

CITY OF MOBILE
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

Minutes of the Meeting
February 13, 2006

CALL TO ORDER

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

Devereaux Bemis, MHDC Director, called the roll as follows:

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

Members Absent: Robert Brown 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>
Duggan F. Ellis	1563 Fearnway St.	032-04/05-CA
Juan Titlestad	Baytown Builders	030-05.06-CA
Melissa Thomas	50 St. Emanuel St.	033-05/06-CA
Rusty Reed	project manager	033-05/06-CA

Tilmon Brown moved to approve the minutes of the last meeting as emailed. Jim Wagoner questioned whether item 31 which pertained to 109 Bradford Avenue was the same property for which an application to remove the rear porches had been denied at a previous meeting. Staff answered in the affirmative. The motion was seconded by Jim Wagoner and unanimously approved.

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

MID-MONTH APPROVALS

1. Applicant's Name: Chuck Dixon Home Improvements
Property Address: 307 Chatham Street
Date of Approval: 1/10/06 weh
Work Approved: Replace rotten porch decking with materials matching existing in materials, profile and dimension. Repaint to match existing. Repair or replace as necessary column and railing to match existing in material, profile and dimension.
2. Applicant's Name: David Tharp
Property Address: 809 Government Street
Date of Approval: 1/11/06 weh
Work Approved: Repair to damaged windows with materials matching existing in material, profile and dimension. Prime and paint exterior woodwork. Remove plywood from front doors and reglaze door glass.

3. Applicant's Name: Myong Sun Yu (Roberson)
Property Address: 1113 Old Shell Road
Date of Approval: 1/12/06 weh
Work Approved: Re-roof building with materials matching existing in profile, dimension, color and material.

4. Applicant's Name: Jeff Deen
Property Address: 207 Church Street
Date of Approval: 1/12/06 asc
Work Approved: Install Timberline roof using Slate Blend shingles. Repaint building in existing color scheme.

5. Applicant's Name: Ronald A. Suggs
Property Address: 354 Regina Avenue
Date of Approval: 1/12/06 weh
Work Approved: (This CoA replaces CoA dated 2/22/05) Replace rotten floor on upstairs rear porch with materials matching existing in profile and dimension. Replace missing shingles with roofing matching existing in profile, dimension and color. Repair or replace trim around cornice & fascia with materials matching existing in profile and dimension.

6. Applicant's Name: Charlie and Catherine McLeod
Property Address: 18 Common Street
Date of Approval: 1/12/06 weh
Work Approved: Repaint house in existing color scheme. Replace rotten wood as necessary with new materials matching existing in profile, material and dimension.

7. Applicant's Name: Barbara Giddens
Property Address: 200 South Dearborn Street
Date of Approval: 1/13/06 asc
Work Approved: Repair storm damage to privacy fence with materials to match existing in profile, dimension and material.

8. Applicant's Name: Sea Corp Holdings
Property Address: 1111 Old Shell Road
Date of Approval: 1/12/06 asc
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary with new materials matching existing in profile, dimension and material. Repaint house in the following BLP color scheme:
Body – Monterey Street Dark Blue
Trim - White

9. Applicant's Name: A. R. McMorris Incorporated
Property Address: 208 Government Street
Date of Approval: 1/17/06 weh
Work Approved: Repair to damaged stucco to match existing in material, profile and dimension. Repaint to match existing color scheme.

10. Applicant's Name: Jaime Betbeze
Property Address: 1210 Selma Street
Date of Approval: 1/17/06 weh
Work Approved: Repair or replace rotten wood to match existing in materials, profile and dimension. Prep for painting. Re-roof with 3 tab shingles, black in color. Remove collapsed and deteriorated outbuilding in back yard.
11. Applicant's Name: Jean Lott/Lee Roofing
Property Address: 960 Palmetto Street
Date of Approval: 1/18/06 asc
Work Approved: Install new 3 tab shingle roof, Dove Gray in color, to match existing.
12. Applicant's Name: Shelter Roofing Company
Property Address: 1707 Hunter Avenue
Date of Approval: 1/18/06 asc
Work Approved: Re-roof house with 3 tab shingles, Oxford Gray in color.
13. Applicant's Name: Shelter Roofing Company
Property Address: 400 Wisconsin Avenue
Date of Approval: 1/18/06 asc
Work Approved: Re-roof house with 3 tab shingles, black in color.
14. Applicant's Name: Gaillard Builders
Property Address: 753 St. Francis Street
Date of Approval: 1/18/06 weh
Work Approved: Install copper eave flashing. Install cold adhesive modified roll roofing.
15. Applicant's Name: Elizabeth Edwards/Trinity Roofing
Property Address: 20 South Hallett Street
Date of Approval: 1/19/06 asc
Work Approved: Install new 3 tab gray shingle roof to match existing.
16. Applicant's Name: O.C. Wiggins
Property Address: 24 McPhillips Street
Date of Approval: 1/19/06 weh
Work Approved: Re-roof with 3 tab shingle roof, black in color.
17. Applicant's Name: Watson Realty
Property Address: 2 South Water Street
Date of Approval: 1/19/06 weh
Work Approved: Replace existing downspouts with new downspouts. Paint new downspouts to match building color.
18. Applicant's Name: Ryan Stukas
Property Address: 8 LeBaron Street
Date of Approval: 1/19/06 weh
Work Approved: Repair loose and damaged siding. Paint exterior the following colors:

Body – SW Colonial Revival Stone Green
Trim – SW Roycroft Vellum

19. Applicant's Name: Delzak Builders
Property Address: 1106 Montauk Street
Date of Approval: 1/23/06 weh
Work Approved: Re-roof with 30 year dimensional shingle roof, Charcoal in color.
20. Applicant's Name: Miller Contracting and Remodeling
Property Address: 1461 Monroe Street
Date of Approval: 1/23/06 weh
Work Approved: Install architectural shingles, black, charcoal grey or weathered wood in color. Replace rotten wood as necessary with new materials to match existing in profile, dimension, materials and color. Paint new materials to match existing color scheme.
21. Applicant's Name: Fred South Construction
Property Address: 307 Chatham Street
Date Approved: 1/23/06 jss
Work Approved: replace rotten wood on fascia, siding and back porch as necessary with new materials to match existing in profile, dimension and material.
22. Applicant's Name: Juanita Owens
Property Address: 1053 New St. Francis Street
Date Approved: 1/23/06 jss
Work Approved: Repair storm damage on garage with new materials matching existing in profile, dimension and material. Repairs to include roof, walls and repainting in existing color scheme.
23. Applicant's Name: Wintzells
Property Address: 605 Dauphin Street
Date Approved: 1/24/06 weh
Work Approved: (This CoA replaces an expired CoA dated 12/9/03) Construct wood deck, measuring 13' wide by 46'-6" long in parking space in front of the building as per submitted plans.

Deck is to be constructed at a distance of 5' from the north wall of the existing restaurant. The deck is to be aligned with the existing building face, and extend out into the existing street/parking lane approximately 7'. Materials include pressure treated structure, railing, (Victorian cutwork balustrade, MHDC stock plan #3). Extend existing shed roof over sidewalk an additional 5' to cover portions of the deck. Existing decorative Victorian brackets to be replicated to support the overhang. Deck to be stained with railing to be painted white.

24. Applicant's Name: Chilton Coulson
Property Address: 16-22 South Conception Street
Date Approved: 1/24/06 asc
Work Approved: Install 30 year architectural shingles, Georgetown Grey in color, over new decking and felt. Install 4 new roof drains, new valleys and wall flashing.
25. Applicant's Name: Nicholas Vrakelos
Property Address: 56 LeMoyne Place
Date Approved: 1/24/06 weh
Work Approved: Repair and or replace damaged and deteriorated wood cornice, soffit and fascia. Re-roof with architectural grade shingles, either black, weathered wood or charcoal in color.
26. Applicant's Name: Cooner Roofing
Property Address: 302 South George Street
Date Approved: 1/24/06 asc
Work Approved: Install new roof, architectural shingles, charcoal in color.
27. Applicant's Name: Cooner Roofing
Property Address: 1163 New St. Francis Street
Date Approved: 1/24/06 asc
Work Approved: Install new roof, 3 tab shingle, charcoal in color.
28. Applicant's Name: Michael Purvis
Property Address: 1802 Old Government Street
Date Approved: 1/26/06 asc
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood on porch with new materials to match existing in profile, material and dimension. Paint new materials to match existing color scheme. Repair storm damaged roof as necessary to match existing.
29. Applicant's Name: Buddy Bilt
Property Address: 22 McPhillips Street
Date Approved: 1/26/06 asc
Work Approved: Re-roof building with architectural shingles, weathered wood in color.
30. Applicant's Name: Diane Maiselle
Property Address: 252 West Street
Date Approved: 1/27/06 weh
Work Approved: Install Elk architectural shingles, antique slate in color.
31. Applicant's Name: Gary Barile
Property Address: 109 Bradford Avenue
Date Approved: 1/27/06 weh
Work Approved: Reconstruct rear porches on apartment building using two existing porches as examples. Materials to match existing in materials, profile and dimension.

32. Applicant's Name: City of Mobile
 Property Address: 203 S. Claiborne Street
 Date Approved: 1/27/06 weh
 Work Approved: Re-roof building with architectural grade shingles, either weathered wood or aged wood in color.
33. Applicant's Name: Janice Phelps
 Property Address: 906 Palmetto Street
 Date Approved: 1/27/06 jss
 Work Approved: Replace rotten siding and repair porch columns with materials to match existing in profile, dimension and materials. Paint to match existing color scheme.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. **030-05/06-CA** 107 Ryan Avenue
 Applicant: John & Allison Peebles
 Nature of Request: Remove existing two story ca. 1970 addition at rear of residence and construct new two story addition as per submitted plans.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.
2. **031-05/06-CA** 1015 Savannah Street
 Applicant: DeAngelo Parker
 Nature of Request: Construct rear addition measuring 15' x 28' as per submitted plans.

TABLED. Certified Record attached.
3. **032-05/06-CA** 1563 Fearnway
 Applicant: Duggan & Bessy Ellis
 Nature of Request: Additions to rear outbuilding as per submitted plan. Add a porch to east elevation measuring 13'-4" x 45'. Add shop to south elevation measuring 31' x 20'-4".

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.
4. **033-05/06-CA** 50 St. Emanuel Street
 Applicant: Tilmon Brown, Contractor
 Nature of Request: Construct balcony as per submitted plans.

TABLED. Certified Record attached.

OTHER BUSINESS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Devereaux Bemis announced that the NAPC meeting will be held in Baltimore from July 27-30th. Please make a decision regarding your attendance at the conference by the next meeting.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

030-05/06-CA 107 Ryan Avenue
Applicant: John and Allison Peebles
Received: 1/11/06 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 2/25/06 1) 2/13/06 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Ashland Place Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Conflicts of Interest: Douglas Kearley recused himself from discussion and voting on the application.
Nature of Project: Remove existing non-historic rear 2 story garage addition and construct new two story garage addition 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

1. The ca. 1921 Denby House is a one story frame structure with wood clapboards and brick porch columns.
2. There is an existing two story garage addition located at the rear of the main house, adjacent to the alley.
3. The existing two story garage addition measures 25' x 30'.
4. The ridge line of the existing addition ties into the ridge line of the main house.
5. The lot measures 143' x 75'.
6. The proposed two story garage measures 30' deep x 36' wide and its ridge line is proposed to extend up 7' past the ridge line of the main house.
7. Typically, the Board requires that proposed additions maintain ridge lines equal to or lower than the existing historic structures.
8. Typically, the Board has denied requests for additions that exceed the existing historic ridge line.
9. The addition occurs at a distance approximately 101' from the street.
10. The addition occurs at a distance of approximately 65' from the front of the house.
11. The north property line setback is 4'-6".
12. The west property line setback is 6'-0".
13. The Historic District Overlay Ordinance will allow the proposed structure to be built following setbacks established by the main residence or properties within 150' of the proposed construction.

14. The proposed two story garage addition is to be constructed at slab on grade, with hardiplank siding installed in the Dutch Lap fashion, matching the profile of the main house.
15. Typically the Board requires that exterior materials match existing materials for additions to existing historic structures.
16. Windows for the proposed two story garage addition are predominantly paired six-over-one clad wood windows matching those in the main house.
17. Roofing for the proposed two story garage addition is Timberline shingles, matching those on the main house.
18. Garage doors are proposed to be flush insulated sectional doors.

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff's judgment, the proposed work does not comply with the Design Review Guidelines concerning materials. Also, staff could not determine the effect of the addition's higher roof line and leaves this to the judgment of the Board. Upon the resolution of these two items, Staff would recommend approval.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Tuan Titlestad of Baytown Builders was present to answer Board questions. He explained that the ridgeline for the addition will be 3 ft. higher than the existing ridge line and that the addition will not be visible from the front or right side. Although it will be visible on the left, the existing addition is visible from this direction. He also explained that wood siding rather than hardiplank will be used on the addition.

The Board questioned staff regarding fact No 6 that the ridge would be 7 ft. above the existing historic ridge line. Staff responded that the drawing indicated the ridge would be 7' higher. The Board noted the discrepancy between the contractor's estimate and the drawings. Joe Sackett commented that the ridge was short and would have a small impact on the historic building. There was no one else 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

Cindy Klotz added fact 19: There are additions to buildings that are higher than the historic ridge line. The Board altered fact 6 to read: The proposed two story garage measures 30' deep x 36' wide and its ridge line is proposed to extend from 3 to 7 feet past the ridge line of the main house.

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 in addition to fact 19 as stated above. The motion was seconded by Cindy Klotz and approved unanimously.

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. The motion was seconded by Joe Sackett and approved unanimously.

Harris Oswalt moved that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued for the project. The motion was seconded by David Tharp and approved unanimously.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 02/13/07.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

031-05/06-CA 1015 Savannah Street
Applicant: DeAngelo Parker
Received: 1/30/06 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 3/16/06 1) 2/13/06 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 measuring 15' x 28' 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. 1923 one story frame residence with vernacular Bungalow detailing.
2. The subject structure is on the southeast corner of Chatham and Savannah Streets.
3. The lot measures 50' x 120'.
4. The proposed addition measures approximately 15' x 28'.
5. The proposed addition occurs at the rear of the property.
6. Foundation piers to match those existing on the historic residence.
7. Wood siding to match that existing on the historic residence.
8. Windows to match that in the historic residence.
9. Roof pitch and materials to match that on the historic residence.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Neither the owner or his representative were present.

Staff presented the application.

The Board questioned whether Staff had prepared the drawings. Staff prepared the interior floor plan and side elevation.

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the fact that the siding varied on the house. They had questions regarding the materials, windows, lattice, lack of a water table and the fact that horizontal siding is used in the front gable while vertical siding is proposed for the rear elevation gable.

FINDING OF FACT

The Board did not adopt facts.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Cindy Klotz moved that, based upon a lack of information in the application, that the application be tabled. The motion was seconded by David Tharp and approved unanimously.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

032-05/06-CA 1563 Fearnway
Applicant: Duggan & Bessy Ellis
Received: 2/3/06 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 3/20/06 1) 2/13/06 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Conflicts of Interest: Douglas Kearley recused himself from discussion and voting on the application.
Nature of Project: Additions to rear outbuilding as per submitted plan. Add a porch to east elevation measuring 13'-4" x 45". Add shop to south elevation measuring 31' x 20'-4".

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 main residence is a large frame and brick veneer bungalow.
2. The existing outbuilding is a one story frame structure.
3. The existing outbuilding is indicated on the 1925 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map.
4. The existing outbuilding measures 31' x 36'- 6".
5. A porch measuring 13'-4" x 45' is proposed for the east elevation.
6. A shop measuring 31' x 20'-4" is proposed for the south elevation.
7. Columns supporting the porch roof match those on the front porch of the house.
8. Wood windows in existing outbuilding to be removed & relocated to sections of new construction.
9. New wood & glass doors to be installed to provide access from existing outbuilding to new porch.
10. New wood & glass carriage-type doors to be installed in new shop area.
11. Roof to be asphalt shingle to match existing.
12. Building to be repainted in existing color scheme.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Duggan Ellis was present to answer any Board questions. The Board asked if a fireplace was being installed in the building expansion. The owner answered in the affirmative. There was no one else 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

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 adopt the facts in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Jim Wagoner and approved unanimously.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Tilmon Brown moved that the proposed work does not impair the historic structure or the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by David Tharp and approved unanimously.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 02/13/07.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

033-05/06-CA 50 St. Emanuel Street
Applicant: Peter F. Burns, Owner/Tilmon Brown, Contractor
Received: 2/3/06 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 3/20/06 1) 2/13/06 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District
Classification: Non-Contributing (de-certified)
Zoning: B-4, General Business
Conflicts of Interest: Tilmon Brown recused himself from discussion and voting on the application.
Nature of Project: Construct balcony 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 ca. 1850 two story masonry building was considered non-contributing due to unsympathetic alterations over time.
2. There are actually two historic buildings with different second floor window heights, different cornice lines, and roof.
2. The proposed balcony is one story and begins on St. Emanuel Street, wraps around the Conti Street elevation and continues around to the end of the building.
3. The 1904 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map shows that originally the corner building had a balcony, but there was no balcony on the Conti Street elevation of the back building.
4. The original balcony had a shorter run down Conti Street than the one proposed.
5. The post collars and column capitals are standard Lawler designs used frequently in the Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District.
6. Plans call for four new doors where there are currently existing original historic windows, one on the St. Emanuel Street elevation and three on the Conti Street elevation.
7. While plans call for doors opening onto the proposed balcony, no information was provided regarding these doors, which will be made from existing original historic window openings.
8. The balcony as proposed creates a false sense of a single building.
9. Although the hand rail is continuous between the buildings, it does angle down at the intersection of the front and rear buildings.

10. The Board should request more information on how the alteration of existing original historic windows will effect the character of the building.

Staff recommends approval of the application with the condition that the handrail be redesigned to suggest that there are two separate buildings with different façade elements and proportions.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Melissa Thomas, a member of the law firm, and Rusty Reed, project manager, were present to answer Board questions.

Staff showed the building footprint as shown on the 1905 Sanborn Map. The balcony illustrated on the map appeared narrower than adjacent balconies and turned the corner; it did not continue along the Conti Street elevation.

Board members suggested making the two separate buildings appear as two. Ms. Thomas responded that the firm wished to make the buildings appear as one.

Board members considered that information was lacking from the application including door locations and details, iron work details, etc.

David Tharp considered that the proportions of the columns to the balcony were incorrect and suggested that the proportions should be worked out. Also the Board encouraged looking at two entirely different railing designs to emphasize that the buildings were originally separate. David Tharp emphasized that the street scene in the historic district is comprised of small buildings rather than super-buildings. Douglas Kearley suggested that non-historic balcony details, such as those found on the Brewery at 225 Dauphin Street, might be acceptable.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Board members suggested to Staff that the application was incomplete and should not have been placed on the agenda.

FINDING OF FACT

There was no adoption of facts by the Board.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Cindy Klotz moved to table the application. Additional information regarding the materials used for doors, windows and balconies, as well as their design, must be submitted for review. Elevations showing their relationship must also be submitted. The motion was seconded by David Tharp and unanimously approved.