

**MOBILE HISTORIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
CITY OF MOBILE
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Minutes of the Meeting
June 23, 2003**

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Cindy Klotz called the Architectural Review Board Meeting to order at 3:03 p.m.

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

Present: Bunky Ralph, Cindy Klotz, Dennis Carlisle, Karen Carr, Buffy Donlon, Nick Holmes, III, Douglas Kearley, Jackie McCracken, Bill Christian

Absent: Robert Brown, Dan McCleave

A quorum was declared after the roll was called.

<u>In Attendance</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Item Number</u>
Ron LaGrange	80 St. Michael Street	059-02/03-CA
Jo Bacton	300 Brandy Run Road	059-02/03-CA
Pat LaGrange	5855 St. Gallen Avenue	059-02/03-CA
Laurie Benjamin	115 Providence Street	061-02/03-CA
David Lindsay	1275 Spring Hill Avenue	057-02/03-CA
Hiep Bui	1275 Spring Hill Avenue	057-02/03-CA
Linda La	1275 Spring Hill Avenue	057-02/03-CA
Tom Lilley	300 Mohawk Street	057-02/03-CA
Joseph O'Brien	157 Charles Street	060-02/03-CA

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES: May 27, 2003 Meeting

Douglas Kearley moved to approve the minutes as mailed. Bunky Ralph seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

APPROVAL OF THE MID-MONTH CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS:

Bunky Ralph moved to approve the mid-month certificates as mailed. Douglas Kearley seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

MID MONTH APPROVALS

1. 8 South Hamilton Street: Bernhardt Roofing Company
Replace roof with new modified bitumen flat roof to match existing in profile and dimension.

APPROVED 5/29/03 asc

2. 159 Roberts Street: Joe Peake/Ralph Reynolds Roofing
Install new built-up roof on rear portion of house to match existing in profile and dimension.

APPROVED 5/29/03 asc

3. 1208 Selma Street: Karen Shirah
Repaint house in the following Sherwin William colors:
Body – Bunglehouse Gray SW2845
Trim – Roycroft Vellum SW2832
Door and Shutters – Polished Mahogany SW2838
Porch – Roycroft Bottle Green SW2847
Porch Ceiling – Robins Egg Blue
APPROVED 5/29/03 asc

4. 151 South Monterey Street: Marylon & Leon Barkan/DoRight Construction
Touch up painted brick skirting to match existing paint scheme. Replace rotten wood on fascia, columns, siding, and porch deck and stairs as necessary to match existing in profile and dimension. Paint to match existing color scheme.

APPROVED 6/2/03 weh

5. 2308 Ashland Place: Jim and Patti Smith
Re-roof house using Elk Capstone architectural grade shingles, granite in color, as per submitted sample.

APPROVED 6/2/02 weh

6. 5 North Claiborne Street: Terrence Hillery
Repaint windows and front door to match existing color scheme. Replace rotten wood as necessary to match existing in profile and dimension.

APPROVED 6/2/03 weh

7. 157 Houston Street: Jeb Schrenk
Replace existing inappropriate solid metal door at rear of house with new wood door, nine light with two panels below as per submitted photo.

APPROVED 6/5/03 weh

8. Vidmon Betts for Wiley Butler
Repair to roof damage by falling tree limbs – redeck as necessary and install shingles to match existing.

APPROVED 6/6/03 asc

9. 105 South Catherine Street: Lori Roberts
Repair rotten wood to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Install a canvas, scalloped valance below the porch soffit, black with white piping. Paint the house in the following Sherwin Williams color scheme:
Body – Laguna
Trim – White
Accents and porch deck – Black

APPROVED 6/6/02 jdb

10. 401-405 Dauphin: Carl Jordan and John Scarborough
Reglaze windows on second floor. Prime and paint as necessary.

APPROVED 6/9/03 weh

11. 1155 Church Street: W. Jason Weekley/Affinity Cleaning and Restoration.
Repaint house in the existing color scheme. Replace rotten wood with new matching existing in profile and dimension as necessary.

APPROVED 6/4/03 jdb

12. 110 Beverly Court: Russell Reilly
Remove non-historic and deteriorated carport from rear of property. Repaint trim white to match existing. Reglaze windows as necessary.

APPROVED 6/10/03 weh

13. 109 South Georgia Avenue: Marion Elledge
Install exterior storm windows. Remove existing, inappropriate and non-original second front door in bay. Replace with one-over-one wood window sash to match existing. All new wood trim to match existing; feather siding to match existing; paint to match existing. Remove door to second floor porch and replace with historic wood and glass door matching the main front door in profile and dimension. Current door is interior door and not appropriate in style or as an exterior door.

APPROVED 6/6/03 weh

NEW BUSINESS

1. **058-02/03 – CA** 1275 Spring Hill Avenue
Applicant: Linda La, Owner/ Frank Dagley, Engineer/ David Lindsay, Architect
Nature of Project: Construction of a one story, three tenant convenience store as per submitted plans.
Held Over: Certified Record attached.
2. **059-02/03 –CA** 200 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Frank Dagley, Engineer/Helix Properties, Owner Representative
Nature of Project: Install balcony at second floor level as per submitted design; change existing windows into doorways as per submitted elevation; add cornice and corner parapet as per submitted elevation.
Held Over: Certified Record attached.
3. **060-02/03-CA** 157 Charles Street
Applicant: Tracy O'Brien
Nature of Project: Extend wood porch out over existing concrete steps. Construct new wood steps; install new Colonial wood porch balustrade using MHDC stock plans. Replace non-historic and inappropriate 6" square turned post porch columns.
Denied: Copy of Certified Record attached.

4. **061-02/03 – CA** 115 Providence Street
Applicant: Laura Benjamin
Nature of Project: Install wood picket fence and 6’ wood privacy fence as per submitted plans.

Approved with Conditions: Certified Record Attached

OTHER BUSINESS and ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. U.S. Government Courthouse Project – Devereaux Bemis explained that through the Certified Local Government process, the Review Board would be able to review and comment on the plans for the proposed new Courthouse. This would be a courtesy review as the GSA is not bound by any decisions of the Review Board. Review of this project is strictly for informational purposes only.
2. Discussion of article in Sunday’s paper detailing the setback issues with the Social Security Building, 550 Government Street. He explained that the plans approved by the Review Board depicted a 10’ setback, and that the Review Board approved the project as per submitted plans. He further explained that the plans submitted to Urban Development for Code Compliance depicted a 3.5’ setback, which is how the building was constructed. He noted that the City and the Developer had mitigated the encroachment to the City’s satisfaction, and now the dispute was between the Developer and the Architect.

There being no other business before the Review Board, Buffy Donlon moved to adjourn the meeting. Bunky Ralph seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote. The meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

058-02/03 – CA 1275 Springhill Avenue
Applicant: Linda La
Received: 6/10/03 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 7/25/03 1) 6/23/03 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way Historic District
Classification: Non-Contributing (vacant lot)
Zoning: B-3 Community Business

At the November 7, 2002 Mobile City Planning Commission Meeting, the Commission approved the sub-division of the Southeast corner of Ann Street & Spring Hill Avenue. This combination of lots included one lot located in the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. Under current zoning law, the entire parcel is now located in the district and falls under the review of the Architectural Review Board.

Additional Permits Required: (4) Building, Electrical, Mechanical, Plumbing

Nature of Project: Construct a one-story masonry structure with hipped metal roof as per submitted plans. Structure to house three individual businesses, including a service station/convenience store with gas canopy at front of lot.
The lot in question measures 155.45' on Spring Hill Avenue and 189.3' along Ann Street. There are two proposed curb cuts along Ann Street – one 30' wide triple lane with two exits and one entrance, and one 12' wide single lane exit. There are two curb cuts proposed for Spring Hill Avenue, each 15' wide designated one way entrance and exit.
The building is rectangular in shape, and measures 108' x 50'. The building is sited at the rear of the lot with a 76' x 26' rectangular canopy towards Spring Hill Avenue.
Proposed building construction is slab on grade with aluminum storefront and stucco-covered masonry. A 4' stucco sign band separates the building from the roof line. The one story façade measures 9' – 6" above finished grade, with an overall building height from finished floor to roof ridge of 25'. The proposed Hunter Green Standing Seam roof has a 5 and 12 pitch. A 2' – 8" base of stucco covered masonry with a chamfered water table provides weight to the overall massing of the design. This band is carried through with the use of horizontal muntins in the glass storefront system. A stucco-covered masonry pediment is located on center of the main façade over the convenience store double entry doors. Proposed colors for the building include varying shades of taupe, gradating from darker at the base to lighter at the sign band.

- a. foundation – slab-on-grade, with false water table constructed of solid, stucco-covered masonry
- b. façade – stucco covered masonry
- c. doors – aluminum storefront
- d. windows – aluminum storefront
- e. roof – standing seam metal with 5/12 pitch

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
Guidelines for New Commercial and Residential Construction in Mobile's Historic Districts

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
4	Design Standards for New Construction	Construct new strip mall/convenience store
4,I	Placement and Orientation	
4,II	Massing and Scale	
4,III	Façade Elements	
4,IV	Materials and Ornamentation	
4, IV, A	Appropriate Materials for New Residential Construction	

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “ In the case of a proposed new building, that such building will not, in itself, or by reason of its location on the site, materially impair the architectural or historical value of the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity and that such building will not be injurious to the general visual character of the Historic District in which it is to be located.”

STAFF REPORT

4,I

I. Placement, Orientation and Special Considerations:

- A. The Guidelines state that new commercial construction should be placed on the lot so that setback and spacing approximate those of nearby historic buildings, maintaining a visual line created by the fronts of the buildings along a street.
 - 1. Setbacks for commercial buildings in the Old Dauphin Way Historic District range from buildings constructed at the sidewalk to buildings with deeper setbacks and paved parking in front.
 - 2. The property is located on the southeast corner of Springhill Avenue and Ann Street.
 - 3. This intersection is one of the major gateways into the Old Dauphin Way Historic District.
 - 4. The property directly to the east is a one story professional office with a setback of approximately 15’.
 - 5. The property directly to the west across Ann Street is a one story historic service station, sited askew on the lot.
 - 6. The properties on the north side of Spring Hill Avenue are predominantly commercial in nature, and are surrounded by asphalt and concrete parking lots.

- B. The Guidelines state that new commercial buildings should not disrupt residential blocks and should reflect neighborhood building forms, materials and scale.
 - 1. Commercial Buildings are scattered throughout the historic districts.
 - 2. The proposed location is on a corner at the entrance to the Old Dauphin Way Historic District.
 - 3. Adjacent historic housing stock is modest in design, mostly one-story wood frame Victorian cottages.

4. Adjacent historic and non-historic commercial buildings are predominantly one story masonry.

C. Franchises: Restaurants, Service Stations, Drug Stores, Dry Cleaners, Laundromats, Banks, ATM Canopies, etc.

The Guidelines state that the quality and visual environment in the historic districts should not be eroded by inappropriate designs and signage.

1. The number and size of the curb cuts should be kept to a minimum.
 - a. Traffic Engineering reviewed the site plan and will only allow one curb cut each on Springhill Avenue and Ann Street
2. The edge of the property should be defined through plantings and walls
 - a. The proposed site plan meets the minimum landscape requirements
 - b. The proposed site plans notes a 6' wood privacy fence separating the subject property from adjacent residential.
3. Specialty structures, such as pump shelters and ATM kiosks, should be custom-designed to reflect the context of the new construction.
 - a. no design for the canopy was submitted; however, through conversation with the architect the canopy will mirror the design of the building sign band.
4. Excessive lighting of the facility is not appropriate in the historic districts.
 - a. no light plan was provided

4,II

II. **Building Proportions: Massing, Scale, Foundations, and Roofs:**

- A. The guidelines state that new construction should reference the massing of forms of nearby historic buildings.
 1. Adjacent historic and non-historic commercial buildings are typically one story in height.
 2. The proposed building is one story in height with 9' from slab to underside of sign band.
- C. The Guidelines state that new buildings should have foundations similar in height to those of nearby historic buildings.
 1. Adjacent historic and non-historic commercial buildings are constructed on slabs at grade.
 2. The proposed building is to be constructed at grade.
- C. The Guidelines state that often commercial roofs of metal, rubber or asphalt, either hipped, gabled or flat, were concealed behind some type of parapet wall above the cornice. New commercial construction may consider, where appropriate, roof shapes and pitches similar to or compatible with those of adjacent historic buildings. The use of parapet walls may contribute to the compatibility of new commercial structures within the historic districts.
 1. A variety of roof shapes can be referenced on commercial properties in the Old Dauphin Way Historic District, but the most common are flat, slightly sloped or hipped roofs behind parapets. Examples of this are Universal Hardware, Church's Chicken, and the laundromat across the street.

2. The proposed roof has a 5 and 12 pitch and measures 12' in height, 3' taller than the first floor level.
3. The proposed roof is out of proportion with the main body of the building.
4. The proposed roof massing is out of character with adjacent historic and non-historic commercial buildings.
5. The proposed roof is hunter green in color, a non-traditional roof color for the historic districts.

4, IV

III. **Materials and Ornamentation:**

- A. The guidelines provide a list of appropriate materials for compatible new construction.
 1. Stucco-covered masonry is considered comparable to brick veneer construction.
- B. The guidelines state that the degree of ornamentation used in new construction should be compatible with the degree of ornamentation found upon nearby historic buildings. Profiles and dimensions should be consistent with examples in the district.
 1. The proposed design has no decorative elements.
 2. The Board encourages use of modern materials and design methods in new construction.

Staff recommends that the Board hold over the application and allow staff to continue to work with the architect and designer to develop a more appropriate structure sympathetic to the site and to the Old Dauphin Way Historic District.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support: Architect David Lindsay and owners Linda La and Hiep Bui were present to answer questions of the Board.

There was no one present in opposition to the application.

The applicant requested to modify the front elevation, moving the double entry doors into the convenience store slightly off-center to accommodate a cash register. Chair Cindy Klotz informed the owner that the Board could only review what was submitted, and that any alterations must be resubmitted to the Board for review.

A letter from Ken McElheney voicing concern over the design and placement of the building was entered into the public record as Exhibit A.

The applicant noted that a decision had not been reached regarding the gas station franchise. Therefore, no signage or logo information was submitted. The applicant also inquired about changing roof colors to reflect the brand of gasoline sold at this location. Chair Cindy Klotz informed the owner that the Board could only review what was submitted, and that any alterations must be resubmitted to the Board for review, including signage and roof color.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Douglas Kearley noted that he found no fault with the roof pitch and color. He further noted that he considered the sign band part of the building, and not the roof. Therefore, in his opinion, the height of the sign band should be counted along with the height of the storefront. The combination of these two dimensions would equal the height of the roof. Kearley also noted that to him hunter green was appropriate for use in this location. Nick Holmes, III concurred with Douglas Kearley's comments.

Buffy Donlon noted she had difficulty reviewing the proposal as submitted due to the lack of a canopy design and more detailed landscaping plans. She further noted that these elements were going to be crucial to the overall design of the property, and therefore should all be submitted for review.

Nick Holmes, III noted that the Board should provide the architect and owners direction in order to achieve a compatible design that the Board could review and accept.

Jackie McCracken noted that the Board was in no way holding the owners responsible for the loss of the historic building, nor was the Board discriminating against the applicants for attempting to place a modern building on the site of a demolished historic building.

Dennis Carlisle noted that the overhang could be a place to introduce some type of decorative ornamentation, such as cast iron columns, brackets, etc.

Cindy Klotz noted that the sign band was incompatible with the design of this building, and also incompatible with the adjacent historic and non-historic buildings. Bunky Ralph and Buffy Donlon concurred with Cindy Klotz's comments. Nick Holmes, III disagreed with the comments.

FINDINGS OF FACT

Nick Holmes, III moved to accept Section I A, facts 1-6, as findings of fact. Douglas Kearley seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Nick Holmes, III moved to accept Section I B, items 1-4, as findings of fact. Bunky Ralph seconded the application, which passed by unanimous vote.

Nick Holmes, III moved to accept Section I C, items 1-4, as findings of fact. Bill Christian seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Douglas Kearley moved to accept Section II A, items 1-2, as findings of fact. Buffy Donlon seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Bunky Ralph moved to accept Section II B, items 1-2, as findings of fact. Bill Christian seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Douglas Kearley moved to modify Section II C, establishing the following findings of fact:

1. A variety of roof shapes can be referenced on commercial properties in the Old Dauphin Way Historic District.
2. The proposed roof has a 5 and 12 pitch and measures 12' in height.
(item 3 was stricken from the fact)
3. The proposed sign band is out of character with adjacent historic and non-historic commercial buildings.
4. The proposed roof is hunter green in color.

Nick Holmes moved to accept the modified findings of fact. Bill Christian seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Douglas Kearly moved to modify Section III, establishing the following findings of fact:

Item A was appropriate as addressed by staff.

Item B, 1. was modified to the following fact:

The proposed design has minimal decorative elements, which include a water table, banding around stucco elements, and a paneled sign band.

Item B, 2. was not modified.

Bunky Ralph seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Nick Holmes, III moved to Hold Over the application to allow staff to work with the applicant to further explore more appropriate design options for the building. Bill Christian seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

The Board requested the following information be submitted for review and final approval:

Lighting plan – quantity, placement and foot-candle information

Landscaping plan – depicting location and type of vegetation

Canopy design – location on site plan, elevation and details

Detailed, scaled and annotated elevations and site plan.

3. The proposed changes would allow the transom windows to be visible.

Removing Paint from Brick:

1. The original exterior brick finish of the building had a significant design aspect in terms of different color and texture bricks, particularly along the horizontal areas between floors and above the second floor windows at cornice level
2. Removal of the paint would reveal the difference in brick colors and textures.

Installation of a decorative cornice at the corner:

1. There is no photographic evidence of anything other than a plain cornice existing at the clipped corner.
2. The proposed decorative cornice would change the character of the front façade and create a false sense of history.

Installation of decorative elements, either painted or applied, below the cornice level:

1. The proposed addition of decorative elements below the cornice would change the character of the existing façade.
2. Any decoration should be modeled after, or copied from, the original shown in the photograph.

- B. The proposal to remove windows and install doors into existing masonry openings on the west and south elevation is necessary to access the balcony.
- C. The *Lower Dauphin Street Commercial District Guidelines, Section 5 - Balconies, Galleries and Awnings* states that "...Should documentation exist that a balcony or gallery was an original part of a building façade, the appropriate type of balcony or gallery may be added.
1. Historic photographs show a metal canopy once hung over the sidewalk, located between the storefront windows and the transom windows.
 2. While the balcony was not an original feature of the façade, the proposed balcony replicates the look of the original canopy in terms of massing and covering the sidewalk
 3. The proposed metal railing is simple in design and in keeping with the character of the building.
 4. The balcony will require a permit from Right-of-Way.

Staff suggests that the Review Board grant Approval with the following conditions:

That if a decorative treatment is carried out on the façade as proposed in the rendering, the original design be replicated from the historic photograph.

That the decorative cornice at the clipped corner not be added.

That the applicants work with staff to determine an appropriate door type for the balcony openings.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support: Ron LaGrange, of Helix Properties, Pat LaGrange and Jo Bacton were present to answer questions of the Board. There was no one present in opposition to the application.

Ron LaGrange explained that the Park Building was constructed and finished September 11, 1921, according to an article in the *Mobile Press-Register*. The owners, consultants and engineers were holding a meeting on site on September 11, 2001 when the bombing of the World Trade Center occurred. Pat LaGrange noted they had the building blessed after that incident.

Ron LaGrange explained that according to the article in the newspaper, the Park Building had been designed to accommodate 15 stories at completion. Only three were constructed, however – a full basement and two full stories above. Due to this fact, the applicants felt that had the building been constructed as planned, the building would have been finished with a decorative cornice.

Pat LaGrange noted that the decorative cornice would add to the character and design of the building. She further stated that the Park Building was constructed later than most of the other buildings on Dauphin Street. Also, an existing building facing Conception Street and Bienville Square, constructed ca. late 19th century and tied to the Park Building during construction in 1921, has a decorative cornice.

Cindy Klotz inquired whether or not the applicants were planning to apply for grants or tax credits. She noted that the proposed change to the front elevations would affect the eligibility for those programs.

Ron LaGrange noted that it was more important to the applicants to have the building altered to reflect the submitted rendering.

Ron LaGrange noted that contrary to the submitted drawings, the plan was to install single doors on the south and east elevations in altered window openings and install double doors at the clipped corner.

Buffy Donlon asked the applicants if there were any extant drawings depicting the 15 story building to validate the request for the addition of a decorative cornice. Ron LaGrange replied that to his knowledge there were no extant drawings or renderings. The request to install a decorative cornice was based on a feeling that the building would have been finished at the cornice. LaGrange further noted that photographs submitted of similar buildings of the same scale but constructed earlier had similar decorative cornice elements.

BOARD DISCUSSION

It was noted that no section or large scale drawing for the cornice detail was submitted.

Nor was any information on lighting fixtures, or materials submitted as part of the application.

Jackie McCracken noted that the drawings produced by Frank Dagley were not clear enough regarding measurements, details, etc.

Douglas Kearley noted that the drawings produced by Frank Dagley and the rendering presented by the LaGranges were contradictory.

Nick Holmes noted that the Board should provide the applicants direction with regard to the addition of a decorative cornice. Douglas Kearley noted that the Board typically discouraged creating a false sense of history.

FINDINGS OF FACT

Due to the fact that the submitted information was contradictory between the engineer and the owner representatives, no facts were found regarding this application.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph moved to hold the application over pending the submission of additional information, including:

- Column design for the balcony;
- details of the decorative cornice;
- details of the lighting fixtures;
- details of exterior doors;
- consistent submittal information.

Buffy Donlon seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

- c. The existing porch railing system is an inappropriate replacement constructed of 2"x4" members.
- d. The proposed colonial design balustrade is appropriate to the period of the residence.

Staff recommends approval as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support: Mr. Joseph O'Brien, applicant, appeared before the Review Board to answer questions. There was no one present in opposition to the application.

Mr. O'Brien explained that the proposed change would correct an original design flaw, in that the concrete steps had settled, causing the porch to sag and hold water against the front of the house. Mr. O'Brien noted that he had leveled the porch, replaced damaged sills, and repaired porch decking.

Mr. O'Brien further explained that his front door was approximately 8" from the front edge of the porch, and that by adding a stoop, would increase the convenience of egress.

Staff explained to the Board that sample stock MHDC handrail, balustrade, column and step designs, all appropriate to the period and design of the structure, had been given to the applicant.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board noted that there was not enough information to thoroughly review the project as submitted. The Board was also unclear about the construction of a deck attached to the front porch of the residence.

FINDINGS OF FACT

The Board found no facts in the review of this application due to the lack of information.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Douglas Kearley moved to deny the application based on lack of information. Buffy Donlon seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

The applicant was requested to submit the following information for further review:

1. design of porch railing and columns
2. elevation of front façade showing proposed changes

Staff recommends approval as submitted with the following conditions:

That the 6' privacy fence be painted dark green towards Spring Hill Avenue.

That the picket fence be painted white.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Support: Mrs. Laurie Benjamin, applicant, appeared before the Review Board to answer questions. There was no one present in opposition to the application.

Mrs. Benjamin noted that the picket fence was to be painted white and the privacy fence was to be natural, left to weather.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Nick Holmes, III noted that it was inappropriate for the Board to require the applicant to paint the fences, as recommended by Staff. However, he did note that the painting or staining of the privacy fence should be an option to the owner, but color submissions must be approved by the Board or by staff on a mid-month basis.

FINDINGS OF FACT

Buffy Donlon moved to accept the Findings of Fact as submitted, with the additional fact that the picket fence was to be painted white and the privacy fence could either be left unpainted or finished with appropriate approvals. Douglas Kearley seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. Dennis Carlisle seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 6/23/04