

CITY OF MOBILE
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

Minutes of the Meeting
May 8, 2006

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m. by Chair, Bunky Ralph. Ed Hooker, MHDC Architectural Engineer, called the roll as follows:

Members Present: Tilmon Brown, Cindy Klotz, Michael Mayberry, Harris Oswalt, Cameron Pfeiffer, Bunky Ralph, , David Tharp, Jim Wagoner.

Members Absent: Robert Brown. Douglas Kearley, Joe Sackett

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

<u>In Attendance</u>	<u>Mailing Address</u>	<u>Item Number</u>
Martha and Robert Collier	1551 Dauphin St.	061-05/06-CA
Nicholas H. Holmes III	257 N. Conception	063-05/06-CA
Gary Jackson	AE Dept.	063-05/06-CA
Spencer Watts	Library	063-05/06-CA
Hal Alexander		059-05/06-CA
Michael Freeman		059-05/06-CA

Tilmon Brown moved to approve the minutes of the last meeting as emailed with corrections by Cindy Klotz. The motion was seconded by Mike Mayberry and unanimously approved.

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

MID-MONTH APPROVALS

1. Applicant's Name: R. D. Pope Contracting
Property Address: 110 Conti Street
Date of Approval: 4/12/06 weh
Work Approved: Replace storm damaged exterior northwest stucco parapet wall at roof, with materials to match existing wall in material, profile and dimension. Match color to existing. (Northwest roof wall is not visible from the street.)
2. Applicant's Name: Greg Rawls
Property Address: 1408 Eslava Street
Date of Approval: 4/13/06 weh
Work Approved: Demolish deteriorated non-historic and non-contributing outbuilding.
3. Applicant's Name: Walker Brothers Investment
Property Address: 661 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 4/17/06 weh
Work Approved: Install black retractable awning over building entrance.

4. Applicant's Name: Justin Hovey
Property Address: 1565 Blair Avenue
Date of Approval: 4/18/06 jss
Work Approved: Repaint house, trim white, body Lincoln Cottage Lattice Green.

5. Applicant's Name: Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund
Property Address: 256 Marine Street
Date of Approval: 4/20/06 asc
Work Approved: Amendment to CoA dated 12/20/05. Eliminate reconstruction of 2nd floor front porch that was added post 1956.

6. Applicant's Name: Maxanna Nichols
Property Address: 18 Houston Street
Date of Approval: 4/20/06 asc
Work Approved: Paint exterior in the following Sherwin Williams color scheme:
Body – Enigma (mauve)
Trim – Chaise Mauve or lighter
Deck – Gray
Foundation – Rock Garden (dark green)

7. Applicant's Name: Senior Citizens' Services Center/Mobile Fence Co.
Property Address: 1717 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 4/20/06 asc
Work Approved: Replace hurricane damaged privacy fence, 6' in height. Add portion toward McGill Street that is 3' in height. Fence to be natural to weather.

8. Applicant's Name: Ray Maurin/David Cooner Roofing
Property Address: 36 South Reed Street
Date of Approval: 4/20/06 asc
Work Approved: Install new 25 year Royal Sovereign shingles, charcoal blend in color, to match existing.

9. Applicant's Name: Lewis Mayson
Property Address: 601 Government Street
Date of Approval: 4/21/06 weh
Work Approved: Install standing seam metal roof, Mansard Brown in color. Roof profile to match that of the existing metal roof in material, profile and dimension. Repaint building. Color scheme to be provided at a later date.

NOTICES OF VIOLATION and MUNICIPAL OFFENSE TICKETS:

No NoVs or MoTs were written during this time period.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. **059-05/06-CA** 360-362 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Hal Alexander, Owner – New Beginning Construction,
Contractor
Nature of Request: Remove third story façade of building due to structural
instability. Re-use bricks to rebuild façade at a later
date.

DENIED. Certified Record attached.

2. **060-05/06-CA** 253 State Street
Applicant: Mr. and Mrs. Bob Donlon
Nature of Request: Remove existing concrete curb, concrete sidewalk, curb
cut and concrete at right-of-way and install new brick
sidewalks, cast iron fence and gates on brick base, new
concrete driveway apron and plant 2 palm trees.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

3. **061-05/06-CA** 1551 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Bob Collier
Nature of Request: Construct cinder block and lattice fence. Stucco block.
Fence to be 6' in height.

APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. Certified Record
attached.

4. **062-05/06-CA** 210 Roper Street
Applicant: William Christopher Patton
Nature of Request: Remove small lattice fence and construct a masonry wall
similar to the one constructed at 210 Rapier Avenue in 2005.

APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. Certified Record
attached.

5. **063-05/06-CA** 701 Government Street
Applicant: City of Mobile –Mobile Public Library
Nature of Request: Reinstall concrete terrace and steps as per the originally-
approved scope of work. Patch missing and damaged areas
with new concrete. Apply FloorTex non-slip textured coating
over the entire area.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS:

1. Ed Hooker reminded Board members about the upcoming Baltimore conference.
Anyone interested in attending, must commit by May 22nd since there is a scholarship
available from the AHC for 50% of expenses. Cindy, Bunky, Jim, Tilmon, David and
Harris have expressed an interesting in attending.
2. Bunky Ralph discussed including a 3-tiered approval system for new construction in the
new Guidelines similar to the system used in Charleston. She felt that this might

prevent developers from submitting completed plans that did not meet the Guidelines and then having to spend additional money to alter them. Some Board members felt that the problem stemmed from developers who received all approvals from various other boards before submitting to the ARB.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:25 p.m.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

059-05/06-CA 360-362 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Hal Alexander
Received: 4/13 /06 Meeting Dates:
Submission Date + 45 Days: 5/22/06 1) 5/08/06 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4, General Business
Conflicts of Interest: David Tharp recused himself from discussion and voting on the application.
Tilmon Brown stated that he had done repair work for the owner on another building, but that relationship would not prevent him from making an impartial decision in this case.
Nature of Project: Remove third story façade of building due to structural instability. Re-use bricks to rebuild façade at a later date.

STAFF REPORT

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 ANALYSIS

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.

1. The ca. 1919 Wilkins-Higgins Building is listed as a contributing structure within the Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District.
2. The subject structure has a three story brick façade facing Dauphin Street.
3. A fire in 1994 destroyed the interior of the building.
4. Only one of the three floors was reconstructed after the fire.
5. Steel beams and braces are in place to shore up the second and third floor façade.
6. The applicants are requesting to dismantle the façade from the second floor up due to the fact that they feel the current wall is structurally unstable.
7. There are a number of decorative cast elements at the cornice above the third floor windows, including a section carved with the building name.
8. The applicants have stated a willingness to retain the materials and reconstruct the wall at a later date.

Staff recommends denial of the application as submitted. Staff further recommends that an independent engineer assess the current condition and develop a way to stabilize the wall.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Hal Alexander and Michael Freeman were present to discuss the application. Mr. Alexander told the Board that an engineer told him that the wall has begun to lean forward and would eventually fall. When the building was constructed, the front wall was not tied into the structure. Although the wall is braced, Mr. Alexander feels its condition poses a safety hazard. In fact, some coping has already fallen. Mr. Alexander stated that it is his eventual intention to build back the wall to match the existing design. He would like to construct an apartment building behind the façade with 2 apartments per floor. He explained that he had inspected the property prior to purchasing it, but that the inspection had been cursory. Mr. Freeman added that the mortar is degrading.

Board members stated that there should be a written report from a structural engineer summarizing the wall's condition. The Board felt certain that the front wall was not separate from the original structure, that supplemental bracing should be done and that more options rather than dismantling the wall should be pursued. Reconstruction of the wall would not be economically feasible since the old brick may be unsuitable for reuse. The Board also pointed out that coping on any wall requires maintenance or pieces may break off and fall.

Board members pointed out that there are no drawings to illustrate the appearance of the wall once a portion of it is removed.

There was no one else to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application.

Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

Board members added two facts to the staff report:

9. No written engineer's report is available.

10. No proposed rebuilding plan was submitted.

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 in addition to facts 9 and 10 above. The motion was seconded by Jim Wagoner and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does impair the historic integrity of the structure and the district according to the Guidelines and that the application be denied. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswald and unanimously approved.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

060-05/06-CA 253 State Street
Applicant: Mr. & Mrs. Bob Donlon
Received: 4/12 /06 Meeting Dates:
Submission Date + 45 Days: 5/23 /06 1) 5/08/06 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: DeTonti Square Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-B, Residential-Business
Nature of Project: Remove existing concrete curb, concrete sidewalk, curb cut and concrete at right-of-way and install new brick sidewalks, cast iron fence and gates on brick base, new concrete driveway apron and plant 2 palm trees.

STAFF REPORT

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 ANALYSIS

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 “Modern paving materials are acceptable in the historic districts. However, it is important that the design, location and materials be compatible with the property.”
 - 1. The ca. 1857 McCoy House is a two story masonry townhouse.
 - 2. The subject structure is a contributing element within the DeTonti Square Historic District.
 - 3. The applicants are requesting to remove existing deteriorated concrete curb and sidewalk.
 - 4. The applicants are requesting to install a new brick sidewalk along the 75’ length of the property.
 - 5. A similar sidewalk is located directly across the street adjacent to the offices of Miller, Hamilton, Schneider and Odom.
 - 6. A variance from the Board of Zoning Adjustment is required to have anything other than the standard concrete sidewalk.
 - 7. The applicants have applied for a variance.

- B. The Guidelines state that fences “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. A cast iron fence is proposed along the perimeter of the front of the property.
 2. The proposed cast iron fence will be placed on top of a brick knee wall approximately 8” high.
 3. The fence panel matches that used on the balcony above the bay window to the right of the main entrance.
 4. The overall height of the fence is proposed to be 4’.
 5. Columns are to be brick, measuring 6’-8” high.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Neither the applicant nor his representative was present to discuss the application. There was no one else to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record. Board members questioned Staff regarding the east and west fence elevations and whether the applicant had applied for a variance. Staff felt that 4 ft. iron fences would be continued on the side elevations, but that a small solid portion of wall would buffer the property at the sidewalk from the business next door. He explained that the applicant had applied for a variance to change the sidewalk from concrete to brick. Tilmon Brown noted that it was appropriate to have a brick sidewalk in a historic district and it should not be necessary to apply for a variance.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

The Board discussed amending the facts in the Staff report:

4. The overall height of the front, east and west fence is 4 ft. with a corner section at the east 6 ft. in height.

Cindy Klotz 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 4 modified as above. The motion was seconded by David Barr 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 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: 05/08/07.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

061-05/06-CA 1551 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Bob Collier
Received: 4/18 /06 Meeting Dates:
Submission Date + 45 Days: 5/29 /06 1) 5/08/06 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Conflicts of Interest: Tilmon Brown recused himself from discussion and voting on the application.
Nature of Project: Construct cinder block and lattice fence. Stucco block.
Fence to be 6’ in height.

STAFF REPORT

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 ANALYSIS

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 fences “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 ca. 1919 Glover House is a two story frame residence with a terra cotta tile roof.
 - 2. The subject structure is a contributing element within the Old Dauphin Way Historic District.
 - 3. The subject structure occupies a prominent location in the district, on the southwest corner of Dauphin and Catherine Streets.
 - 4. The applicants are requesting to erect a stucco-covered masonry and wood lattice wall approximately 50’ in length by 6’ in height between the rear of the main residence and the two story garage.
 - 5. Currently there is a deteriorated wood picket fence at this location.
 - 6. The proposed new stucco-covered masonry and wood lattice wall is to be constructed using 6’-6” masonry columns spaced equidistantly between the buildings.
 - 7. A 2’ high knee wall will run continuously along the perimeter of the fence.
 - 8. 4’ high framed wood lattice panels will be placed between the masonry columns.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted with the following recommendation:

1. That the finish be a true 3 part stucco system with a fine sand texture.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. and Mrs. Collier were present to discuss the application. They explained that they had decided to relocate the gate to the location of the existing gate and presented a photograph of the iron fence they intended to use. They explained that the lattice would be 2 inches square and be painted white. They intended to place finials on the columns providing they found something they liked.

The Board asked about the drawing that illustrates concrete block. The applicant explained that the block would be stuccoed and left the natural concrete color and that the knee wall would be 32 inches in height. The lattice panels will be somewhat less than 4 ft. x 8 ft. in order to have the fence at a height of 6 feet. 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

Board members discussed that there are other stucco systems, such as a 2 part system, that could be used. Perhaps the system and finish could be presented to the Staff for approval.

FINDING OF FACT

The Board amended the staff report as follows:

7. A 32 inch high knee wall will run continuously along the perimeter of the fence.
8. 40 inch high framed wood lattice panels painted white will be placed between the masonry columns.
9. The gate will be cast iron per the submitted photograph and be centered on the wall.
10. Providing finials are used, the design is to be submitted to Staff.

Cameron Pfeiffer 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 as modified above. The motion was seconded by Mike Mayberry and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Cindy Klotz 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 David Tharp and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 05/08/07.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

062-05/06-CA 210 Roper Street
Applicant: William Christopher Patton
Received: 4/25 /06 Meeting Dates:
Submission Date + 45 Days: 6/04/06 1) 5/08/06 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Nature of Project: Remove small lattice fence and construct a masonry wall similar to the one constructed at 210 Rapier Avenue in 2005.

STAFF REPORT

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 ANALYSIS

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 fences “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 ca. 1901 Hearin House is a two story wood frame residence with Queen Anne detailing.
 - 2. The subject structure is a contributing element within the Oakleigh Garden Historic District.
 - 3. Currently there is a deteriorated wood fence at this location.
 - 4. The proposed stucco-covered masonry wall is 6’-4” high, with 7’-4” tall piers starting at the southwest corner of the house, traveling to the sidewalk, then turning west and running to the existing carport.
 - 5. Typically, privacy fences or walls are limited to 6’ in height unless the property adjoins a commercially-zoned property.
 - 6. The subject property and all adjacent properties are zoned R-1, Single Family Residential.
 - 7. A gate is located at the center point of the wall.
 - 8. No design was provided for the gate but the applicant noted when making the application that a photograph will be provided prior to installation to ensure that it is appropriate.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted with the following conditions:

- 1. That the wall height be lowered to 6’ and piers be lowered to 7’.
- 2. That the finish be a true three part stucco system with a fine sand texture.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Neither the applicant nor his representative was present to discuss the application. Staff reported that the applicant had intended to be present to discuss his request for a fence higher than 6 ft. The applicant felt that many fences in the neighborhood exceeded 6 ft. in height such as at 1157 Palmetto, an 8 ft. fence approved by the Board. 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 issue of fencing that exceeds 6 ft. in height as required by the Guidelines. While some Board members felt that the Guidelines must be followed, the Board has, upon occasion, approved fences higher than 6 ft. While the Board has the 6 ft. restriction in its Guidelines, City code allows for 8 ft. high fences. Perhaps further discussion on this issue is warranted.

FINDING OF FACT

Cindy Klotz 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 David Tharp and approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

David Tharp 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 the finish to be approved by Staff. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswalt and failed by a vote of 5 to 4.

Cindy Klotz moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does impair the historic integrity of the structure and the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued contingent upon the columns being no higher than 7 ft. and the panels being no higher than 6 ft with the finish to be approved by staff. The motion was seconded by Cameron Pfeiffer and approved with David Tharp voting in opposition.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 05/08/07.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

063-05/06-CA 701 Government Street
Applicant: Mobile Public Library
Received: 4/28 /06 Meeting Dates:
Submission Date + 45 Days: 6/07/06 1) 5/08/06 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4, General Business
Nature of Project: Reinstall concrete terrace and steps as per the originally-approved scope of work. Patch missing and damaged areas with new concrete. Apply Floortex non-slip textured coating over the entire area.

STAFF REPORT

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 ANALYSIS

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 1928 Mobile Public Library is a two story masonry structure.
2. The Mobile Public Library is a contributing element within the Church Street East Historic District.
3. The front terrace is an original architectural feature of the complex.
4. To facilitate the building's restoration, the terrace and the steps were removed and stored.
5. The terrace and steps have been put back in place, however, due to minimal damage at removal and damage & deterioration over time, approximately 10% of the material has to be replaced.
6. The applicants are requesting to place a coating over the surface to achieve a uniform appearance.
7. The coating color will match the exterior walls of the library.

This is the first request of this type that has been presented to Staff and the Board for consideration. Staff recommends that the Board determine whether or not the request is an impairment to the structure or the district.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Nick Holmes III was present to discuss the application. He stated that the problem is that both the terrace and steps were broken and chipped. A French drain system had been installed under the terrace, necessitating that sections of concrete were removed. The result was an uneven texture and color. Re-pouring the entire terrace and steps was not in the budget. In an effort to make the area a uniform color,

he wanted to use a high traffic coating that would both make the color even and provide some protection from water infiltration. He expected that the material could have a long life span. He compared the material to that used on concrete balconies to help keep water out. He added that there will be a slight sheen at a distance to the product, but that dirt from the environment will reduce its effect. He noted that he had discussed this issue with Chloe Mercer at the Alabama Historical Commission. Funding from the State for the project is contingent upon the project meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. While Ms. Mercer felt that the proposal did not violate the Standards, a patchwork effect would be preferred. There was no one else to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

Board members amended facts in the Staff report as follows:

7. The coating color will match the color of the original concrete.
8. The SHPO has no problem with the application of this product.

Cindy Klotz 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 as amended above. The motion was seconded by David Tharp and unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Cindy Klotz moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Tilmon Brown and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 05/08/07.