

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

Minutes of the Meeting  
August 22, 2005

**CALL TO ORDER**

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

**Members Present:** Lynda Burkett, Douglas Kearley, Michael Mayberry, David Tharp, Bunky Ralph, Harris Oswalt, Joe Sackett, Tilmon Brown, Cameron Pfeiffer.

**Members Absent:** Cindy Klotz, Robert Brown

**Staff Members Present:** Ed Hooker, Anne Crutcher, Devereaux Bemis, Wanda Cochran.

<u>In Attendance</u>	<u>Mailing Address</u>	<u>Item Number</u>
Nick Holmes, III	257 N. Conception St. 36603	085-04/05-CA
Christopher Baker	209 Congress St. 36603	084-04/05-CA
Timothy Hight	114 Parker St. 36604	079-04/05-CA
Hubert H. Stokes	2201 O'Connor St. 36617	072-04/05-CA

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

DBK moved to approve the minutes with the following correction regarding the decision on 1000 Dauphin Street: "the motion was seconded by Lynda Burkett and unanimously approved." The motion to approve the minutes as amended was seconded by Lynda Burkett and unanimously approved.

**APPROVAL OF THE MID-MONTH CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS:**

A motion to approve the mid month Certificates of Appropriateness was made by David Tharp. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswalt and unanimously approved.

**MID-MONTH APPROVALS**

1. Applicant's Name: Elaine Claire Harden  
Property Address: 56 Hannon Avenue  
Date of Approval: 7/21/05 weh  
Work Approved: Install framed lattice infill between piers as per insurance company request.
2. Applicant's Name: Harrold Rummel  
Property Address: 1000 Selma Street  
Date of Approval: 7/25/05 asc  
Work Approved: Replace rotten wood as necessary to match existing in profile and dimension. Install porch railings as per MHDC stock plans. Install lattice on foundation infill. Prime and paint with Pittsburgh Paint scheme:  
Body – Geysers – light green  
Trim – White  
Porch deck - Gray

3. Applicant's Name: A-1 Roofing  
Property Address: 708 Government Street  
Date of Approval: 7/26/05 weh  
Work Approved: Re-roof modified flat roof on building with materials matching existing in profile and dimension.
  
4. Applicant's Name: Creola Ruffin  
Property Address: 1400-1402 Church Street  
Date of Approval: 7/26/05 weh  
Work Approved: Remove existing deteriorated fire escape at rear of building and replace with balcony and steps as per submitted plans.
  
5. Applicant's Name: Fredericks Roofing Co.  
Property Address: 961 Old Shell Road  
Date of Approval: 7/27/04 asc  
Work Approved: Re-roof building to match existing. Built up flat roof where existing and 3 tab shingles, charcoal in color to match existing in profile and dimension.
  
6. Applicant's Name: Charles Weems  
Property Address: 2301 DeLeon Avenue  
Date of Approval: 7/28/05 asc  
Work Approved: repair storm damaged roof and soffit with new materials to match existing in material, profile dimension and color.
  
7. Applicant's Name: Dobson Roofing  
Property Address: 1151 Springhill Avenue  
Date of Approval: 7/29/05 asc  
Work Approved: Re-roof to match existing built up flat roof with new materials to match existing in profile and dimension.
  
8. Applicant's Name: Timothy Hight  
Property Address: 114 Parker Street  
Date of Approval: 8/1/05 jdb  
Work Approved: Remove non-historic aluminum siding. Replace rotten wood as necessary with new materials to match existing wood in profile and dimension. Repaint house in the following color scheme:  
Body – SW2841 – weathered shingle  
Trim - SW2833 – Roycroft Vellum  
Porch – SW 2847 – Roycroft Bottle Green  
Accent – SW 2837 – Aurora Brown
  
9. Applicant's Name: Stanley West  
Property Address: 654 Church Street  
Date of Approval: 8/1/05 jdb  
Work Approved: Re-roof building with Timberline architectural shingles in existing color. Install ridge vent. Repaint with existing color scheme (olive green with white trim.)

10. Applicant's Name: Shirley Wyper  
 Property Address: 29 McPhillips  
 Date of Approval: 8/2/05 jss  
 Work Approved: Re-roof building with 3 tab Owens Corning shingles, Driftwood in color.
11. Applicant's Name: Vision Roofing  
 Property Address: 558 Conti Street  
 Date of Approval: 8/2/05 weh  
 Work Approved: Install 5 v-crimp galvalume roof on residence.
12. Applicant's Name: Stuart Peyton  
 Property Address: 103 South Ann Street  
 Date of Approval: 8/5/05 jdb  
 Work Approved: Repair rotten wood as necessary matching existing in profile, dimension and material. Paint the house: colors to be approved.
13. Applicant's Name: Richard Tapscott  
 Property Address: 1310 Old Shell Road  
 Date of Approval: 8/5/05 asc  
 Work Approved: Paint exterior in the following Valspar paints:  
                   Body – Oatlands Yellow  
                   Trim – Chef White  
                   Accent – Shutter Green
14. Applicant's Name: Bill Majure  
 Property Address: 1155 Selma Street  
 Date of Approval: 8/5/05 asc  
 Work Approved: Repair to rotten wood as necessary with new wood to match existing; paint to match existing color scheme; install new black asphalt shingle roof.
15. Applicant's Name: Integrity Builders  
 Property Address: 123 Garnett Street  
 Date of Approval: 8/5/05 weh  
 Work Approved: Install metal roof, Sahara Tan in color.

**OLD BUSINESS:**

1. 072/04-05/CA 306 Marine Street  
 Applicant: Hubert H. Stokes  
 Nature of Request: Demolish structure damaged by fire. Applicant requested an additional 30 days.

**TIME EXTENSION APPROVED** Certified record attached.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

1. 079-04/05-CA 114 Parker Street  
Applicant: Timothy Hight  
Nature of Request: Replace porch columns as per photographs.  
**APPROVED Certified Record attached.**
2. 080-04/05-CA 221 South Dearborn Street  
Applicant: Tony Jones  
Nature of Request: Construct 8' masonry wall along property lines as per submitted site plan.  
**APPROVED. Certified Record attached.**
3. 81-04/05-CA 1124 Palmetto Street  
Applicant: Bob and Janet Omainsky  
Nature of Request: Convert existing deck to covered porch as per submitted plans.  
**APPROVED. Certified Record attached.**
4. 082-04/05-CA 253 State Street  
Applicant: Bob and Buffy Donlon  
Nature of Request: Rehabilitate existing historic residence as per submitted plans.  
**APPROVED. Certified Record attached.**
5. 083-04/05-CA 316 North Jackson Street/Lot 10, DeTonti Square  
Applicant - Mr. and Mrs. Raue  
Nature of Request: Construct new one story residence as per submitted plans.  
**REFERRED TO DESIGN SUBCOMMITTEE.  
Certified Record attached.**
6. 084-04/05-CA 320 North Jackson Street/Lot 11, DeTonti Square (southeast corner of Adams & Jackson)  
Applicant: Christopher Baker  
Nature of Request: Construct new two story Charleston side hall residence as per submitted plans.  
**APPROVED. Certified Record attached.**
7. 085-04/05-CA 163-165 St. Emanuel Street  
Applicant: Larry Posner, Fort Conde Venture LLC  
Nature of Request: Rehabilitate historic Spear-Barter and Hall-Ford Houses;

construct new hotel on adjacent property and connect all 3 buildings as per submitted plans.

**APPROVED. Certified Record attached.**

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

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
CERTIFIED RECORD**

**072-04/05 – CA**            306 Marine Street  
**Applicant:**                Hubert H. Stokes  
**Received:**                 7/1/05, held over    **Meeting Date (s):**  
**Submission Date + 45 Days:**      8/16/05    1) 7/25/05      2)8/22/05      3)

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:**          Oakleigh Garden Historic District  
**Classification:**            Contributing  
**Zoning:**                        R-1, Single Family Residential  
**Nature of the Project:** Demolish existing historic residential structure severely damaged by fire. Landscape vacant lot once structure is removed.

**History of the Project:** This project was held over by the Board to allow staff time to locate a potential buyer for the house and lot for restoration purposes. Staff was unable to solicit a buyer within the four week period during which the application was held over.

**STAFF REPORT**

Section 10 of the Preservation Ordinance prohibits the demolition or relocation of “any property within a historic district unless the Board finds that the removal or relocation of such buildings will not be detrimental to the historical and architectural character of the district...” In making this determination, the Board must examine a number of factors set out in the ordinance, each of which is discussed below:

- A. Historic or Architectural Significance
  1. The Oakleigh Garden Historic District was created in 1972.
  2. 306 Marine Street is a one story shotgun structure.
  3. 306 Marine Street is a contributing structure within the Oakleigh Garden Historic District.
  4. While listed as contributing, the structure has had significant incompatible alterations over time.
  
- B. Importance to the Integrity of the District
  1. Mobile’s Oakleigh Garden District neighborhood is a large, late 19<sup>th</sup>-century/early 20<sup>th</sup>-century suburban neighborhood...The majority of the development in this district...dates from the 1870s and 1880s through World War I. Within this large grouping are examples of various Victorian styles as well as large numbers of bungalows...Between 1830 and World War II, the district developed as a solidly middle-class residential neighborhood. The residential character is evident in the size and massing of building form that represents adaptations to local climate considerations. In response to these influences, a group of buildings evolved that maintain a compactness of size, massing and consistent program while responding to a variety of stylistic influences...
  
- C. Ability to Reproduce Historic Structures
  1. The type and quality of the materials used in the construction of 306 Marine Street are no longer readily available.

2. The structure dates from the first quarter of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, before the introduction of nominal dimension lumber. Components include old growth pine structural members and siding, historic windows, doors and interior decoration, etc. Replacement material would have to be garnered from salvage yards or specially milled.
3. Though the removal of any historic building impairs the integrity of the district, it is the opinion of the staff that restoration of this building would result in the creation of a substantially new structure.
4. Approximately 75% of the structure has been destroyed.

D. Ensemble of Historic Buildings Creating a Neighborhood

1. The subject property is one of numerous shotgun residences in the district.
2. Removal of this residence would erode the Oakleigh Garden Historic District.

E. Proposed Redevelopment Plans for the Site

1. The application states that the site will be cleared of building debris and grassed.

F. Effect of Proposed Project on the Oakleigh Garden Historic District.

1. The removal of 306 Marine Street would degrade the streetscape along this relatively intact section of Marine Street.
2. The removal of 306 Marine Street would impair the architectural, cultural, historical, social, aesthetic and environmental character of the Oakleigh Garden Historic District.

G. Content of Application

1. Property Information:
  - a. 306 Marine Street was acquired by the applicant in 1985 for \$15,000.
  - b. The applicant states that the property was in good condition prior to the fire.
  - c. The property is currently unoccupied.
2. Alternatives Considered
  - a. Staff contacted 3 prospective buyers but none were interested in the property in its current condition.
  - b. The applicant has kept the property for sale.
3. Sale of Property by Current Owner
  - a. Information presented in the application notes that 306 Marine Street is for sale for \$30,000.
  - b. Prior to the first meeting, the applicant states that 2 offers were made on the property; however, neither was acceptable.
4. Financial Proof
  - a. No financial proof was included with the application.

Based on the above facts, Staff recommends approval of the request to demolish.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Mr. Stokes appeared before the Board and explained that he had spoken to three individuals who wanted to rehabilitate the burned structure. He had lowered the selling price to \$20,000 because of their desire to work on the building. However, two prospects were out of town and he requested another 30 days to work things out with one of these prospective buyers.

Three individuals were contacted by Staff, however, none were interested in purchasing the property. 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 department to read into the record.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

There was no additional Board discussion

### **FINDING OF FACT**

There was no finding of facts.

### **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Tilmon Brown moved to grant the applicant an additional 30 days to sell the property. The motion was seconded by David Tharp and approved with Joe Sackett voting in opposition.



**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
CERTIFIED RECORD**

**079-04/05-CA**            114 Parker Street  
**Applicant:**            Timothy Hight  
**Received:**            8/1/05                    **Meeting Date (s):**  
Submission Date + 45 Days: 9/15/05            1) 8/22/05    2)                    3)

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:**        Old Dauphin Way Historic District  
**Classification:**        Contributing  
**Zoning:**                R-1, Single family residential  
**Nature of Project:**     Replace porch columns as per photographs.

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

<b><u>Sections</u></b>	<b><u>Topic</u></b>	<b><u>Description of Work</u></b>
3	Porches	Replace porch columns

**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 “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture…Particular attention should be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions and decorative details.”
  1. The main structure is a ca. 1940 one story wood frame residence.
  2. The existing deteriorated classically-inspired columns are not original to the structure.
  3. The proposed replacement columns are to be copied from a similar bungalow residence at 27 McPhillips Street, and are more appropriate.
  4. The proposed replacement columns are square battered built-up paneled wood columns.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Mr. Hight was present to answer Board questions. He stated that he purchased the house from the grandchildren of the original builder. They remembered that the house was built in 1918 and had battered columns. Although there are family photographs showing the house from the 1940s, by that time, the columns had already been altered to the current condition. 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 amending A.1. to read: "The main structure is a ca. 1918 one story wood frame residence." The motion was seconded by Lynda Burkett and approved unanimously.

### **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the facts adopted by the Board, that the proposed work 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 Lynda Burkett and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 08/22/06.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
CERTIFIED RECORD**

**080-04/05 – CA**            221 South Dearborn Street  
**Applicant:**                Tony Jones  
**Received:**                 8/4/05                                **Meeting Date (s):**  
Submission Date + 45 Days:    9/18/05                                1) 8/22/05        2)            3)

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:**        Church Street East Historic District  
**Classification:**        Non - Contributing (new construction)  
**Zoning:**                    R-1, Single Family Residential  
**Nature of the Project:** Construct 8’ stucco-covered wall along property lines as per submitted plans.

**STAFF REPORT**

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. . .

Based on the information contained in the application, and in Staff’s judgment, the design of the fence is in compliance with the Design Review Guidelines; however, the height is not in compliance with the Guidelines.

- A. The Design Review 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. 221 South Dearborn Street is a non-contributing structure constructed ca. 1998.
  - 2. The residence is a 2 ½ story masonry residence with a large gabled roof between parapet walls.
  - 3. The proposed 8’ high masonry-covered stucco wall will begin at the north wall of the house, run to the north property line, turn east and run to the east property line, then turn south and run to the south property line along Canal Street Service Road, then turn north and die into the south elevation of the residence.
  - 4. The proposed masonry-covered stucco wall will have columns spaced 12’ apart with pre-cast pyramidal caps.
  - 5. The wall itself will have a flat cap as shown on the elevation drawing.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines state that “The height of solid fences in historic districts is generally restricted to 6’, however, if a commercial property or multi-family housing adjoins the subject property, an 8’ fence may be considered.”
  - 1. The Board has allowed fences 8’ in height where the scale of the structure is larger than that of a standard residence, as is the case here.
  - 2. This is a large residence and an 8’ wall would not be out of scale.
  - 3. The parapet height of this structure is 43’-6”.
  - 4. The subject property borders Canal Street and the Canal Street Service Road.

5. The Board has allowed fences 8' in height where the property adjoins a major thoroughfare such as along Dauphin Street and Springhill Avenue.
6. The maximum height allowed by the City of Mobile's Zoning Ordinance limits the height of any fence to 8' in height.

Based on the above facts, Staff defers decision on the application to the Board.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

There was no one present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record. Board members questioned staff relative to its reluctance to provide a recommendation for the application. Staff explained that the wall as proposed is 8 ft. 4 in. in height with additional height in the columns, the result of pyramidal caps. The Guidelines generally restrict fences to 6 ft. However, the house is large and an 8 ft. wall appears to be in proportion to the house. In addition, there are a number of other 8 ft. walls in the area. The owners propose building a garage, although not at this time, so there will be a gap in the wall where the garage will be located. Staff suggested that there will be a temporary wood fence to fill this gap, although, there is no indication of a wood fence at this location in the application.

Board members questioned the placement of the fence on the sidewalk and asked about zoning requirements. Although the property was rezoned R-1, the owner is allowed to implement setbacks from R-1 or its former R-B zoning. This will allow the placement of the wall on the sidewalk along Canal Street.

The Board attorney reminded Board members that City code restricts all fences to a maximum of 8 ft. in height.

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. The motion was seconded by David Tharp and approved.

### **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the facts adopted by the Board, that the proposed work does impair the historic integrity of the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued conditional upon the total height of the fence being 8 ft., including caps. The motion was seconded by Lynda Burkett and approved with Bunky Ralph voting in opposition.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 08/22/06.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
CERTIFIED RECORD**

**081 -04/05-CA**                      1124 Palmetto Street  
**Applicant:**                      Bob and Janet Omainsky  
**Received:**                      8/4/05                              Meeting Dates:  
**Submission Date + 45 Days:**                      9/18/05                      1) 8/22/05                      2)

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:**                      Oakleigh Garden Historic District  
**Classification:**                      Contributing  
**Zoning:**                              R-1, Single Family Residential  
**Conflicts of Interest:**                      Douglas Kearley was not present for this portion of the hearing.  
**Nature of Project:**                      Convert existing deck into a covered porch as per submitted plans.

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

<b><u>Sections</u></b>	<b><u>Topic</u></b>	<b><u>Description of Work</u></b>
3	Additions	Alter existing elevations

**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 work requested is in compliance with the Design Review Guidelines and will not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district.

- A. The Guidelines state that “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture...Particular attention should be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions and decorative details.”
1. 1124 Palmetto Street is a one story frame residence.
  2. The proposed screened porch is a 3 bay wood frame porch with a concrete slab floor.
  3. Proposed porch foundation is concrete block with sand finish stucco.
  4. Proposed built-up wood paneled porch columns measure 1’-6” x 10”.
  5. Proposed infill between columns is MARC lattice panels.
  6. Proposed end gable roof dormer contains two skylights.
  7. 3 pairs of wood French doors are to be replaced with single wood doors with sidelights and topped with transoms.
  8. The northernmost set of wood French doors is proposed to have an extension of the roof to protect the doors from the elements.

Based on the above facts, Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

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

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

There was no additional Board discussion.

### **FINDING OF FACT**

David Tharp 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 Harris Oswald and unanimously approved.

### **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

David Tharp moved that, based upon the facts adopted by the Board, that the proposed work 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: 08/22/06.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
CERTIFIED RECORD**

**082 -04/05-CA**                      253 State Street  
**Applicant:**                      Bob and Buffy Donlon  
**Received:**                        8/8/05                              Meeting Dates:  
**Submission Date + 45 Days:**                      9/23/05                              1) 8/22/05                              2)

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:**                      DeTonti Square Historic District  
**Classification:**                      Contributing  
**Zoning:**                                R-B, Residential Business  
**Conflicts of Interest:**                      Douglas Kearley was not present for this portion of the hearing.  
Lynda Burkett stated that she had previous knowledge of this project but has no connection to it and can render an impartial decision.  
Tilmon Brown stated that a previous owner had asked him to work on the building, but that he has no connection to this project and can render an impartial decision.  
**Nature of Project:**                      Restore rear porch and glass in for use as circulation and interior space; construct orchid house; construct screened porch; construct deck and pergola.

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

<b><u>Sections</u></b>	<b><u>Topic</u></b>	<b><u>Description of Work</u></b>
3	Additions	Alter existing elevations

**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 work requested is in compliance with the Design Review Guidelines and will not impair the historic integrity of the structure or the district.

- The proposed construction is in compliance with Section 3 of the Design Review Guidelines.
- A.        The main structure is a two story masonry Italianate residence with a two story wood frame wing at rear.
  - B.        The property is a contributing structure within the DeTonti Square Historic District.
  - C.        Plans call for alterations of the south (rear) and east (left side) elevations.
  - D.        Alterations to the south elevation:

1. Construct an orchid house, measuring 6'-8" by width of rear wing
  2. Construct 15' x 25' screened porch, and 15' x 17' deck with pergola
  3. Remove existing basement stair structure and install new sloped hinged metal roof.
- D. Alterations to the east elevation:
1. Restore porch on rear wing.
  2. Install insulated glass in wood frames between existing columns.
- F. Facts D-E are in compliance with numbers 2 and 10 of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, as follows:
1. Number 2 –  
The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alterations of the features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.
  2. Number 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.

Based on the above facts, Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

There was no one present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Staff had no comments from the public or city departments to read into the record. Staff explained that the house backs up to the Rogers House at 251 St. Anthony Street and that there is an existing wall along the rear property line. The orchid house will be adjacent to the western portion of this wall. Staff stated that a pergola, proposed with this application, was left off one of the drawings for clarity but was on the plan and the elevation.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

There was no additional Board discussion.

### **FINDING OF FACT**

Mike Mayberry 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 Lynda Burkett and unanimously approved.

### **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Mike Mayberry moved that, based upon the facts adopted by the Board, that the proposed work 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 Lynda Burkett and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 08/22/06.



**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
CERTIFIED RECORD**

**083-04/05 – CA**                      316 North Jackson Street  
Applicant:                              Mr. and Mrs. Leon Raue  
Received:                                8/8/05                                      Meeting Date (s):  
 Submission Date + 45 Days:    9/23/05                                      1) 8/22/05                                      2)                                      3)

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:**                      DeTonti Square Historic District  
**Classification:**                        Non-Contributing (vacant lot/new construction)  
**Zoning:**                                    R-B, Residential Business  
**Nature of Project:**                      Construct a wood frame with brick veneer, one story residence on a raised concrete slab.

**Project Synopsis:**  
 The building site is located one lot south from the southeast corner of Adams and Jackson Streets. This parcel was recently purchased from the City of Mobile’s Real Estate Department. The lot measures approximately 47’-7” wide by 120’ deep. The building measures approximately 33’ wide with a 9’ wide recessed front porch, by approximately 67’ long. The north setback is approximately 11’ and the south setback is approximately 4’. The house faces west towards Jackson Street. The front wall of the main house is located at a distance of 20’ from the sidewalk. The proposed construction is a one story brick veneer residence raised on a floating slab. The ground plan is rectangular in design. The proposed building has a 2’-6’ finished floor height above grade, and a first floor finished floor height of 10’. Overall ground to parapet height is 19’-9”. The proposed roof is hipped. The proposed pitch of the main roof is 7/12. Proposed roofing material is asphalt/fiberglass shingles.

- The following are proposed building materials:
- a. foundation –
    - front porch - brick veneer
    - main residence –brick veneer over wood frame with a soldier course water table
  - b. façade – brick veneer with hardiboard trim;
  - c. doors – wood & glass
  - d. windows – wood casement, wood fixed, wood double hung
  - e. porch details –
    - front porch: Built-up wood columns
  - f. roof – architectural grade shingles

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

<b><u>Sections</u></b>	<b><u>Topic</u></b>	<b><u>Description of Work</u></b>
3	Design Standards for New Construction	Construct new residence
3,I	Placement and Orientation	
3,II	Massing and Scale	
3,III	Façade Elements	
3,IV	Materials and Ornamentation	

**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**

In Staff’s judgment, the proposed new construction is in compliance with the Design Review Guidelines for New Residential and Commercial Construction and will not impair the historic integrity of the Historic District.

**3,I**

**I. Placement and Orientation:**

- A. The Guidelines state that new construction should be placed on the lot so that setback and spacing approximate those of nearby historic buildings.
  - 1. Setbacks in the DeTonti Square Historic District range from buildings constructed at the sidewalk to buildings with a 5’-15’ setback.
  - 2. The proposed front setback for this building is approximately 20’ from the sidewalk/property line.
  - 3. The proposed front setback for this building is in line with the houses to on lots to the immediate south of the subject property.

**3,II**

**II. Massing and Scale:**

- A. The Guidelines state that new construction should reference the massing of forms of nearby historic buildings.
  - 1. This area of DeTonti Square has a high concentration of new construction and one moved structure on an adjacent lot.
  - 2. 1 – 3 story masonry structures are found in the DeTonti Square Historic District.
  - 3. The proposed building is a 1story brick veneer structure.
- B. The Guidelines state that new buildings should have foundations similar in height to those of nearby historic buildings.
  - 1. Historic buildings in the DeTonti Square Historic District are constructed on piers, or are elevated above grade by a continuous foundation wall at a height of 2’-5’.
  - 2. The proposed foundation is designed using a floating slab, at a height 2’ above grade.
- C. The Guidelines state that new construction should consider roof shapes, pitches and complexity similar to or compatible with those of adjacent historic buildings.
  - 1. A variety of roof shapes exist in the DeTonti Square Historic District, but the most common are simple end gables and hips.
  - 2. Parapet walls are common within the DeTonti Square Historic District.
  - 3. The proposed design features a front parapet wall.

### 3, III

#### III. Façade Elements:

- A. The Guidelines state that new construction should reflect the use of façade elements of nearby historic buildings.
  - 1. The use of wood windows is a common design element found throughout the Historic Districts.
  - 2. The use of wood French doors with transoms, is a common design element found throughout the Historic Districts.
  - 3. Wood windows and wood French doors are proposed for use in this structure.

### 3, IV

#### IV. Materials and Ornamentation:

- A. The Guidelines provide a list of appropriate materials for compatible new construction.
  - 1. There are number of brick veneer and solid masonry structures remaining in the DeTonti Square Historic District.
- B. The Guidelines state that the degree of ornamentation used in new construction should be compatible with the degree of ornamentation found in the design of nearby historic buildings. Profiles and dimensions should be consistent with examples in the district.
  - 1. Examples of historic ornamentation include the use of a parapet wall.
  - 2. The use of hardiplank trim is a modern interpretation of a traditional building material and is allowed on new construction.
  - 3. The Board encourages use of modern materials and design methods in new construction.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

#### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

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

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Staff explained that the design submitted by the applicant had a gable facing the front and that the gable had been changed to a parapet in order to have it blend with the neighborhood. The front set back will be in line with the adjacent buildings, however, the foundation height of two feet would be approximately one foot lower than the adjacent buildings. Board members expressed concern that the proposed foundation would not be compatible with adjacent properties because it would appear as slab on grade, as opposed to a historic pier foundation. Although there are some examples in the neighborhood of lower foundations, those buildings were clearly constructed on piers and had other historic features that insured compatibility with the neighborhood.

#### **FINDING OF FACT**

There was no finding of facts.

## **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Tilmon Brown moved that the application be referred to the design committee to resolve the issues of incompatibility. The motion was seconded by David Tharp and approved unanimously. The design committee will consist of Tilmon Brown and David Tharp with Michael Mayberry assisting with the design.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS  
CERTIFIED RECORD**

**084-04/05 – CA**                      320 North Jackson Street  
**Applicant:**                      Christopher Baker  
**Received:**                      8/8/05                      **Meeting Date (s):**  
Submission Date + 45 Days:    9/23/05                      1) 8/22/05                      2)                      3)

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:**                      DeTonti Square Historic District  
**Classification:**                      Non-Contributing (vacant lot/new construction)  
**Zoning:**                                      R-B, Residential Business  
**Nature of Project:**                      Construct a wood frame with brick veneer, two story residence on a raised concrete slab.  
**Conflicts of Interest:**                      Douglas Kearley was not present for this portion of the hearing.  
Lynda Burkett had previous knowledge of the application but is not working on the project.

**Project Synopsis:**  
The building site is located on the southeast corner of Adams and Jackson Streets. This parcel was recently purchased from the City of Mobile’s Real Estate Department. The lot measures approximately 47’ wide by 120’ deep. The building measures approximately 17’ wide with an 8’ front porch, by approximately 55’ long. The house faces west towards Jackson Street, and the brick stoop is located at a distance of 0’ from the sidewalk. The front wall of the main house is located at a distance of 5’ from the sidewalk. The north wall of the residence has a 0’ setback, and is constructed on the sidewalk. The main façade faces Jackson Street. The proposed construction is a two story brick veneer residence raised on a floating slab. The ground plan is rectangular in design. The proposed building has a 3’ finished floor height above grade, and a first floor finished floor height of 12’. Overall ground to ridge height is 34’. The proposed roof is hipped. The proposed pitch of the main roof is 7.25/12. Proposed roofing material is asphalt/fiberglass shingles.

A single detached garage measuring 16’-8” x 25’-8” is connected to the main residence by a covered breezeway. A 6’ high stucco –covered wall closes in the space between the main house and the garage, and continues around the remaining property line to enclose the property. A 15’ x 25’ pool is also proposed for the rear of the property.

The following are proposed building materials:

- a. foundation –  
front porch - brick pier/arches with 3 part stucco infill  
main residence –brick veneer over concrete block
- b. façade – brick veneer with hardiboard trim; wood siding under porches
- c. doors – wood & glass
- d. windows – wood casement, wood fixed, wood double hung
- e. porch details –  
side porch: brick columns on first floor; Built-up wood columns on second floor

- traditional handrail with ½” wood square pickets, similar to MHDC stock rail design Number 1
- f. roof – architectural grade shingles

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

<b><u>Sections</u></b>	<b><u>Topic</u></b>	<b><u>Description of Work</u></b>
3	Design Standards for New Construction	Construct new residence
3,I	Placement and Orientation	
3,II	Massing and Scale	
3,III	Façade Elements	
3,IV	Materials and Ornamentation	
3, 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**

In Staff’s judgment, the proposed new construction is in compliance with the Design Review Guidelines for New Residential and Commercial Construction and will not impair the historic integrity of the Historic District.

**3,I**

**I. Placement and Orientation:**

- A. The Guidelines state that new construction should be placed on the lot so that setback and spacing approximate those of nearby historic buildings.
  1. Setbacks in the DeTonti Square Historic District range from buildings constructed at the sidewalk to buildings with a 5’-15’ setback.
  2. Currently only two historic buildings in the DeTonti Square Historic District rest on the sidewalk.
  3. The proposed building site is located on the southeast corner of Jackson and Adams Streets. The proposed front setback for this building is 5’ from the sidewalk/property line; the proposed side setback for this building is 0’ on the north.
  4. In examination of the 1904 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map, numerous corner lots in the neighborhood show 0’ side yard setbacks.

**3,II**

**II. Massing and Scale:**

- A. The Guidelines state that new construction should reference the massing of forms of nearby historic buildings.
  1. There are a few original examples of the Charleston side house in Mobile.
  2. There are two examples of historic side houses located to the immediate east of this parcel.
  3. There are two examples of newly-constructed side houses in the Oakleigh Garden Historic District, one on Church Street and one at the southeast corner of Palmetto and Marine Streets.

4. 1 – 3 story masonry structures are found in the DeTonti Square Historic District.
  5. The proposed building is a 2 story brick veneer structure.
- B. The Guidelines state that new buildings should have foundations similar in height to those of nearby historic buildings.
1. Historic buildings in the DeTonti Square Historic District are constructed on piers, or are elevated above grade by a continuous foundation wall at a height of 2’-5’.
  2. The proposed foundation is designed using a combination of brick veneer and brick arches with 3 part stucco infill, at a height 3’ above grade.
- C. The Guidelines state that new construction should consider roof shapes, pitches and complexity similar to or compatible with those of adjacent historic buildings.
1. A variety of roof shapes exist in the DeTonti Square Historic District, but the most common are simple end gables and hips.
  2. The proposed roof is a hipped configuration.

### **3, III**

#### **III. Façade Elements:**

- A. The Guidelines state that new construction should reflect the use of façade elements of nearby historic buildings.
1. The use of wood windows is a common design element found throughout the Historic Districts.
  2. The use of wood French doors with transoms is a common design element found throughout the Historic Districts.
  3. The building is proposed to have wood windows and wood French doors.

### **3, IV**

#### **IV. Materials and Ornamentation:**

- A. The Guidelines provide a list of appropriate materials for compatible new construction.
1. There are number of brick veneer and solid masonry structures remaining in the DeTonti Square Historic District.
- B. The Guidelines state that the degree of ornamentation used in new construction should be compatible with the degree of ornamentation found in the design of nearby historic buildings. Profiles and dimensions should be consistent with examples in the district.
1. Examples of historic ornamentation include use of brick arches with stucco infill as the front porch foundation, brick and wood columns, and wood porch rail as found here.
  2. The use of hardiplank siding and trim is a modern interpretation of a traditional building material and is allowed on new construction.
  3. The Board encourages use of modern materials and design methods in new construction.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

The property owner was present and had no additions 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. The motion was seconded by Joe Sackett and unanimously approved.

## **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the facts adopted by the Board, that the proposed work does not impair the historic integrity of the district according to the Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued with brick samples and roofing materials to be approved on a mid-month basis by staff. The motion was seconded by David Tharp and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 08/22/06.



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

**085-04/05 – CA**            163-165 St. Emanuel Street  
**Applicant:**                Fort Conde Venture LLC/ Larry Posner  
**Received:**                 8/8/05                            **Meeting Date (s):**  
**Submission Date + 45 Days:**    9/23/05                            1) 8/22/05                    2)                            3)

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

**Historic District:**        Church Street East Historic District  
**Classification:**        Non-Contributing (vacant lot/new construction)  
                                      Contributing (Hall-Ford/Spear-Barter and dependencies)  
**Nature of Project:**     Construct brick veneer, two story hotel on a raised concrete slab with glassed porch connectors at the rear of the lot connecting 2 historic residences and their dependencies into one 30 room hotel.  
**Conflicts of Interest:** Douglas Kearley recused himself from discussion and voting on the application.  
**Project Synopsis:**

The building site is located on St. Emanuel Street between Theater Street and Monroe Street. This parcel is part of the city-owned Fort Conde Development Area leased to Larry Posner for rehabilitation and development. The historic Hall-Ford and Spear-Barter Houses will be restored as part of this project.

Due to the complexity of reviewing this project, it will be broken into 3 separate sections: first, a review of the new construction; second, the proposed work for the Spear-Barter house and its dependencies and third, the proposed work for the Hall-Ford house.

**NEW CONSTRUCTION:**

The lot measures approximately 76.25' wide by 122.55' deep. The building measures approximately 60' wide by approximately 69' long. The main structure faces west towards St. Emanuel Street. The vehicular and pedestrian entrance is off Theater Street facing north. The front wall of the main structure is located at a distance of approximately 25' from the sidewalk, and is in line with the front façade of the Spear-Barter house directly to the south. The north wall of the structure has a 5' setback from the sidewalk. The proposed construction is a two story brick veneer structure raised on a floating slab. The proposed first floor has a 5' finished floor height above grade, equal to that of the Spear-Barter house. Overall ground to top of parapet height is 44'-6". The proposed roof is end gable with parapets. The proposed pitch of the main roof is a combination of 6/12 and 5/12. Proposed roofing material is asphalt shingles. This structure contains lobby and bar space, hotel rooms, fire stair guest laundry, elevator and mechanical.

A second structure is proposed in the rear of the property between the Spear-Barter and Hall-Ford dependencies. This structure measures approximately 20' wide by 41' long. It is constructed of concrete block with brick veneer. The rear wall of this structure is located in close proximity to the property line. The building contains four hotel rooms, a fire stair, an elevator and service area.

The entire complex, including new construction and existing historic structures, is connected by a series of glass-enclosed porches as shown on the plan.

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

<b><u>Sections</u></b>	<b><u>Topic</u></b>	<b><u>Description of Work</u></b>
3	Design Standards for New Construction	Construct new structure
3,I	Placement and Orientation	
3,II	Massing and Scale	
3,III	Façade Elements	
3,IV	Materials and Ornamentation	
3, 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**

In Staff’s judgment, the proposed new construction is in compliance with the Design Review Guidelines for New Residential and Commercial Construction and will not impair the historic integrity of the Historic District.

**3,I**

**I. Placement and Orientation:**

- A. The Guidelines state that new construction should be placed on the lot so that setback and spacing approximate those of nearby historic buildings.
  - 1. Setbacks in the Church Street East Historic District range from buildings constructed at the sidewalk to buildings with a 5’-25’ setback.
  - 2. The proposed building site is located on the southeast corner of Theater and St. Emanuel Streets. The proposed front setback for this building is 25’ from the sidewalk, 5’ from the north property line.
  - 3. The proposed building is in line with the front façade of the historic Spear-Barter house directly to the south.

**3,II**

**II. Massing and Scale:**

- A. The guidelines state that new construction should reference the massing of forms of nearby historic buildings.
  - 1. The massing of both new structures mimics that of the historic Hall-Ford house and its dependency.
  - 2. The proposed buildings are 2 story brick veneer structures.
- B. The guidelines state that new buildings should have foundations similar in height to those of nearby historic buildings.
  - 1. Historic buildings in the Church Street East Historic District are constructed on piers, or are elevated above grade by a continuous foundation wall at a height of 2’-5’.

2. The proposed foundation of the main hotel building is designed using a combination of concrete block and sand finish stucco, matching the height of the historic Spear-Barter house, at a height 5' above grade.
  3. The connector building is set lower, in line with the Hall-Ford house and its dependency wing.
- C. The guidelines state that new construction should consider roof shapes, pitches and complexity similar to or compatible with those of adjacent historic buildings.
1. A variety of roof shapes exist in the Church Street East Historic District, but the most common are simple end gables and hips.
  2. Parapets as used here are common design elements within the districts.

### **3, III**

#### **III. Façade Elements:**

- A. The Secretary of the Interiors Standards for Rehabilitation state that new construction should differentiate between historic structures..
1. The use of casement windows is a differentiation in fenestration.
  2. The connector uses a glassed-in porch of modern materials as a means of differentiation.
  3. The glassing in of rear porches for service and circulation is a common design element found throughout the Historic Districts.
  4. There is no focal point on the main façade of the hotel building.

### **3, IV**

#### **IV. Materials and Ornamentation:**

- A. The guidelines provide a list of appropriate materials for compatible new construction.
1. There are a number of brick veneer and solid masonry structures remaining in the Church Street East Historic District.
- B. The guidelines state that the degree of ornamentation used in new construction should be compatible with the degree of ornamentation found in the design of nearby historic buildings. Profiles and dimensions should be consistent with examples in the district.
1. Examples of historic ornamentation include a cast iron balcony across the front elevation.
  2. The Board encourages use of modern materials and design methods in new construction.

#### **Spear-Barter House and Dependencies:**

- A. The main house and dependencies will be rehabilitated adhering to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation as part of the Historic Preservation Tax Credit Program.
1. The rear porch will be reconstructed using evidence from mortise pockets in the rear wall. The porch will then be glassed in as part of the circulation/connection of the complex.

#### **Hall-Ford House and Dependencies:**

- A. The main house and dependencies will be rehabilitated adhering to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation as part of the Historic Preservation Tax Credit Program.
1. The cantilevered front porch of the rear wing will be reconstructed using evidence from mortise pockets in the wall. The porch will connect to the newly constructed wing as part of the circulation/connection of the complex.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

Notes for Clarification:

1. On the main hotel building, the floor plan and elevations do not correspond. The floor plans show doors opening onto the balcony of the second floor and the elevations show casement windows. The elevation drawing is correct. There will be no access to the second floor balcony.
2. On elevation drawing of the Spear-Barter house's reconstructed rear porch, the balustrade is not shown. There will be a balustrade at that location.
3. The original wood columns for the second floor porch of the Hall-Ford house are present on site and will be reused according to the architect.
4. A balustrade design for the Hall-Ford house will need to be presented.
5. Brick sample, color samples and roof sample will need to be submitted.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Nicholas Holmes, III, architect for the project, appeared on behalf of the applicant. He proceeded to clarify various points in the staff report by explaining that this design program was developed with the help of the Alabama Historical Commission, that this project had received clearance for Federal Tax Credits, that the new buildings are intended to appear as background buildings, and that the plan attempts to address the multiple levels present in both historic buildings.

The Board asked for clarification on the location of the main entrance. Mr. Holmes responded that the main entrance will be on Theatre Street and that there will be several service entrances, two on Monroe and one on Theatre.

The Board asked Staff about the *Notes for Clarification* in the Staff report. Staff responded that these points had been satisfied: there will be no access to the second floor balcony on the north infill building, there will be a balustrade on the Spear-Barter house copying the ghosts on the columns, and original wood columns on the Hall-Ford house will be reused. The Board will need to see the balustrade design proposed for the Hall house and review brick, color and roof samples on the new construction.

The Board also inquired about parking, since none is included in the project. Mr. Holmes explained that Urban Development does not feel that parking is an issue since there is parking in the former Roussos lot which serves the entire Village, in front of the Royal Street Victorians and elsewhere in the Village on the street.

**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. The motion was seconded by Harris Oswalt and unanimously approved.

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Tilmon Brown moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the proposed work does not impair the historic integrity of the structures or the district according to the

Guidelines and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued contingent on a balustrade design for the Hall-Ford house and brick, color and roof samples for the new construction being submitted for review. The motion was seconded by Lynda Burkett and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 08/22/06.