

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES

July 5, 2023 – 3:00 P.M.

Auditorium, Government Plaza
205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Vice-Chair, Mr. Jim Wagoner, called the meeting to order at 3:02 pm. Christine Dawson, Historic Development staff, called the roll as follows.

Members Present: Bob Allen, Abby Davis (arrived 3:11), Andre Rathle, Craig Roberts, Joseph Rodrigues, and Jim Wagoner

Members Absent: Janelle Adams (alternate), Cart Blackwell (alternate), Catarina Echols, Kimberly Harden, Kathleen Huffman (alternate), Karrie Maurin, and Gypsy Van Antwerp,

Staff Members Present: Annie Allen, Christine Dawson, Chris Kern, Marion McElroy, John Sledge, Kim Thomas, and Meredith Wilson

2. Mr. Roberts moved to approve the minutes from the June 21, 2023 meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Allen and approved unanimously.
3. Mr. Roberts moved to approve the Mid-Month COAs granted by Staff. The motion was seconded by Mr. Allen and approved unanimously.

B. MID-MONTH APPROVALS

- APPROVED

1. Applicant: Professional Roofing & Construction LLC

- a. Property Address: 207 Church Street
- b. Date of Approval: 06/13/2023
- c. Project: 1) Replace damaged wood on northeast corner of building.
2) Paint to match.
3) Reinstall decorative metal.
4) Seal bolts on railing.

2. Applicant: Cooner Construction Inc

- a. Property Address: 29 S. Lafayette Street
- b. Date of Approval: 06/15/2023
- c. Project: Reroof in-kind with architectural shingles. Color: IKO Cambridge Charcoal Grey

3. Applicant: Tanya Eubanks

- a. Property Address: 166 Government Street
- b. Date of Approval: 06/16/2023
- c. Project: Install 22'x1' aluminum, non-illuminated text signage over storefront. "Mobile Bay Magazine. Media. Events"

4. Applicant: Gillian McGee

- a. Property Address: 306 S. Broad Street
- b. Date of Approval: 06/22/2023 (reissue of COA approved by ARB in 2020)
- c. Project: 1) Repair rotten wood siding, fascia, soffit, and trim on all elevations.
2) Repaint the body of the house (siding, windows, trim, stair risers, porch supports, brackets and porch railing) in Benjamin Moore "Brilliant White."
Repaint the porch decking and stair treads in Benjamin Moore "Anchor Gray."
Repaint the shutters, exterior doors, brick piers, and lattice panels in BLP Paint "Bellingrath Green."

- 3) Repair and repoint brick piers as necessary; paint Bellingrath Green (all elevations).
- 4) Install new framed wood lattice panels painted Bellingrath Green (all elevations)
- 5) Rehabilitation work on the East elevation (façade) would consist of the following.
 - a) Replace the front door with paneled wood door. Replace existing transom with new wood transom with matching mullion spacing.
 - b) Replace existing wood steps with new wood stairs and railing.
 - c) Existing brick piers repaired & repointed as necessary & paint Bellingrath green.
 - d) Install new framed wood lattice panels painted Bellingrath Green.
 - e) Repair turned wood posts and brackets.
 - f) Install new wood six-over-six windows and wood louvered shutters.
 - g) Install a new wood railing and balusters to enclose the front porch.
 - h) Repair existing brick chimney.
 - i) Remove a set of steps leading to a door set back from the front plane of the façade and the door. Install one-over-one wood window in place of the door.
 - j) Remove all windows and replace with wood six-over-six (on outer ends) and aluminum clad six-over-nine windows.
- 6) Rehabilitation work on the North elevation would consist of the following.
 - a) Remove one small aluminum one-over-one window in the original mass of the house, and cover the resulting opening with wood siding to match existing.
 - b) Remove one-over-one aluminum window in existing, historic rear addition (at west end of elevation) and cover the resulting opening in wood siding to match the existing.
 - c) Remove all remaining aluminum windows and replace with wood one-over-one types.
- 7) Rehabilitation work on the West elevation (rear) would consist of the following.
 - a) Remove existing stairs and door (this area to be enclosed by proposed addition described in item 9 below).
 - b) Remove existing, small one-over-one window at south end of the elevation, and cover the resulting opening with wood siding to match the existing.
 - c) Install one (1) one-over-one wood window in the existing, historic, hip-roofed addition at the north end of the elevation.
- 8) Rehabilitation work on the South elevation would consist of the following.
 - a) Remove one window in the rear addition at the west end of the elevation (this area to be enclosed by proposed rear addition, described in item 9 below).
 - b) Replace existing windows with wood one-over-one types.
- 9) Construct rear (west elevation) addition and deck.
 - a) The addition would be one story in height and measure 7'-3" deep by 24' wide.
 - b) The deck would measure 8' deep by 16' wide.
 - c) The addition would have a shed roof covered with architectural shingles to match the existing roofing.
 - d) The addition would be sheathed in wood siding and trim to match the existing.
 - e) One (1) wood, one-over-one window would be located in the north end of the addition, and a new paneled wood door would give access to the deck from the addition.
 - f) The deck would be enclosed with wood railing and balusters, and the deck would be accessed from the back yard via a set of wood steps.
- 10) Site improvements would consist of the following.

- a) Remove existing concrete front walkway and install a new walkway to the front porch, paved with Old Mobile bricks.
- b) Install a 6' wood privacy beginning at the northeast corner of the existing rear addition and running to the north property line, turning west along the north property line and running west to the northwest corner of the property, then turning south to the southwest corner of the property, then running east to a point parallel with the eastern plane of the façade, and turning north to the southeast corner of the house.

5. Applicant: Corte Homes Inc.

- a. Property Address: 241 N Jackson Street
- b. Date of Approval: 06/23/2023
- c. Project:
 - 1) Install a wood front porch rail on the first and second floor front porches.
 - a) The top rail will be rounded and will measure 2”X4”. The bottom rail is 2”X 4”. The balusters will be 2”X2” pickets with chamfered corners.
 - b) The handrail will be painted black. The balusters, bottom rail, etc. will be painted white.
 - 2) Install an iron fence of the property.
 - a) The fence will enclose the side yard to the north of the house, running between existing brick columns, and will sit behind the front plane of the building.
 - b) The fence will measure 6'-0" high.
 - c) The fence will be painted black.
 - 3) A brick veneer foundation to match the existing foundation will be placed under the side entrance stoop (north elevation).
 - 4) Install 4" dentil molding under the soffit on the façade, which will be painted to match the house.

6. Applicant: Frances Holdings, LLC

- a. Property Address: 158 Michigan Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 06/23/2023
- c. Project:
 - 1) Replace second storefront from South with full roll-up door (or roll-up door and wall with pedestrian door to match the storefront to the south) to fit the existing opening.
 - 2) Remove section of windows on northeast corner of the building (only those windows that meet at the corner).
 - 3) Replace all windows on east elevation with new aluminum windows to fit the existing openings. Color will be rubbed bronze or black.
 - 4) Paint brick elevation. Color: white.
 - 5) Remove three existing canvas awnings.
 - 6) Paint existing metal awning. Color: Black

7. Applicant: DW Construction Services LLC

- a. Property Address: 34 Hannon Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 6/26/2023
- c. Project: Termite damage repairs: Replace in-kind siding on south elevation. Paint to match existing.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2023-32-CA: 401 Civic Center Drive/ 200 S. Claiborne Street

- a. Applicant: Evan Terry Associates LLC on behalf of City of Mobile
- b. Project: Construct six-story parking garage

APPROVED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

2. 2023-33-CA: 164 S. Georgia Avenue

- a. Applicant: Henry Morrissette
- b. Project: Replace existing rear porch with larger porch

APPROVED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

3. 2023-34-CA: 1005 Texas Street

- a. Applicant: Nu Vision Construction Inc. on behalf of Warren & Shirley Mason
- b. Project: Demolish single-family residence

APPROVED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

4. 2023-35-CA: 209/217/225 N. Jackson Street

- b. Applicant: Corte Homes Inc.
- b. Project: After-the-Fact Approval: Omission of round windows on 2nd floor facades

APPROVED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

D. OTHER BUSINESS

- 1. The next ARB meeting is scheduled for July 19, 2023.

Public comment regarding items on this agenda will be accepted via e-mail (mhdc@cityofmobile.org) or USPS (Mobile Historic Development Commission, P.O. Box 1827, Mobile, AL 36633) until 5PM on Monday, July 3, 2023. Please include your name, home address, and the item number about which you are writing.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

ADDRESS/PARCEL	R022906400013012	APPLICATION NO.	2023-32-CA
SUMMARY OF REQUEST	Construct six-story parking garage		
APPLICANT	Evan Terry Associates LLC	OWNER, IF OTHER	City of Mobile

HISTORIC DISTRICT	Church Street East	MEETING DATE	7/5/2023
CLASSIFICATION	Vacant	REVIEWER	C. Dawson

DISTRICT/PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

Church Street East Historic District was initially listed in the National Register in 1971 under Criteria A (historic significance) and C (architectural significance) for its local significance in the areas of architecture, education, and urban planning. The district is significant for its concentration of multiple 19th century architectural styles and because it encompasses the site of Mobile in the early 1700s. The district boundaries were expanded in 1984 and 2005.

The larger parcel of which the subject parcel was part, is occupied by the 1964 Civic Center, a complex composed of an arena, a theater, and an exposition hall. As shown on the 1876 Hopkins ward map of Mobile showing the area bounded by Church, Lawrence, Canal, and Claiborne streets - the land on which the Civic Center and associated parking now exist - was densely developed with residences. The 1885 Sanborn map illustrates only the far northwest corner of the current Civic Center property, showing an area densely populated with one-story frame dwellings, “tenements”, and “shanties.” A two-story brick stable with attached one-story brick barber shop is shown on Lawrence Street just north of the current location of Civic Center Drive. Two grocery stores, one at the northeast corner of Monroe and Lawrence and one at the southwest corner of Monroe and Hamilton, were recorded, and a saloon was placed at the southeast corner of Monroe and Lawrence.

The entire Civic Center area is illustrated on the 1891 Sanborn map, which continues to show a densely developed residential area. Interspersed with the mostly one-story frame houses of varying size were grocery stores, barber shops, an ice cream shop, retail stores, a fire station, a church, a saloon, and a restaurant. By the time the 1904 Sanborn map was prepared, more residences including more two-story dwellings were present, and the variety of businesses appears to have narrowed. A two-story frame residence with apparent bay window on its façade was shown at the northeast corner of Monroe and Franklin streets, and a two-story brick furniture store was at the opposite end of the block at the northwest corner of Monroe and Franklin streets. The neighborhood included a Chinese laundry, a barber, Bethel A.M.E. Church, and a furniture warehouse.

The 1924 Sanborn map, updated in 1955, shows a similar pattern with a few exceptions. A cinder block dwelling had been constructed at the southwest corner of Hamilton and Eslava streets at some point between 1924 and 1955, and a cinder block addition had been made to a frame house on Claiborne Street south of Monroe in the same period. The grocery stores and barbers seem to have disappeared, and the block bounded by Madison, Claiborne, Canal, and Franklin streets had been cleared for use as a “Public Play Ground” complete with public restrooms. The two and one-half story brick Robert E. Lee Public School occupied the block bounded by Madison, Franklin, Hamilton, and Canal streets.

Available aerial photographs of the Civic Center area taken in 1938, 1952, 1955, and 1960 show essentially the same development as reflected in the 1924/1955 Sanborn map. By the time of the next available aerial photograph, 1967, more than seven blocks had been leveled to make way for the Civic Center. The only structure remaining was the public school bounded by Madison, Franklin, Hamilton, and Canal streets. The school disappeared by the time of the next available aerial photograph, taken in 1980.

Per the vertical files of the Historic Development Department, the larger parcel, of which the subject parcel was part until recently, has appeared five (5) times previously before the Architectural Review Board (ARB). In November 1983, the ARB approved placement of a commemorative plaque on a brick base at the corner of Claiborne Street and Auditorium Drive (now Civic Center Drive). The installation of a 100' telecommunications tower and construction of a one-story 10'x16' accessory structure on a small parcel to the immediate north of the subject parcel were approved by the ARB in July 1998. The ARB approved the construction of two steel and glass bus shelters located along the Lawrence Street side of the parcel was approved in October 2009. Most recently, the current applicant received approval in concept (square footage/footprint, height of the proposed building, height of the proposed fence, and proposed setbacks) on August 17, 2022. Full approval of the proposed office building was granted on November 16, 2022. Approval of two one-story projections from the office building was granted by the ARB in April 2023.

SCOPE OF WORK (per submitted application)

1. Construct a six-story, approximate 360'-10"x189'-4" parking garage.
 - a. The garage footprint would measure 360'-10" along the Claiborne Street (east) elevation and 189'-4" deep, roughly parallel to Canal Street.
 - b. The structure would be approximately 94' high at its highest points on the corners housing the elevator/stair towers.
 - c. Two alternatives have been submitted for cladding.
 - 1) "Base Bid" option: The two lowest levels of the east elevation, south elevation, and the stair/elevator towers would be clad in architectural precast concrete panels with thin brick inlay in a light brown color. All six stories of the central bays of the west and north elevations would be clad in precast concrete panels painted white, as would the upper four levels of the east and south elevations. All elevations of the penthouse level of the stair/elevator towers would be clad in precast concrete panels painted gray.
 - 2) "Add Alternate" option: The lowest two levels of the west and north elevations would be clad in architectural precast concrete panels with thin brick inlay in a light brown color. Painted precast concrete panels would be added between the vertically aligned windows on the third through fifth levels to match the east and south elevations. All other cladding details would be the same.
 - d. All doors and curtain wall systems would be commercial coated aluminum.
 - e. The fenestration on each elevation of the garage would appear as follows.
 - 1) East elevation, from south to north: glazed curtain wall system at stair/elevator tower; 12 sets of vertically paired openings on the lower two levels and 12 sets of three (3) vertically aligned openings on the third through fifth levels; central glazed curtain wall system; eight (8) sets of vertically paired openings on the ground level and eight (8) sets of three (3) vertically aligned openings on the third through fifth levels; two (2) vehicle entry/exit openings with "headache" bars on the ground level with four (4) openings immediately above on the second level and four (4) sets of three (3) vertically aligned openings on the third through fifth levels; glazed curtain wall system at the stair/elevator tower
 - 2) South elevation, from west to east: glazed curtain wall system at the stair/elevator tower with inset single door and aluminum canopy at west end; four (4) sets of vertically paired openings on the lower two levels and four (4) sets of three (3)

vertically aligned openings on the third through fifth levels; central glazed curtain wall system; four (4) sets of vertically paired openings on the lower two levels and four (4) sets of three (3) vertically aligned openings on the third through fifth levels; glazed curtain wall system at the stair/elevator tower with inset single door and aluminum canopy at east end

- 3) Two alternatives have been submitted for the West elevation, from north to south:
 - a) “Base Bid” option: glazed curtain wall system at the stair/elevator tower; five (5) wide openings punctuated by painted precast concrete-clad structural piers; aluminum storefront composed of three (3) sets of three (3) vertically aligned lights, a doorway, and a set of three (3) vertically aligned lights on the ground level with single, wide openings on the four (4) levels above; four (4) wide openings punctuated by painted precast concrete-clad structural piers; two (2) vehicle entry/exit openings with “headache” bars on the ground level with two (2) wide openings separated by painted precast concrete-clad structural piers on levels two through five above; glazed curtain wall system at the stair/elevator tower
 - b) “Add Alternate” option: glazed curtain wall system at the stair/elevator tower; 12 sets of vertically paired openings on the lower two levels and 12 sets of three (3) vertically aligned openings on the third through fifth levels; aluminum storefront composed of three (3) sets of three (3) vertically aligned lights, a doorway, and a set of three (3) vertically aligned lights with two (2) openings above on the second level and two (2) sets of three (3) vertically aligned openings on the third through fifth levels; two (2) vehicle entry/exit openings with “headache” bars on the ground level with two (2) openings above on the second level and two (2) sets of three (3) vertically aligned openings on the third through fifth levels; glazed curtain wall system at the stair/elevator tower
- 4) Two alternatives have been submitted for the North elevation, from east to west:
 - a) “Base Bid” option: glazed curtain wall system at the stair/elevator tower with inset single door and aluminum canopy at east end; five (5) wide openings punctuated by painted precast concrete-clad structural piers; glazed curtain wall system at the stair/elevator tower with inset single door and aluminum canopy at west end
 - b) “Add Alternate” option: glazed curtain wall system at the stair/elevator tower with inset single door and aluminum canopy at east end; ten (10) pairs of vertically aligned openings on the first and second levels with ten (10) sets of three (3) vertically aligned openings on the third through fifth levels; glazed curtain wall system at the stair/elevator tower with inset single door and aluminum canopy at west end

2. Install site improvements.

- a. Construct entry/exit drives at the southwest and northeast corners of the structure.
- b. Install grass lawns on west and north sides of structure, with three walkways (two on the north side and one on the west side) connecting the garage to sidewalks running parallel to the garage on the outside of the lawns.
- c. Install sidewalks along the west and south sides of the garage.

STAFF REPORT

A. Applicable standards from the *Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts* (Guidelines):

1. In order to assure that historic resources are appreciated as authentic contributing buildings, it is important that new buildings be distinguishable from them. Therefore, new construction should appear as a product of its own time, while also being compatible with the historically significant features of the area...Building materials and finishes for new structures...should contribute to the visual continuity of the district and appear similar to those seen traditionally. (7.0)
2. Although imitation is discouraged, traditional façade and material patterns used in historic structures should inform the design of new commercial structures in locally-designated historic districts. (7.0)
3. Orient a new commercial building to be similar to that of nearby historic structures.
 - Design side setbacks to be similar to those in adjacent historic buildings. If a project is flanked by non-historic structures, refer to nearby historic structures.
 - In most cases, new commercial structures should be oriented to directly face the street.
 - Face primary building entries toward the public street. (7.30)
4. Place and orient new commercial construction to engage the public street similar to historic commercial structures.
 - Place buildings close to the back of the sidewalk, but in keeping with adjacent historic commercial structures.
 - Orient facades to be parallel with the street.
 - Locate primary building entries and storefronts at the street edge. (7.31)
5. Design a building to be compatible with massing and scale with historic structures in the district.
 - Design building massing to reflect massing of nearby historic structures.
 - Where the volume of new construction is larger than historic structures in the district, break down the massing into smaller components to increase compatibility.
 - Incorporate changes in color, texture, and materials.
 - Use architectural details to create visual interest.
 - Use materials that help to convey scale in their proportion, detail, and form. (7.34)
6. Maintain traditional spacing patterns created by the repetition of building widths along the street.
 - Proportion a new façade to reflect the established range of traditional building widths seen in Mobile.
 - Where a structure must exceed a traditional building width, use changes in building configuration, articulation, or design features such as materials, window design, façade height, or decorative details to break the façade into modules that suggest traditional building widths. (7.36)
7. Maintain the distinction between the street level and upper floor on multi-story structures.
 - Incorporate a high percentage of transparent glass in the first floor of the primary façade.
 - Design upper floors to appear more opaque than the street level.
 - Express the distinction in floor heights between street level and upper levels through detailing, materials, and fenestration. (7.40)
8. Use building materials that are compatible with the surrounding context.
 - Use brick, true stucco, or stone as the primary exterior building material. (7.45)
9. Visually connect the street and building.
 - Maintain or install a walkway leading directly from the sidewalk to the main building entry. (10.5)
10. Minimize the visual impact of parking.
 - Locate a parking area at the rear or to the side of a site wherever possible.
 - Use landscaping to screen a parking area.

- Minimize the widths of a paved area or a curb cut.
- Do not create a new driveway or garage that opens onto a primary street. (10.7)

B. Staff Analysis

The application under consideration is for a six-story parking garage and site improvements near the southeast corner of what is known as the Civic Center Site at the corner of Canal and Claiborne streets. The garage would be located to the immediate north of the previously approved six-story U.S. Army Corps of Engineers office building.

The existing Civic Center buildings were considered Non-Contributing elements of the Church Street East district at the time of the last survey in 2005. The proposed site does not fall precisely into any of the commercial contexts (Main Street, Commercial Corridor, Interior Neighborhood) outlined in the *Guidelines*.

The orientation and placement of new commercial buildings on their lots in historic districts are key elements for compatibility with a surrounding historic district. The *Guidelines* instruct that, in most cases, new commercial structures should be oriented to directly face the street, engaging the public street similar to the way historic commercial structures do. Further, buildings should be placed close to the back of the sidewalk. (A.3, 4) Parking garages are not structures intended for human occupation, but the proposed design offers a wealth of glass and openings to the east, the only side adjacent to a street. Sidewalks would be located on all four sides of the proposed parking garage, and walkways would connect the garage to the sidewalks across shallow lawns on the north and east sides. The garage would be accessed from South Claiborne Street, which would essentially dead-end at the garage after the new I-10 bridge approach is constructed.

The *Guidelines* also emphasize that the massing and scale of new commercial buildings should be compatible with nearby historic buildings: “Design building massing to reflect massing of nearby historic structures. Where the volume of new construction is larger than historic structures in the district, break down the massing into smaller components to increase compatibility.” (A.5) While the mostly one-story residences to the south across Canal Street are not located in a historic district, the proposed six-story parking garage would be obscured by the Army Corps of Engineers building to its immediate south. The closest historic structure to the proposed garage would be the Phoenix Fire Museum, approximately 1,000’ north of the northeastern corner of the garage. Due to the existing curve in South Claiborne Street and existing, intervening trees, a line-of-sight study revealed the garage would be minimally visible from the museum.

The varied cladding and fenestration patterns of the six-story garage would serve as visual breaks in the 361’ elevation running along South Claiborne Street. Further, the glazed aluminum curtain walls in the stair/elevator towers and at the center of the elevation would create five bays, making it appear less massive in an area dominated by one- and two-story residences. (A.6)

The design of the proposed garage takes into account the *Guidelines*’ directive to “maintain the distinction between the street level and upper floor on multi-story structures.” Echoing the design of the adjacent Army Corps of Engineers office, the lower two levels of the garage would be clad in precast concrete panels with a thin brick inlay, defining the lower two levels in a similar way to historic commercial buildings and skyscrapers with more massive lower stories. The design also incorporates a high percentage of glass in the curtain walls enclosing the stair/elevator towers. Further, the fenestration pattern and use of horizontal panels between vertically aligned openings expresses the deck levels of the garage. (A.7)

The upper four levels of the garage would be clad in painted precast concrete panels, and the lower two levels would be clad in precast concrete panels with thin brick inlay. These materials are almost identical in character to the previously approved brick laid in stretcher bond to be applied to the lower two levels and the precast architectural concrete to be used in the upper four stories of the adjacent Corps of Engineers Office building. The brick veneer would recall the long tradition of brick construction in Mobile, and the precast concrete panels would be visually similar to panels seen on the First National Bank/Trustmark Building and the Waterman Building.

The application at hand proposes to install a sidewalk along the South Claiborne Street side of the garage, in conformance with the *Guidelines*. (A.9)

The *Guidelines* instruct that the visual impact of parking should be minimized. (A.8) The guidance offered is in reference to surface parking and does not entertain parking garages. However, the proposed garage would minimize the visual impact of parking at this location as it would alleviate the need for the sea of surface parking now in existence at the site. (A.10)

C. Summary of Analysis

- The closest Contributing property to the proposed garage, the Phoenix Fire Museum, is located approximately 1000' to the north, and the garage would be visually obscured by a curve in S. Claiborne Street and existing trees.
- The proposed parking garage would conform to the *Guidelines*' directives regarding orientation and placement, massing and scale, use of varying materials and bays to break up massive facades, distinguishing between the street level and upper levels, materials, and connection to sidewalks.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Neil King from Evan Terry Associates, LLC. was present to discuss the application. He stated that the intent behind the submitted design proposals was to consider the importance of the placement of the structure and how it relates to the Army Corps of Engineers building and the potential commercial wraparound.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Roberts asked for clarification of the different elevation designs presented in the application. Mr. King explained that the purpose in presenting multiple elevation designs revolved around the fact that the project is ongoing, that the south and east elevations will most likely always have a public face, whereas the north and west elevations are anticipated to eventually be surrounded by commercial wraparound, losing visibility. Therefore, options are being presented with elevations with center vertical components breaking up the mass of the building.

Ms. Dawson added for further clarification that the new I-10 approach to the Bay Bridge is anticipated to essentially eliminate Claiborne Street along the east side of the proposed garage.

Mr. Wagoner asked if the Board was being asked to choose one or other or both elevation options based on the contingency master plan. He added that, in his opinion, the Board should decide on one or another elevation option. Mr. King responded that the options were created to accommodate the continuing progress of the project and are based on what was discussed with the City regarding cost balanced with development.

Mr. Rodrigues questioned if the application was premature due to the ongoing status of the project. Mr. Wagoner stated that the application was put before the Board, which gives the Board authority to

decide on the application.

Mr. Allen asked if the height of the proposed parking garage would be equivalent to that of the adjacent Army Corps of Engineers building. Mr. King replied the height of the parapet walls were almost identical in height to those of the Army Corps of Engineers building.

Ms. Davis asked if the functions of the Base Bid and Alternative elevation designs were the same. Mr. King replied that they were.

Mr. Roberts asked if there was a landscaping design plan included in the application. Mr. King responded that the site plan included plantings on the south elevation and lawns on the east and north elevation. He added that the Army Corps of Engineers project is finishing their landscaping plan and the intent is to blend with the parking garage building.

Mr. Allen asked if there would be a fence around the parking garage. Mr. King responded that there would not.

FINDING FACTS

Mr. Roberts moved that, based on the evidence presented in the application, the Board finds the facts in the Staff's report.

Ms. Davis seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Roberts moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, the application does not impair the architectural or historic character of the district and should be granted a Certificate of Appropriateness, under the conditions that the south base bid elevation design presented in the application be applied to the north and south elevations; and the east base bid elevation design presented in the application be applied to the east and west elevations.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Davis, and it was approved unanimously.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

ADDRESS	164 S. Georgia Avenue	APPLICATION NO.	2023-33-CA
SUMMARY OF REQUEST	Remove existing rear porch and construct new porch addition.		
APPLICANT	Lucy Barr	OWNER, IF OTHER	Mr. and Mrs. Henry Morrisette

HISTORIC DISTRICT	Oakleigh Garden District	MEETING DATE	07/05/2023
CLASSIFICATION	Contributing	REVIEWER	Annie Allen

DISTRICT/PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

Oakleigh Garden Historic District was initially listed in the National Register in 1972 under Criteria A (historic significance) and C (architectural significance) for its local significance in the areas of architecture, landscape architecture, and planning and development. The district is significant for its high concentration of 19th- and 20th-century architectural types and styles and significant in the area of landscape architecture for its canopies of live oaks planted from 1850 to 1910. The district is significant in the area of planning and development as the location of Washington Square, one of only two antebellum public parks remaining in Mobile. The district was expanded in 1984, and an updated nomination was approved in 2016.

The structure at 164 S. Georgia Avenue is a frame two-story side-hall plan residence fitted out in the neo-classic style. The home was built c.1904 by Sarah and George Creary. On the Sanborn overlay of 1904, the property is represented as “being built” on a large lot that was at the time 160 S. Georgia. By the time of the 1925 overlay, the property had been subdivided, and the lot containing the subject property was changed to its current number, 164. The house has remained in relatively good condition and close to its original appearance. According to MHDC records, a balustrade including a carved handrail and turned balusters originally enclosed the deck above the first-floor porch. Photographic evidence reveals that at some point between 1982 and 1989, this balustrade was removed, along with the original shutters on the second story. Approval was sought in 1994 to install a balustrade matching the original, but currently a balustrade is not extant. At some point before 2011, shutters were re-applied to the second story façade. In 1994, a full width porch was added to the rear elevation.

This property has appeared before the Architectural Review Board one time. In 1994, a COA was granted to install a new second story porch deck balustrade, rehabilitate the garage, add a 6’-0” privacy fence and gate across driveway, and construct a rear porch.

SCOPE OF WORK (per submitted application)

1. Remove non-original, non-historic rear porch.
2. Construct a new rear porch addition.
 - a. The proposed porch would span the 28’-4” width of the west (rear) elevation.
 - b. The porch would consist of three (3) sections as follows (from north to south):

Vaulted ceiling portion

- 1) This portion of the porch addition would measure 16’-0” wide and 20’-10” deep and would be supported by two (2) 6” X 6” wood posts on the west and two (2) partial wood boxed posts on the east against the west elevation of the existing structure.

- 2) A 6'-0" wide outdoor fireplace would be centered on the north elevation. It would consist of a slate hearth and a brick veneer chimney. It would project 1'-0" from the north elevation.
- 3) A wood landing measuring approximately 9'-0" wide by 3'-2" deep would be centered on the west elevation and be flanked by two (2) 6"x6" wood posts. Four (4) wood steps would descend from the landing and would be flanked by wood top and bottom railings with picket balusters.
- 4) Also on the west elevation, a pair of wood screen doors, each measuring 2'-6" wide by 8'-0" high would be centered on the elevation, providing access to the proposed landing and steps.

Flat ceiling portion

- 1) This portion would measure 7'-6" wide by 15'-10" deep and would be supported by four (4) 6" X 6" wood posts and two (2) partial wood boxed posts against the east elevation of the existing structure.
- 2) A wood screen door measuring 3'-0" wide by 8'-0" tall would be located on the western end of the south elevation.

Landing and steps

- 1) A landing measuring 4'-11" wide by 6'-0" deep would be constructed to access the screen door on the west elevation of the porch addition.
 - 2) Three (3) wood steps would descend westward from the landing and would be flanked by wood top and bottom railings with picket balusters.
- c. The vaulted and flat ceiling portions of the addition would sit under an 18'- 4 ½" -high gable roof clad in shingles, which would match those of the existing residence. The section of the vaulted ceiling portion that projects 5'-0" beyond the flat ceiling portion would create a second partial-width gable on the west elevation which would measure 16'-9 ½" high.
 - d. A 36" high balustrade consisting of wood top and bottom railings with wood picket balusters would run the perimeter of the porch addition between the wood posts, doors, and chimney.
 - e. The porch would sit on a raised foundation of brick-veneered piers with framed wood lattice infill. The foundation height would match that of the original residence.
 - f. Changes to the existing west elevation of the building include the following:
 - 1) An existing entry door on the north end of the elevation would be removed.
 - 2) A pair of wood doors, each measuring 2'-8" wide by 7'-0" high would replace a pair of existing six-over-six windows.

STAFF REPORT

A. Applicable standards from the *Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts* (Guidelines):

1. **6.17** Design and place a new porch to maintain the visibility to and integrity of an original historic porch, as well as the overall historic building.
 - Do not expand an original historic front porch. Additions of new front porches or expansion of existing front porches are generally not appropriate.
 - Limit the height of a porch addition roofline so it does not interfere with second story elevations.
 - Replace a rear porch where a previously existing rear porch is lost or enclosed.
 - Design a rear porch so that its height and slopes are compatible with the original historic structure.
2. **6.18** Design a new porch to be compatible with the existing historic building.

- Design the scale, proportion and character of a porch addition element, including columns, corner brackets, railings and pickets, to be compatible with the existing historic residential structure.
 - Match the foundation height of a porch addition to that of the existing historic structure. Design a porch addition roofline to be compatible with the existing historic structure. However, a porch addition roofline need not match exactly that of the existing historic building. For example, a porch addition may have a shed roof.
 - Use materials for a porch addition that are appropriate to the building.
 - Do not use a contemporary deck railing for a porch addition placed at a location visible from the public street.
 - Do not use cast concrete steps on façades or primary elevations.
3. **6.19** Design piers, foundations and foundation infill on a new addition to be compatible with those on the historic building.
- Match the foundation of an addition to that of the original.
 - Use a material that is similar to that of the historic foundation.
 - Match foundation height to that of the original historic building.
 - Use pier foundations if feasible and if consistent with the original building.
 - Do not use raw concrete block or wood posts on a foundation.

B. Staff Analysis

The application under review involves the removal of an existing rear porch and the construction of a new rear porch addition to the contributing structure at 164 S. Georgia Street. The existing rear porch was added to the residence in 1994 and is, therefore, neither original nor historic.

The *Guidelines* require that porch additions be placed in such a way to visually maintain the integrity of the historic building and that the addition be compatible in scale, proportion, and character with the existing structure. (A.1, 2) The proposed porch will extend westward from the existing home's rear elevation and will not be visible from the street. The porch addition spans the width of the rear elevation and is a one-story design measuring 18'-4 ½" high, whereas the residence is a two-story building, making the addition subordinate to the historic structure. The gable roof design is consistent with the character of the existing building, and its height does not obstruct the second story elevation. All materials proposed for the addition are consistent with the original building and with those used throughout the historic district.

The foundation height is equal to that of the existing house and also utilizes materials which are suitable to the historic building. (A.3)

C. Summary of Analysis

- The application proposes the removal of non-historic rear porch, which was added in 1994.
- The proposed new rear porch is compliant with the *Guidelines*' requirements in regard to placement, scale, proportion, and character.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Henry Morrisette was present to discuss the application. He stated that he had nothing to add.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Allen asked if the porch being removed is one-story and if only the rear porch being removed and not part of the rear elevation of the original house. Mr. Morrisette replied that the rear porch is one story and is the only structure being removed.

FINDING FACTS

Mr. Roberts moved that, based on the evidence presented in the application, the Board finds the facts in the Staff's report.

Mr. Rodrigues seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Roberts moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, the application does not impair the architectural or historic character of the subject property or the district and should be granted a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Mr. Rodrigues seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

ADDRESS	1005 Texas Street	APPLICATION NO.	2023-34-CA
SUMMARY OF REQUEST	Demolish one-story single-family residence		
APPLICANT	Nu Vision Construction Inc.	OWNER, IF OTHER	Warren & Shirley Mason
HISTORIC DISTRICT	Oakleigh Garden – Locally designated	MEETING DATE	July 5, 2023
CLASSIFICATION	Contributing	REVIEWER	Annie Allen

DISTRICT/PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

Oakleigh Garden Historic District was initially listed in the National Register in 1972 under Criteria A (historic significance) and C (architectural significance) for its local significance in the areas of architecture, landscape architecture, and planning and development. The district is significant for its high concentration of 19th- and 20th-century architectural types and styles and significant in the area of landscape architecture for its canopies of live oaks planted from 1850 to 1910. The district is significant in the area of planning and development as the location of Washington Square, one of only two antebellum public parks remaining in Mobile. The district was expanded in 1984, and an updated nomination was approved in 2016.

The property at 1005 Texas Street is located within the locally-designated portion of the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. The lot appears vacant on the 1878 Hopkins Map. The existing one-story frame shotgun house with restrained Queen Anne detailing is represented on the 1904 Sanborn Map as 805 Texas Street. The 1925 overlay shows a small accessory structure extant at the rear southwest corner of the lot. Also at this time, the house number changed to its current 1005 Texas Street. According to MHDC vertical files, the dwelling dates to c. 1890. It was used as a residence, then later altered as a meeting house, which is denoted by the fenestration alterations. The property was added to the Oakleigh Garden Historic District as part of a 2007 local expansion.

According to MHDC records, this property has appeared before the Architectural Review Board (ARB) once. In 2016, an application to demolish the structure was denied.

SCOPE OF WORK (per submitted application and communication)

1. Demolish the one-story single-family residence at 1005 Texas Street.

STAFF REPORT

A. Applicable standards from the *Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts* (Guidelines):

1. Consider the current significance of a structure previously determined to be historic.
2. Consider the condition of the structure in question. Demolition may be more appropriate when a building is deteriorated or in poor condition.
3. Consider whether the building is one of the last remaining positive examples of its kind in the neighborhood, county, or region.

4. Consider the impact that demolition will have on surrounding structures, including neighboring properties, properties on the same block or across the street, or properties throughout the individual historic district.
5. Consider whether the building is part of an ensemble of historic buildings that create a neighborhood.
6. Consider the future utilization of the site. (12)

B. Staff Analysis

The application involves the demolition of a contributing structure within the locally designated portion of Oakleigh Garden Historic District.

The *Guidelines* state that when demolition is contemplated, the current significance of the structure should be considered. (A.1) The subject house is considered a contributing property in the locally designated portion of the Oakleigh Garden district. The shotgun dwelling type, which features single room width and multiple room depth, represents a vernacular form common mainly in urban areas throughout the Southeast.

Per the *Guidelines*, “the condition of the structure in question” should be considered. “Demolition may be more appropriate when a building is deteriorated or in poor condition.” (A.2) In the case of the subject property, the building is found to be in a deteriorated state. The following is visually evidenced: the roof contains large openings; portions of the siding are rotten and have fallen off of the structure; windows and doors are either non-extant or are insufficient as all openings have been boarded up; walls are bowing, and the structure seems to have significant foundation issues. The property has appeared on the city’s blighted properties list and was cited in May 2023 by Municipal Enforcement for violations of Section 4 of Chapter 52 of the *Municipal Code of the City of Mobile*, which is titled “Dangerous and Unsafe Buildings Defined”.

Whether the building in question is “one of the last remaining positive examples of its kind in the neighborhood, county, or region” should be factored into any decision to allow or disallow demolition in a historic district. (A.3) The subject building was at one time a match with its neighbor to the east. The shotgun form house with front porch and restrained detailing was traditionally seen on adjacent streets such as George, Dunham, and Fry Streets and are prevalent further afield throughout the district. The immediate surrounding area has lost a fair amount of this once prevalent form, with three of six no longer extant on the subject property’s block between Charles and Chatham Street. One of these three was lost between 1985 and 1997, and two between 1997 and 2004. One was located on the northern side of the street, the other two were on the southern side. This building once ranked as one of the most elaborately detailed among the shotgun dwellings of the southeastern portion of the Oakleigh Garden District’s local portion. However, most of its detailing has been removed, including delicate filigree designs which once decorated the front gable.

The *Guidelines* instruct that the impact of a structure’s demolition on surrounding structures, including neighboring properties, properties on the same block or across the street, or properties throughout the individual historic district should be taken into account. (A.4) Although the demolition of this building will contribute an empty and gap-toothed appearance to the block, a significant portion of this part of Texas Street is already vacant. Four out of eight dwellings which appear on the 1925 Sanborn map have been removed, including two other shotgun style dwellings.

Further, the *Guidelines* instruct that the future use of a cleared site should be considered. (A.6) The applicant has designated that all materials and debris will be removed after the demolition but has provided no further plans or any description of potential construction on the site.

C. Summary of Analysis

- The house at 1005 Texas Street is a contributing structure within the locally designated portion of the Oakleigh Garden historic district.
- The house is found to be in a deteriorated and unsafe state and has been cited by Municipal Enforcement for violations pertaining to its insecure condition.
- The building is found to be of a type which traditionally dominated its immediate neighborhood.
- The surrounding block has experienced significant loss of historic fabric.
- The applicant has not indicated any possible future use of the property.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Ms. Charmaine Mason and Mrs. Shirley Mason were present to discuss the application. Mrs. Mason stated that they have been trying for years to demolish the subject structure and have been inhibited by the architectural department.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Dawson added that after the Staff report was written, Staff conferred with two individuals known for moving and rehabilitating structures in the city of Mobile. Both individuals surmised that in this case, neither rehabilitation nor relocation of the structure is feasible.

Mr. Wagoner asked if the applicant intends to clear the lot and re-sod. Ms. Mason responded that this was the intent.

Mr. Allen asked if the applicant knew why the demolition application in 2016 was denied. Ms. Mason replied that she was not sure.

Mr. Allen asked if the applicant had attempted to sell the house. Ms. Mason replied that a lien placed by the City inhibited the sale of the house.

Mr. Allen asked if the lien was placed to cover the expense of mowing the lot. Ms. Mason stated that the City gave the options of either repairing or demolishing the house, but Historic Development would not allow the demolition. She added that the City had the house painted white and charged her.

Mr. Allen asked if repairs were attempted, or if the Masons had attempted to give the structure away to be moved off the property. Ms. Mason replied that repairs were not an affordable option.

Mr. Allen asked if the windows were still extant behind the boards that have been applied over the openings. Ms. Mason replied that she was not sure, but she thinks maybe two on the left side are still intact.

Mr. Allen stated that he hates to see the structure torn down.

FINDING FACTS

Mr. Roberts moved that, based on the evidence presented in the application, the Board finds the facts in the Staff's report.

Mr. Rodrigues seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Roberts moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, the application does not impair the architectural or historic character of the surrounding district and should be granted a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Mr. Rodrigues seconded the motion, and it was approved on a 5-1 basis, with Mr. Allen opposed.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

ADDRESS	209/217/225 N. Jackson Street	APPLICATION NO.	2023-35-CA
SUMMARY OF REQUEST	After-the-Fact Approval: omission of round windows on 2 nd floor facades, as approved 10/6/2021		
APPLICANT	Corte Homes Inc.	OWNER, IF OTHER	Pilots Service Dauphin Island Inc. (209); Thomas & Gail Lea (217); Jonathan & Marilynn Barlow (225)

HISTORIC DISTRICT	DeTonti Square	MEETING DATE	7/5/2023
CLASSIFICATION	Non-Contributing	REVIEWER	C. Dawson

DISTRICT/PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

DeTonti Square Historic District was initially listed in the National Register in 1972 under Criterion A for social and urban planning significance and Criterion C for significant architecture. The district was one of two historic districts created by a municipal ordinance in 1962 in an effort to halt the rapid demolition of historic buildings near the city's central business district. The district, named for the French explorer Henri DeTonti, contains a few structures surviving from the 1830s, but the majority were built in the 1850s as residences of the wealthy and influential cotton factors, merchants, and planters.

The 1878 Hopkins ward map of Mobile shows the larger property from which the three subject properties were subdivided was occupied by a single house with outbuilding at the northwest corner facing State Street, twin houses with one outbuilding each in the northeast corner facing Jackson Street, the outbuilding of a house facing St. Anthony Street at its southwest corner, and the rear wing of a house facing St. Anthony Street at the southeast corner. The northern twin house is labeled Ottenstein, and the southern twin is labeled Frolickstein. The empty lot between the two houses facing St. Anthony is labeled Mordecai. None of the other lots within the subdivided property are labeled.

By the time of the 1885 Sanborn map and continuing unchanged on the 1891 map, the three current tax parcels were occupied by portions of three houses (one facing St. Anthony Street and two facing N. Jackson Street), a brick wall separating the two properties facing N. Jackson, and three outbuildings. The rear half of the house facing St. Anthony, number 1709, consisted of a frame one-story addition with porch facing east, a water tank on platform, and a small two-story frame addition squeezed into the northwest corner of the lot and bordered on the north and west by a brick wall separating properties. Most of the house at 3703 N. Jackson Street was located on the property now known as 209 N. Jackson Street, with a small portion of the southern end of the property located on the property now known as 201 N. Jackson, and an addition on the north side located on the current 217 N. Jackson. The two-story frame house had a partial-width front porch facing N. Jackson and a two-story partial-width porch on its south side. The property now known as 217 N. Jackson is shown with a brick wall running through its center in an east-west orientation. Additions to the two aforementioned houses were located on the south side of the wall, and part of an outbuilding associated with 3704 N. Jackson was located north of the wall. The property now known as 225 N. Jackson Street was occupied by most of the southern twin (noted as belonging to Frolickstein on the 1878 Hopkins map) and associated outbuildings.

The 1904 Sanborn map depicts an almost identical situation, though the addition at the northwest corner of 1709 St. Anthony, by this time known as 302 St. Anthony, and the water tank tower had been removed. The house known as 3703 N. Jackson Street had disappeared by the time of the 1924 Sanborn map and was replaced by a two-story frame house at the corner of St. Anthony and Jackson streets, known as 300 St.

Anthony Street. The house had a full-width, two-story porch on its façade, and its outbuildings, including a frame garage, were located at the north end, on the current location of 209 N. Jackson Street. The outbuildings north of 1709 St. Anthony Street, by this time known as 302 St. Anthony Street, had been removed and replaced by a frame garage at the northeast corner of the lot.

The twin houses facing Jackson Street had disappeared by the time of the 1955 Sanborn map. The house at the southeast corner of the block (300 St. Anthony) was labeled “Room’g” (rooming house). The map shows the north end of the garage building then in use as a store.

The 1967 aerial photograph of the area is unclear due to tree cover. However, the now-subdivided parcel had been cleared of all structures by 1980 and remained so until 2022.

The subject properties, 209, 217, and 225 N. Jackson Street, were part of a larger property known as 303 State Street until that property was subdivided into seven single-family lots in 2021. According to the Historic Development Department’s vertical files, these properties have appeared four times previously before the Architectural Review Board (ARB). An application proposing construction of a multi-family residential structure at 207 and 209 N. Jackson Street received conceptual approval from the ARB in June 2001. An application proposing the construction of a single-family residence and carriage house at 211 N. Jackson Street was approved in March 2007. The first version of the application resulting in the construction of these three houses was heard by the ARB in April 2021. The final version was approved by the ARB in October 2021.

SCOPE OF WORK (per submitted application)

1. Maintain second floor east elevation (façade) without windows approved in previously reviewed plan.

STAFF REPORT

A. Applicable standards from the *Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts* (Guidelines):

1. Design exterior building walls to reflect traditional development patterns of nearby historic buildings.
 - Use a ratio of solid to void that is similar in proportion to those of nearby historic buildings.
 - Reflect the rhythm of windows and doors in a similar fashion on all exterior building walls. The ARB will consider all building walls; however, building walls facing streets may face increased scrutiny. (6.38)

B. Staff Analysis

This application proposes maintaining the blank (windowless) second floor facades (front elevation) of the new-construction houses at 209, 217, and 225 N. Jackson Street. This treatment does not match the design approved by the Architectural Review Board in October 2021. The scope of work approved at that time for the façade stated, “The fenestration on the second floor would consist of two (2) round, four-light fixed windows placed toward the outer walls.” The approved windows were in compliance with the *Guidelines*, which call for the employment of a ratio of solids to voids that is similar to nearby historic structures. The *Guidelines* specifically state, “The ARB will consider all building walls; however, building walls facing streets may face increased scrutiny.” (A.1)

The lack of fenestration on the second floor of the façade does not reflect a ratio of solids to voids that is similar to nearby historic structures. A visual survey of the vicinity failed to reveal any one-and-a-half or two-story historic structure without fenestration in a front-facing second floor wall. For example, 304 and

305 State Street, which are located just around the corner from these properties, are Creole cottage type houses with dormer windows in the front-facing slope of their side-gabled roofs, allowing light into their upper half-stories.

C. Summary of Analysis

- The existing “blank” second floor facades do not reflect a ratio of solids to voids that is similar to nearby historic structures, in contravention of the *Guidelines*.
- The existing “blank” second floor facades do not reflect the design approved by the ARB in October 2021.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Trae Corte was present to discuss the application. He stated that he is before the Board desiring after-the-fact approval in an effort to obtain Certificates of Occupancy for the three subject houses. He added that he takes full responsibility for the accidental omission of the windows in question, explaining that they were omitted due to communication and supply challenges. He further stated that he didn't understand that the omission would be important because the windows are not very visible from the street. He respectfully asked the Board to not put the financial burden of installing these windows on this project

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Wagoner asked if a Certificate of Occupancy (CO) had been issued for this property. Ms. Dawson replied that a CO had not been issued.

Mr. Allen asked if the round windows were present on the first design presented to the Board. Mr. Corte replied that they were.

Mr. Allen asked Mr. Corte if the windows were on the design drawings, why they were not installed. Mr. Corte reiterated that it was an accidental omission due to communication and supply issues.

Mr. Tommy Lee, the owner of one of the subject structures, came forward to speak about the application. He stated that he was in favor of the omission of the windows in question as they are not functional. He added that other neighbors and owners are in agreement. He stated that he has applied for wind and hail insurance but cannot obtain it until a CO is issued.

FINDING FACT

Mr. Roberts moved that, based on the evidence presented in the application, the Board finds the facts in the Staff's report.

Mr. Rodrigues seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Roberts moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, the application does not impair the architectural or historic character of the Old Dauphin Way Historic District and should be granted a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Mr. Rodrigues seconded the motion, and it was approved by a 5 to 1 vote, with Mr. Allen opposed.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:08 p.m.

These minutes could not be approved due to change in ARB members.