

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES

April 20, 2011 – 3:00 P.M.

Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Harris Oswalt, called the meeting to order at 3:00. Cart Blackwell, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
Members Present: Mary Cousar, Kim Harden, Bill James, Thomas Karwinski, Harris Oswalt, and Craig Roberts.
Members Absent: Gertrude Baker, Carlos Gant, Bradford Ladd, Jim Wagoner, Janetta Whitt-Mitchell, and Barja Wilson.
Staff Members Present: Devereaux Bemis, Cart Blackwell, and John Lawler.
2. Mr. Karwinski moved to approve the minutes of the April 6, 2011 meeting. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.
3. Mr. Karwinski moved to approve the midmonth COA's granted by Staff. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED

1. **Applicant: Brooks Conkle**
 - a. Property Address: 215 South Scott Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/28/11
 - c. Project: Install interior lot fencing. The fencing will measure 6' in height. A section of fencing will extend from the southeast corner of the house to the lot line. The fence will then extend along the east lot and then along a portion of the northern lot line. It will then tie into the side of the house. Another section of fence will extend between the bodies of house and the adjacent house to the north. Install framed lattice skirting between the house's foundation piers.
2. **Applicant: Melissa M. Thomas**
 - a. Property Address: 254 Dexter Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/25/11
 - c. Project: Construct a wooden overhang over the rear entrance.
3. **Applicant: William James**
 - a. Property Address: 1216 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/28/11
 - c. Project: Repair porch columns, poor deck, soffits, fascia and trim matching existing in material, profile, and dimension. Paint to match the existing. Repair roof and flashing matching the existing in material, profile, dimension and color.
4. **Applicant: Daniel McCleave**
 - a. Property Address: 1012 Old Shell Road
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/29/11
 - c. Project: Repaint the house the submitted color scheme.
5. **Applicant: Michael Stricklin**
 - a. Property Address: 1115 Church Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/30/11
 - c. Project: Remove a chain-link fence. Install a six foot interior lot wooden privacy fence to the rear of the building.
6. **Applicant: David McConnell**
 - a. Property Address: 150-164 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/30/11

- c. Project: Repair and replace components on windows on the west façade where necessary. Repair ironwork in dislocated locations.
7. **Applicant: Kim & William Tew**
 - a. Property Address: 9 Semmes Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/30/11
 - c. Project: Replace tongue-and-groove porch decking. Reinstall the wooden porch railing. Replace wooden windows with wooden windows. Repair and replace rotten siding and woodwork to match the existing. Reroof to match the existing. Repaint per the existing color scheme.
 8. **Applicant: Bunky Ralph for the Mobile Archdiocese**
 - a. Property Address: 307 Conti Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/31/11
 - c. Project: Install a wooden sign (per submitted drawing). The sign will measure less than 30 square feet. The sign will feature the name house museum and the hours.
 9. **Applicant: Sam Au**
 - a. Property Address: 58 Bradford Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/31/11
 - c. Project: Repaint the house per the existing color scheme.
 10. **Applicant: Jim Walker**
 - a. Property Address: 602 Church Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/31/11
 - c. Project: Tear off old roof, redeck and reroof with rubber membrane (not visible from street).
 11. **Applicant: Bob Lipford with Lipford Construction**
 - a. Property Address: 10 North Reed Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 4/5/11
 - c. Project: Repair and replace rotten woodwork to match the existing. Repaint the house to match the existing color scheme.
 12. **Applicant: Robert Dueitt**
 - a. Property Address: 1323 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 4/5/11
 - c. Project: Repair and replace rotten wooden decking and woodwork to match the existing.
 13. **Applicant: Robin Roach**
 - a. Property Address: 1119 Church Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 4/7/11
 - c. Project: Repaint the house per the existing color scheme.
 14. **Applicant: David Thomas, Sr.**
 - a. Property Address: 263 Cedar Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 4/7/11
 - c. Project: Repaint house white per existing (trim).
 15. **Applicant: Jean Cieutat**
 - a. Property Address: 35 South Lafayette Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 4/7/11
 - c. Project: Replace a damaged door glazed and paneled wooden door with a paneled wooden door.
 16. **Applicant: Katherine Morrisette**
 - a. Property Address: 12 Common Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 4/8/11
 - c. Project: Touch up paint per the existing color scheme.

17. Applicant: Charles Bodden

- a. Property Address: 1503 Brown Street
- b. Date of Approval: 4/11/11
- c. Project: Repaint the house per the existing color scheme. Replace the columns. The replacement columns will match the existing.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2011-25-CA: 1209 Palmetto Street

- a. Applicant: Louie H. McLendon
- b. Project: Construct a single story garage atop the slab of an earlier single story garage.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

2. 2011-26-CA: 58 Bradford Avenue

- a. Applicant: Bill Glover with Premier Windows of the Gulf Coast for Sam Au
- b. Project: Window Replacement – Replace aluminum windows with vinyl windows.

TABLED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

3. 2011-27-CA: 1507 Dauphin Street

- a. Applicant: Wayne Gardner for the Dauphin Way United Methodist Church
- b. Project: Window Replacement – Replace wooden windows with double-paned wooden windows featuring a Low-E Glass coating.

TABLED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. 2256 DeLeon Avenue

Mr. Blackwell prefaced the PowerPoint presentation of the tabled application with comments regarding the revised application. He told the Board that the revised application reflect comments and feedback from the Staff Report, the April 6th meeting, and the April 13th Staff meeting. He explained that the east lot line wall had been dropped in height from eight to six feet. The six foot iron fence would employed on the eastern lot instead of the proposed wooden fence. A discussion of fencing detailing and locations ensued. Mr. Roberts stated that the application as amended did not impair the historic district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The Board ruled unanimously in favor of the applicant.

2. Guidelines

Mr. Bemis apprised the Board of the current state of the proposed Guidelines. He asked the Board if they had taken the opportunity to review the revised portions. A discussion ensued.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2011-25-CA: 1209 Palmetto Street
Applicant: Louie McLendon
Received: 4/8/11
Meeting: 4/20/11

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Construct a garage with storage shed extension atop the site of an earlier single story garage.

BUILDING HISTORY

This two story wooden house with a hipped roof dates from circa 1905. The house is a mediation of the traditional side hall plan and the foursquare type.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the 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 district...”

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on May 1, 2000. At that time the Board approved alterations to the main residence’s rear elevation. On April 8, 2011, Staff received notification of unauthorized work. A non-contributing garage had been demolished without the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness or a building permit. A Stop Work Order was issued. The applicant returns to the Board with an application calling for the after-the-fact-approval of a partially constructed new garage.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “An ancillary structure is any construction other than the main building on the property. It includes but is not limited to garages, carports, pergolas, decks, pool covers, sheds and the like. The appropriateness of accessory structures shall be measured by the guidelines applicable to new construction. The structure should complement the design and scale of the main building.”
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. The ancillary structure will be located atop the concrete slab of an earlier ancillary structure.
 - 2. The body of the building will be a replica of the earlier structure.
 - 3. The body of the building will feature a gabled roof.
 - 4. The body of the building will measure 9’ 10” in width and 20’ 2” in depth. A 4’ 10” recessed shed roofed extension will be located off the eastern side of the building.
 - 5. The building’s wooden siding will match that of the main residence.

6. The structure will rest atop a single course of concrete blocks.
7. The rafters will be fronted by simple boxed eaves.
8. The roofs will be sheathed with asphalt shingles matching those found on the house.
9. The east-facing shed addition will feature a wooden door.
10. The whole of the building will be painted white.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application for after-the-fact-approval involves the construction of a new garage with attached storage shed atop the site of an earlier ancillary structure. The body of the proposed building is essentially a replica of the previous structure. The new building would feature a small shed roofed extension off the east elevation.

The Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that ancillary structures should complement the design and scale of the main building. The proposed building will feature the same simple box-like massing and detailing of the main house. Ancillary structures of this type were once found across the City's historic districts. The plan and elevations are similar to the MHDC's stock garage plan (minus the shed extension). The siding and roof shingles of the proposed building will match those found on house.

Based on the traditional nature of the design and the selection of materials, Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical integrity of the property or the historic district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1), Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or the historical character of the property or the district. Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. and Mrs. Louie McLendon were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt welcomed the applicants. He asked Mr. and Mrs. McLendon if they had any comments to make, questions to ask, or clarifications to address with regard to the Staff Report. Mr. McLendon stated that the old garage had been in a bad state of repair.

Mr. Oswalt asked his fellow Board members if they had any questions to ask the applicants or comments to make regarding the application. Neither questions nor comments ensued.

Mr. Oswalt asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak for or against the application. Upon hearing no response, Mr. Oswalt closed the period of public comment.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report as written.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr.Roberts moved that, based upon the facts as approved by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued.

The motion received a second and passed unanimously.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 4/20/12

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2011-26-CA: 58 Bradford Avenue
Applicant: Bill Glover with Premier Windows of the Gulf Coast for Sam Au
Received: 4/4/11
Meeting: 4/20/11

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Window Replacement – Replace aluminum windows with vinyl windows.

BUILDING HISTORY

This one-and-one-half story bungalow was constructed circa 1920. The house features a full length front porch and shingled side gables.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the 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 district...”

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property appeared before the Old Dauphin Way Review Board on January 12, 1983. At that time the Board approved the construction of a second story atop the existing garage. The current owner applicant proposes the removal and replacement of latter aluminum awning windows with vinyl double hung sash windows.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “The type, size and dividing lights of windows and their location and configuration (rhythm) on the building help establish the historic character of a building. Original windows should be retained as well as original sashes and glazing.”
 - 2. “Where windows cannot be repaired, new windows must be compatible to the existing. The size and placement of new windows for additions and alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.”
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. Remove the latter aluminum awning windows from the house’s north and south (side) elevations.
 - 2. Replace the aluminum awning windows with double hung, double-paned vinyl sash windows.
 - a. The vinyl window units will be framed with wooden surrounds replicating those of the façade’s wooden windows’ framing.
 - b. The vinyl windows will be faced with a textured aluminum facing with a grained finish.

- c. The frames and units will be white in color.
- d. Screens will be placed over the windows.
- e. Remove a later window installed in the south elevation's gable.
- f. The south elevation's first story windows will be sized to better fit the reveals (not framed and suspended as some of the existing).
- g. Install wooden shingles matching the existing over the location of the aforementioned window.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the replacement of latter aluminum awning windows with double hung vinyl windows.

The house dates from circa 1920. The house is a non-contributing dwelling because of alterations made to its historic fabric with the absence of original/historic windows being the most obvious. The original windows were removed sometime after the Second World War. The present aluminum windows were in place when the residence was first surveyed in 1984. The current non historic replacement windows are inoperable. The existing windows are not historically or aesthetically appropriate to the style and period of the residence.

The applicant proposes replacing the aluminum awning windows on the side elevations with vinyl, double-hung, sash windows.

The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts list vinyl windows as inappropriate for use in the City's historic districts. Traditional wood windows have a dimensional appearance, resulting from the engagement of the window's framing members with the building's structure. Vinyl windows, lacking any wood framing holding the glass, are unable to replicate this appearance. The use of vinyl windows on historic buildings results in a projecting, rather than a receding, appearance which jeopardizes both the historical and architectural integrity of the building.

Staff does not recommend approval of this application. Since the original windows are no longer present, Staff recommends the use of a vinyl-clad or aluminum-clad replacement window (one-over-one in light configuration).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2), Staff believes this application impairs the architectural and historical character of the historic district. Staff does not recommend approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Sam Au was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt welcomed the applicant. He asked Mr. Au if he had any comments to add, questions to ask, or clarification to address with regard to the Staff Report. Mr. Au explained to the Board that he had recently acquired the property. He stated that fifteen of the house's windows (those located on the side elevations) are inoperable. Mr. Au told the Board that he wanted to replace the windows with operable energy efficient windows. He said that the current aluminum windows were not the original windows.

Mr. Karwinski addressed the applicant and his fellow Board members by saying that it was his belief that the house was listed as non-contributing on account of the current windows. He said that he had spoken with Mr. Blackwell regarding the property and its environs. Mr. Karwinski stated that the houses to either side of the house were similar in date and style to the subject dwelling and were listed as contributing. He asked if the existing non-conforming windows were replaced with historically correct windows would the property then be considered a contributing property. Mr. Bemis explained that contributing and non-contributing status is decided when a district is surveyed or in this case resurveyed. He told the Board that if changes were made to the building, the historical designation would be reevaluated when the district is next resurveyed.

Mr. Robert agreed with Mr. Karwinski as per the existing windows effect on the house. He said that the current non-contributing status of the building gave the applicant more leeway with regard to alterations. Mr. Roberts told Mr. Au that the Guidelines list vinyl as an inappropriate window material. He suggested that since the original windows had long since been removed that he investigate vinyl or aluminum clad windows. A discussion of the sash configuration of any proposed replacement windows ensued.

Mr. Oswalt asked Mr. Au if he understood the meaning of contributing and non-contributing designations. Mr. Au answered yes. Mr. Oswalt asked Mr. Au if he had considered replacing the aluminum windows with wooden or wooden-clad windows. Mr. Au said that from his preliminary investigations clad-wood windows cost prohibitive.

Mr. James stated that vinyl windows are deemed inappropriate in large part on there appearance and installation. He said that dimensionality and profile are key concerns when evaluating vinyl windows.

Mr. Au apologized for the Board for seeming flustered. He explained that his contractor was to have accompanied him to the meeting in order to explain how the windows would be installed. Mr. Blackwell added that the contractor was to have installed a sample window for Staff inspection. He said that the sample window had not been installed. Mr. Au said that the window would be set back within the brick reveal like traditional windows.

Mr. Bemis said that the pane and sash construction were equally important as installation. Ms. Harden stated that the framing of a vinyl window within a reveal would pose issues. Mr. Roberts said that replacement windows bring up many design issues. He and Mr. James complimented the vinyl window proposed. They noted that it was sturdier than most. It was lamented that the contractor was not present to discuss the window installation. Mr. Karwinski said that method of installation and the detailing, especially of the sills and jambs, would all need to be discussed.

Ms. Cousar suggested that application be suspended so that the applicant could call the contractor. The Board unanimously agreed.

Following several failed attempts to reach the contractor, the Board continued its review of the application. Mr. Au told the Board that it was his understanding that the widows would be framed in a manner identical to the façade's windows. Mr. Roberts informed Mr. Au that the Board would require details in addition to explication as to how the windows would be installed and framed. A discussion as to how the application should be tabled ensued. Mr. Cousar told Mr. Au that in tabling the application the Board was not denying it, but allowing him to possibly receive approval after further clarification and review. The Board moved to table the application for submission of photos of the sample window installation.

TABLED

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2011-27-CA: 1507 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Wayne Gardner for the Dauphin Way United Methodist Church
Received: 4/4/11
Meeting: 4/20/11

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning:
Project: Window Replacement – Replace wooden windows with double-paned wooden windows featuring a Low-E Glass coating.

BUILDING HISTORY

Old Dauphin Way United Methodist Church is one of the most monumental Protestant churches of the post Second World War period. The vast complex focuses about a 1957 sanctuary, an accomplished essay in the High Georgian Revival.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the 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 district...”

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on August 25, 2004. At that time the Board approved the relocation of a playground, the installation of a drive, the installation of fencing, and the construction of a utility building. The applicant’s representative appears before the Board with an application calling for the replacement of the main sanctuary’s wooden windows with double paned wooden windows whose glass panes will treated with a Low-E coating.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “The type, size and dividing lights of windows and their location and configuration (rhythm) on the building help establish the historic character of a building. Original windows should be retained as well as original sashes and glazing.”
 - 2. “Where windows cannot be repaired, new windows must be compatible to the existing. The size and placement of new windows for additions and alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.”
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. Remove fourteen multi-paned arched wooden windows from the main sanctuary.
 - 2. Replace the single-paned windows with double-paned wooden windows of the same design.
 - 3. The panes of the replacement windows will feature a Low-E coating.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the replacement of wooden windows with wooden windows. The existing windows make up over one-fourth of the building's historic fabric. The proposed replacement would be double as opposed to single-pane in construction and the glazing would feature a Low-E glass coating.

The removal and replacement of historic windows is a topic of major discussion in both the preservation and construction literature. With the rising energy costs and increasing "green" incentives, there exists much information and misinformation on the subject. The National Trust for Historic Preservation has devoted a section of its website to the subject (www.preservationnation.org/issues).

A 2010 issue of the Alabama Trust for Historic Preservation's newsletter addressed the situation. The basic conclusion of the web site and publication is that existing windows should be preserved. In analyzing retention as opposed to replacement, economic, and energy factors are cited in favor of keeping the historic windows. Additional argument is made for their importance to the historic integrity of the building. The use of storm windows is recommended as energy saving solution that simultaneously preserves historic fabric, character, and resources. When windows must be replaced the replacement composition (material) and construction (single or double-paned) are matters of key concern. The window literature further addresses the types and dates of wooden window construction.

The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that historic windows should be retained (B.1 above). When windows must be replaced the Guidelines state that those replacements should be compatible with the general character of the building. The construction method, double instead of single pane, would change. The Guidelines do not authorize the replacement of single-paned windows with double-paned windows.

While Staff is cognizant of and open to energy saving measures, the Guidelines, professional literature, and previous Board rulings, all speak against the installation of double-paned window replacements. Since Staff is not recommending approval of the double-paned windows, Staff's recommendation need not reach the issue concerning the use of a Low-E coating.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2), Staff believes this application impairs the architectural and the historical character of the building and the district. Staff recommends against the replacement of the historic windows.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Wayne Gardner and Diana Maly were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt welcomed the applicants. He asked the Ms. Maly and Mr. Gardner if they had any comments to make add, questions to ask, or clarifications to make with regard to the application. Mr. Gardner commenced his comments by noting the church building was constructed in 1957. He said that the building was originally classified as a non-contributing. Mr. Blackwell explained that when the Old Dauphin Way Historic District was resurveyed in 2007, the building was elevated from non-contributing to contributing in significance. Mr. Gardner told the Board that the Church would prefer not to replace the windows but a combination of rot, condensation, and to some degree poor maintenance had all taken their effect on the sanctuary's windows. He told the Board that this project was an expensive undertaking. He said that churches like other

businesses were under the same burdens as all other entities during these economically stressed times. Mr. Gardner stated that luckily for the church, a donor had stepped forward with monies that would fund the project. He said that the replacement windows would be solid wood windows and would match the existing. Mr. Gardner noted that three local manufactures were under consideration. In addition to the condition of the current windows, Mr. Gardner stated that church was concerned with rising energy costs. He told the Board that the Church spends roughly \$200,000 a year heating and cooling the complex. Mr. Gardner noted that not only would the replacement windows look like the old windows, but they would also be more energy efficient.

Mr. Roberts asked Mr. Gardner if the proposed double-paned replacement windows would be true-divided-light windows. Mr. Gardner answered yes.

Mr. Roberts asked Staff how a fifty-four year old building was listed as contributing. He said that he thought contributing buildings had to be a minimum of seventy-five years old. Mr. Bemis explained that the seventy-five year qualification was the minimum requirement for a Banner and Shield, not National Register status.

Mr. Robert voiced his endorsement as to high quality double-paned windows. He stated that double-paned wooden windows differed only from traditional single-paned wooden windows in that the doubly insulated. He stated that often times one cannot tell the difference between the two. Ms. Maly said that not being able to tell a difference was the church's objective.

Mr. Gardner brought of the subject of the Low-E glass coating. He said that the use of a Low-E coating could reduce energy costs up to twenty percent. Mr. Gardner told the Board that coating would be applied to the outside of the outer panes. An additional twenty percent could be achieved through the use of double-paned windows. Mr. Gardner reiterated to the Board that the proposal was an expensive one, but it would pay off monetarily and look the same aesthetically.

Mr. Roberts asked Mr. Wagoner as to the type of woods that had been considered. Mr. Gardner addressed Mr. Roberts' query.

Mr. Karwinski asked Mr. Gardner about the spacing strip that would be located between the double panes.

Mr. Roberts initiated a discussion of the double-paned window discussion.

Mr. Oswalt asked the applicants if they had invested the cost of replacing the single-paned windows with single paned windows. Mr. Gardner explained to the Board that investigations of single-paned window replacement were cost prohibitive.

Mr. Roberts brought to the Board's attention the issue of wind impact codes. Mr. Roberts and Mr. James discussed matters relating to wind impact glass. Mr. Oswalt stated that while codes constituted an important consideration, the Board's concern centers upon the integrity and impairment.

Ms. Harden addressed her fellow Board members by asking about their experiences with regard to 1950s windows. Mr. Blackwell said that during the 1940s and 1950s window manufacturers were transitioning out of the use of more durable, dense, old growth timber.

Mr. James asked Mr. Gardner if the design of the proposed window replacements would match the existing. Mr. Gardner answered yes.

Mr. James and Ms. Harden entered into a discussion as to the dimensionality of the panes and sashes.

Ms. Harden asked Mr. Gardner if the interior spindled lunettes would be reinstalled. Mr. Gardner and Mr. Blackwell answered yes.

Mr. Karwinski returned the discussion back to the issue of the spacers between the windows. He said that white spacers would be less obtrusive.

Mr. Karwinski stated that in order to remain sustainable preservation policy needed to evolve. Mr. Bemis reminded the Board that they had repeatedly denied home owners approval to replace their original single-paned wooden windows with double-paned replacement windows. He stated that both present and the proposed Guidelines do not allow the replacement of single-paned windows with double-paned windows. Mr. Bemis told the Board to take into account that the church's windows represented probably twenty-five percent of the building's historic fabric. He said that he did not know the extent of the interior deterioration but recommended the use of storm windows. Mr. Bemis told the Board that appearance and cost were not the only issues. Historical integrity remained a paramount concern. He said that the National Parks Service reviewed building with regards to their historical integrity. A building's integrity determines its historical status, as well as, its eligibility for tax credits.

Addressing his fellow Board members and Staff, Mr. Roberts alluded to Mr. Lawler's comments concerning case by case rulings. Mr. Lawler interjected by saying that core regulation was required. Mr. Lawler and Mr. Bemis entered into a discussion regarding interpretation of state preservation rulings. Mr. James said that preservation policy should reflect energy conditions. Mr. Bemis told the Board that if they approved this application they were setting a precedent. He stated while at a distance double-paned windows might appear the same as single-paned windows, closer inspection proved otherwise, especially when viewed from close up and within the interior. Ms. Maly said that the Church was concerned with the appearance of the windows from within and outside the sanctuary.

Mr. Bemis suggested that the Board adjourn to the site in order to inspect the original windows and discuss the proposed windows. Discussion regarding the awareness and significance of contributing status ensued. Ms. Harden said that she agreed with Mr. James regarding an increased dialogue between energy efficiency and preservation practice but pointed out that in her thirteen years with the Alabama Historical Commission, building fabric mattered as much as building appearance.

A discussion of interior and exterior storm windows ensued.

Several failed motions were made.

Mr. James made a motion to table the application for submission and review of shop drawings of the original and proposed windows. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.

TABLED