. However, the massing and scale is out of character with the neighborhood and the residential character.

#### IV. PARKING –

- A. The Guidelines state that the appearance of parking areas should be minimized through good site planning and design.
  1. Planting areas are proposed around the parking area.
  2. Specific plants are not listed.
  3. In order to screen parking, plants should be 36" in height.

Staff recommends approval of the application for building issues as submitted. Staff further recommends that the sign be modified to be no taller than 5' in height, after total signage on site is measured. The Board should consider requesting a landscape plan to ensure adequate parking lot screening.

#### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Justin Lucas of TAG Architects and Jane Ellis of ASMS were present to answer any Board questions. Mr. Lucas submitted a revised sign design with the overall height at 5 ft. as recommended by Staff. He stated that the project will be confined to the area north of Caroline Avenue and not affect the parking lot south of Caroline Avenue.

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 additional 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 adopts the facts in the staff report, noting the fact that the sign will be reduced in height to 5 ft. 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 application does impair the structure and the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued pending approval of a landscape plan by Staff. The motion was seconded by Jim Wagoner and unanimously approved. A CoA will be issued once the landscape plans are approved.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
CERTIFIED RECORD**

**028-05/06-CA**            401 Church Street  
**Applicant:**            Christopher E. Peters, P.C.  
**Received:**            1/05/06                            **Meeting Date (s):**  
**Submission Date + 45 Days:** 2/19/06                            1) 1/23/06    2)                            3)

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:**        Church Street East Historic District  
**Classification:**        Contributing  
**Zoning:**                    R-B, Residential Business  
**Nature of Project:**     Repair bottom sash of third floor window with wood matching existing in material, profile and dimension. Replace hurricane damaged, non-historic wood windows with Kolbe & Kolbe clad windows with snap-in muntins, as per submitted photographs.

**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 request to repair existing sash complies with the Design Review Guidelines and will not impair the historic integrity of the structure and the district. The request to change windows from wood double hung with true divided lite to clad windows with artificial muntins does not comply with the Design Review Guidelines and will impair the historic integrity of the district.

1. The Ravesies House, ca. 1860, is a two story Greek Revival town house.
2. Windows in the existing historic structure are wood, double hung, true divided lite.
3. The applicant is requesting to repair a damaged bottom sash with a new material matching the original sash in material, profile and dimension.
4. A ca. 1960 addition is located at the rear of the structure.
5. Existing windows in the 1960 wing are wood, single paned, true divided lite.
6. The southeast elevations of the building sustained damage during Hurricane Katrina.
7. The applicant is requesting to remove damaged and deteriorated wood windows and replace them with clad windows with artificial muntins.
8. Snap in muntins are not allowed for any type of construction in the districts.

Staff recommends approval of the request to replace damaged wood sash with new wood sash. Staff recommends denial of the request to install clad windows with artificial muntins. Staff further

recommends that the windows be replaced with windows matching the original in profile, material and dimension.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Grey Redditt, one of the owners of the building, appeared before the Board. He explained that the windows proposed for the new portion of the building were in fact Kolbe and Kolbe double pane glass with aluminum cladding and a dimensional clad muntin on each side of the glass. There was no one else to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board questioned Staff regarding the Guideline requirement for replacement windows. Guidelines state that windows must be true divided light, even in new construction.

### **FINDING OF FACT**

David Tharp moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and at the public hearing, that the Board adopts the facts in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Tilmon Brown and approved unanimously.

### **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

David Tharp moved that, based upon the facts adopted by the Board, that the application does not impair the structure or the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Douglas Kearley. In discussion on the motion, Tilmon Brown noted that there is a clear precedent for true divided lights in the district. David Tharp withdrew his motion with the concurrence of Douglas Kearley.

Tilmon Brown moved that the application does impair the structure and the district and that application be denied. The motion was seconded by Cameron Pfeiffer and passed unanimously.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
CERTIFIED RECORD**

**029-05/06-CA**            210 South Washington Avenue  
Applicant:            Hargrove & Associates  
Received:            12/09/05                            Meeting Date (s):  
 Submission Date + 45 Days: 2/19/06                            1) 1/23/06    2)                            3)

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District:      Church Street East Historic District  
Classification:        Non – Contributing  
Zoning:                B-1, General Business  
Nature of Project:    Install 5’ high metal 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 5’ 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 story commercial building with brick veneer and metal paneled exterior.
  2. The subject structure is located on the northwest corner of Canal and South Washington Streets.
  3. The subject structure is a non-contributing structure within the district.
  4. The proposed fence is 5’ high, painted black.
  5. There are two sets of gates, one set at each parking area. One gate is automatic (sliding) and one gate is manual (hinged).
  6. The proposed fence matches the fence installed around the South Alabama Regional Planning Commission Office at the corner of Church and South Washington Streets.
  7. The proposed fence will not impair the integrity of the structure or the district.

Staff recommends approval of the request as submitted.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

David Hargrove was present to answer Board questions. He explained that there will be a personnel gate and an automated roll back gate for truck traffic.

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 additional Board discussion.

### **FINDING OF FACT**

Douglas Kearley moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and at the public hearing, that the Board adopts the facts in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Joe Sackett and unanimously approved.

### **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

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

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 01/23/07.