

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES

August 17, 2016 – 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: Nick Holmes II, Harris Oswalt I, Craig Roberts, Steve Stone, Robert Allen, and Jim Wagoner.
Members Absent: Bradford Ladd, Catarina Echols, Kim Harden, Carolyn Hasser, and Robert Brown.
Staff Members Present: Cartledge W. Blackwell, Paige Largue and Melissa Mutert.
2. Mr. Stone moved to approve the minutes for the December 3, 2014 meeting. The motion received a second and was unanimously approval.
3. Mr. Stone moved to approve midmonth COA's granted by Staff. The motion received a second and was unanimously approval.

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED

1. **Applicant:** Brittany Smith
 - a. Property Address: 12 S. Hallett
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/25/16
 - c. Project: Install 3' picket fence from main body of house to sidewalk and wrap to side of house, allow gate at front sidewalk. Construct 6' privacy fence at side of house and around rear.
2. **Applicant:** Pinkie Henderson
 - a. Property Address: 1058 Elmira Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/25/2016
 - c. Project: Remove and replace wooden lap-siding with materials in exact type, dimension, and profile. Remove and replace porch decking with same materials in exact type, size and dimension. Replace columns on porch as needed to match in dimension, profile, and thickness. Remove other wooden components, such as molding around windows, fascia, soffitt, and eaves and replace with materials of exact type, dimension, and profile as needed.
3. **Applicant:** Apex Roofing
 - a. Property Address: 915 Church Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/26/2016
 - c. Project: Re-roof with dark architectural shingles.
4. **Applicant:** Patricia Felis
 - a. Property Address: 954 Palmetto Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/28/16
 - c. Project: Install steel handrails per the submitted design.
5. **Applicant:** Earl Harris Construction LLC on behalf of Pentacostal Church of God
 - a. Property Address: 308 N. Joachim Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/29/2016 (Revised date for 4/25/2016 per Permitting Office)
 - c. Project: Rework and replace front door to match existing door in materials and profile. Replace front handrails to match existing, replace back door to match existing, and replace back porch decking.

- 6. Applicant:** Jennifer Reese
 - a. Property Address: 265 Park Terrace
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/29/16
 - c. Project: Paint the house per the submitted color scheme.
- 7. Applicant:** P.M. Gardener
 - a. Property Address: 200 Dexter Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/1/16
 - c. Project: Reroof front porch.
- 8. Applicant:** William Singleton
 - a. Property Address: 160 Houston Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/1/16
 - c. Project: Install pre-fabricated accessory building (shed) per MHDC Design Guidelines. Building will be located in rear of lot minimally visible of public view and adhere to setback guidelines. Body of structure to match main house, roof to be charcoal metal.
- 9. Applicant:** Linda Guy
 - a. Property Address: 1220 Selma Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/3/16
 - c. Project: Reroof using architectural shingles in dark brown color.
- 10. Applicant:** Mike Dunn
 - a. Property Address: 301 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/5/16
 - c. Project: Install new roof, TPO.
- 11. Applicant:** Gaines Zarzour
 - a. Property Address: 54 N. Monterey Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/8/16
 - c. Project: Repaint the house. The body will be painted white. The foundation will be painted black. The front door will be repainted red. Repair/replace any deteriorated woodwork to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material.
- 12. Applicant:** Gulf Coast Foundation and Remodeling
 - a. Property Address: 2254 DeLeon Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/8/16
 - c. Project: Repair and when necessary replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material. Touch up the paint as per the existing color scheme.
- 13. Applicant:** David Miller
 - a. Property Address: 1204 Old Shell Road
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/8/16
 - c. Project: On ancillary building, Paint exterior to match, repair and reroof with asphalt shingles to match, repair garage doors, repair steps.
- 14. Applicant:** Gus Albanese
 - a. Property Address: 312 Chatham
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/8/16
 - c. Project: Construct an ancillary building based on the MHDC stock design. The building will be so placed as to meet municipal setback requirements for the HDO landscape.
- 15. Applicant:** David and Christine Knowles
 - a. Property Address: 253 West Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/8/16
 - c. Project: Repaint house in the approved color scheme. Replace two wooden sashes on windows per MHDC Guidelines to match in dimension, materials.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2016-19-CA: 211 Lanier Avenue

- a. Applicant: **Douglas B. Kearley of Douglas Burtu Kearley Architect on behalf of Mr. & Mrs. Mike Stashak**
- b. Project: Demolish existing garage and construct new garage.
APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

2. 2016-20-CA: 1017 Old Shell Road

- a. Applicant: Mr. Daniel Henderson
- b. Project: After the Fact Approval - Replace six-over-six wooden windows with four-over-four wooden windows on an antebellum side hall dwelling remodeled and enlarged in the 1920s.

TABLED. TO COME BACK BEFORE THE BOARD ON SEPTEMBER 7, 2016.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

- 1. Discussion

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2016-19-CA: 211 Lanier Avenue
Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley of Douglas Burtu Kearley Architect on behalf of Mr. & Mrs. Mike Stashak
Received: 7/29/16
Meeting: 8/17/16

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Ashland Place
Classification: Contributing (main residence)
Zoning: R-1
Project: Ancillary Related – Demolish a garage and construct a new garage.

BUILDING HISTORY

Dating from 1909, this highly significant Spanish Colonial Revival residence ranks among the finest of its genre in whole of Mobile. With its thick stuccoed walls, arched opening, overhanging eaves, tiled roof, and overall monumental form, the house adopts the constructions, massings, and detailing of a Colonial Revival variant that was particularly popular in Mobile. The Port City has such a large concentration of Spanish Colonial Revival buildings that a selection of them comprises a thematic National listing. This house, one built for Charles H. Smith, along the Syson Houses on Old Government (first two properties West of Houston Street), Government Street Methodist Church, and the Gulf Mobile & Ohio Passenger Terminal, constitutes particularly fine executions of a stylistic subset that had strong regional evocations and presence in Mobile.

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 April 2, 2008. At that time, the Board approved the construction of side wings to the principle residence. With this application, the new owners propose the demolition of an existing garage and the construction of a new garage in the rear lot.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “A new accessory structure should be compatible with those in the district.”
 - 2. “Locate the accessory structure in line with other visible accessory structures.”
 - 3. “Design an accessory structure to be subordinate in scale to that of the primary structure. If a proposed accessory structure is larger than the size of the typical historic accessory

structure in the district, break up the mass of the larger structure into smaller modules that reflect traditional accessory structures.”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted site plan and elevations):

1. Demolish an existing garage.
2. Construct a new garage atop and beyond the footprint of the existing.
 - A. The garage will be two-story in height.
 - B. The lower first-story will be faced with sand-finished stucco over CMU block construction.
 - C. The second-story will be faced will smooth-faced Hariboard siding.
 - D. Six-light aluminum clad casement casement windows will be employed.
 - E. Operable wooden shutters will be employed.
 - F. Hipped roof forms will surmount the building.
 - G. Exposed rafter tails will be employed on the eaves.
 - H. Either clay barrel tiles or asphalt shingles will sheath the roof.
 - I. East Elevation (facing the main residence’s rear elevation)
 - i. The first-story will feature one casement window and a three bay arcuated loggia.
 - ii. The L-shaped second-story will feature two casement windows.
 - J. North Elevation (a side)
 - i. The first-story will feature two casement windows.
 - ii. The T-shaped second-story will feature one casement window
 - K. West Elevation (facing the alley)
 - i. The first-story will feature two vehicular metal garage doors.
 - ii. The L-shaped second-story will feature one casement window.
 - L. South Elevation (a side)
 - i. The first-story will not feature fenestration.
 - ii. The second-story will feature one one-over-one sash window and two casement windows.
3. Stabilize and repaint existing masonry walls.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This two part application calls for the demolition of a single-story ancillary or accessory building and the construction of a new two-story building atop and beyond the footprint of the aforementioned building. The existing building functioned as a garage/service oriented building. The proposed building would feature vehicular storage on the lower-story and guest space on the upper-story.

When reviewing demolition applications for ancillary constructions, the same considerations informing the review of demolitions of principle buildings prevail. The main review criteria for demolitions are as follows: the architectural significance of the building; the condition of the building; the impact the demolition will have on the streetscape; and the nature of any proposed redevelopment.

With regard to the architectural significance of the building, while the structure was built prior to publication of the 1955 Sanborn, the first Sanborn Map to depict Ashland Place, the building is not contemporaneous with the main dwelling. Early plats depict part, but not the whole of building. Said building could have been removed for construction of the subject building. The building is not of the same design and construction quality as the principle residence, or even other ancillary construction of the same period and stylistic subset of the same. An example of an architecturally significant ancillary

building of the same style and period survives next door at 207 Lanier Avenue. Other extant ancillary buildings in the Spanish Colonial Revival mode include the garage of 1806 Old Government Street and the garage and garden pavilions located of 1673 Government Street.

As per the condition of the building, the garage suffers from far more than cosmetic concerns. Structural failure, termite infestation, and rising damp have caused considerable damage to the building. Issues extend from the foundation to the roof.

The building is not visible from the public view. The location of the main residence, proximity to the southern lot line, and presence of landscape features cause the building to not be seen from Lanier Avenue.

When addressing the nature of any redevelopment, the design of new ancillary or accessory construction comes into play. Location, massing, and scale come into play. Here follows an assessment of the proposed ancillary construction:

The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that accessory structures should be placed in line with other visible accessory structures (See B-2.). In accord with The Design Guidelines the building would be placed atop and expand upon the existing West and South setbacks as the existing building. Those two setbacks define the interactions with adjacent buildings (ancillary building at 207 Lanier Avenue) and the alleyway more than the other two lot lines. Said setbacks complement the picturesque nature of said alleyway.

The Design Review Guidelines go on to state that an accessory structure should be subordinate in scale to that of the primary structure (See B-3.). The placement, footprint, elevation, and height of the building all serve to make the building subordinate to the principle dwelling that defines the property.

Though the proposed two-story building is larger than the present one-story ancillary building, the massing of the building is so handled as to break it up into smaller modules as in the manner of traditional ancillary construction (See B-3.). Multiple examples of such picturesque groupings survive in Ashland Place. The garage located behind 103 Lanier Avenue is just one instance. Accessory structures of the period located within and without Ashland Place often featured multi-story service structures. The Board has approved similar instances in which an ancillary structure was reconstructed and heightened. The garage at 108 Lanier Avenue is a case in point.

The materials (stucco walls) and details (eave construction, window type, etc...) and other design aspects are drawn directly from the main house so as to fulfill an intent of infill construction in being complementary or compatible to the existing in the district. (See B-1.).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

With regard to the demolition of the current ancillary building, Staff recommends approval on account the combination of the building's architectural merits, physical condition, location on the lot, and the proposed redevelopment of the pertinent portion of the site. The aforementioned work would not impair the architectural or historical character of the contributing building that establishes the historical and architectural character of the property.

Based on B (1-3), Staff does not believe the construction of the proposed ancillary building will impair the architectural or the historical character of the property or the surrounding district.

Staff recommends approval of the application in full.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Douglas B. Kearley, architect, was present to discuss the application. Mr. Kearley clarified the roof is to be covered in asphalt shingles.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt thanked Mr. Blackwell for the staff report and welcomed the applicant’s representative. He asked Mr. Kearley if he had any clarifications to make, questions to ask, or comments to make. Mr. Kearley responded that the applicants had already elected not to pursue barrel roofing tiles.

Mr. Oswalt asked his fellow Board members if they had any questions germane to the application which to ask the applicant’s design professional. Mr. Roberts asked why the windows of the new garage to be constructed were not shown as having the same windows as the main house. Mr. Kearley explained it was not his intention to replicate the design of the main house, only to use it as inspiration. Mr. Wagner asked for clarification as to how the spaces would be employed. Mr. Kearley articulated how spaces would be used.

No further discussion ensued amongst the assembled Board members.

Mr. Oswalt asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. Upon hearing no response from the audience, 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 was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 8/19/2017

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2016-20-CA: 1017 Old Shell Road
Applicant: Mr. Daniel Henderson
Received: 8/9/16
Meeting: 8/17/16

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: After-the-Fact-Approval - Replace six-over-six wooden windows with four-over-four wooden windows on an antebellum side hall dwelling remodeled and enlarged in the 1920s.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to materials located in the property's file, the core of this residence dates circa 1859. An overlay in the 1901 City of Mobile Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps depicts rear additions and alterations that expanded the dwellings footprint. The house was remodeled in the 1920s. Other changes ensued. In 2015 a later side/ rear addition was demolished and the exterior was restored.

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 March 4, 2015. At that time, the Board approved a restoration package for Restore Mobile that centered on the construction of prominently located, but historically attuned and design sensitive roof cricket, as well as the demolition of small southeast corner addition that obscured a significant historic fabric. It is with this application the new owner, Daniel Henderson, would like to retain two four-over-four wooden windows on West Elevation. The work was executed without the issuance of a building permit or a Certificate of Appropriateness, The applicant also proposes the replacement of all of the dwellings remaining six-over-six wooden windows on the West, East with four-over-four wooden windows.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. "Where historic (wooden or metal) windows are intact and in repairable condition, retain and repair them to match the existing as per location, light configuration, detail and material. "

- C. Scope of Work:
1. Retain two installed four-over-four wooden windows.
 2. Replace all remaining wooden windows on located on the West, East and South Elevations with custom-made four-over-four wooden windows.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This two part application involves a proposal to retain the unauthorized installation of two four-over-four wooden windows in the place of intact six-over-six wooden windows located on the northernmost end of the West elevation (facing Pine Street) of a contributing residence. The application also calls for the additional removal of all remaining six-over-six windows on the building's West, East, and South Elevations and their replacement with four-over-four wooden windows. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that where historic (wooden or metal) windows are intact and in repairable condition, retain and repair them to match the existing as per location, light configuration, detail and material (See B-1.). While the composition of the four-over-four windows replacing the six-over-six windows remains the same, the light configuration does not match the lost windows. Both of the windows were in good states of repair. The loss of historic fabric with its architectural and historical implications on the property's principle contributing building, one situated on a prominent corner lot, alters the building's character and integrity. The loss of the remaining six over six windows, even with custom-made replacements, would only exacerbate the impact on the architectural, historical, and design fabric.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1), Staff believes that both retention of the two unauthorized windows and the removal of the remaining windows application would impair the architectural and historical character of the building. Staff does not recommend approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Daniel Henderson 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. Henderson if he had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make. Mr. Henderson stated that he believed the windows had not been restored properly by the contractor employed by the previous owner. He stated that to his knowledge any new windows installed had to be wood in construction and sized within the existing window opening. Mr. Henderson explained that he was here to get direction and resolution.

Mr. Craig Roberts asked Mr. Henderson to clarify his application and the current state of the windows. Mr. Henderson explained that four windows six-over-six windows had already been replaced with four-over-four windows. It was noted the location of those windows – two southernmost on the West Elevation and the two westernmost on the South Elevation. He stated that the windows on the porch - South Elevation or Façade facing Old Shell Road- would not be altered, however he would like to replace all six-over-six original single hung sash windows to four-over-four double pane wooden windows.

Mr. Blackwell stated six-over-six sashes totaling the number for each fenestrated unit were either still in their respective casings or stored within the dwelling.

Mr. Roberts questioned Mr. Henderson as to why he replaced the original six-over-six windows with four-over-four windows. Mr. Henderson replied that the configuration of panes was never mentioned, however materials had been discussed by the seller.

Mr. Blackwell noted the Certificate of Appropriateness issued from staff in March of 2015 to Restore Mobile for exterior work did not include changing windows. He stated that the Certificate of Appropriateness had not been renewed in addition to being expanded upon and building permits for the full scope of work were not issued. He said that while Mr. Henderson followed up with staff as per all work upon issuance of the 311.

Mr. Henderson then said he did not know to come to contact the Historic Development office until visited by a city inspector. He continued that he feels “let down” and did not receive information on city processes.

Mr. Stone asked if the four windows that were installed without the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness were true divided light. Following up on Mr. Stone’s question, Mr. Roberts asked if the muntins were glued on the glass. Mr. Henderson clarified that the muntins were glued on to the glass, and there are a total of six, four-over-four windows he wanted to retain.

Mr. Blackwell reiterated a brief account of the timeline and actions informing the application up for review. Historic windows were being removed from the structure and non-historic four-over-four windows were installed on rear wing (two on the southernmost portion of the West Elevation along Pine Street and two on Rear or South Elevation). He said that office received a 311 call, at which time John Sledge and Paige Largue made a site visit. Mr. Henderson’s contractor then obtained a permit for plumbing and ceased exterior work. Mr. Henderson came to the MHDC office in good faith. MHDC staff and representatives of Restore Mobile made a site visit during which additional items to be added to the scope of work were discovered. Mr. Blackwell enumerated the following additions to the scope of work: installation of period appropriate door for secondary windows and the infill of a rear porch. Mr. Blackwell recommended that the Board approve those additional items discovered on the site visit. Mr. Blackwell informed the Board that he had made a call to ACE Hardware to see if the four-over-four windows that are on order can be stopped. He said that the answer was no. Mr. Blackwell went on to say that he scheduled a meeting with a regional representative of ACE Hardware during which the Design Review Guidelines would be discussed in terms who obey the Guidelines, respect historic buildings, and serve historic property owners. Additionally, Mr. Blackwell said that he had volunteered himself and the MHDC staff to meet with purchasers of Restore Mobile properties in advance of, during, and after closings to ensure smooth transitions.

Mr. Oswalt asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. Mr. Tilman Brown representing Restore Mobile addressed the Board. Mr. Brown noted that Restore Mobile used \$81,000 in city, state and federal funds to restore property according to the National Secretary of Interior Standards and in accord with the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts. He continued by saying that the property was sold for \$45,000 under the agreement that it would be continued to be restored to those standards. He stated Restore Mobile was not aware of the work conducted. He stated that approving the four-over-four windows undermined the work completed and waste the funds secured. Mr. Brown requested that the Board respectfully deny the application and asked that the original windows be reinstated.

Mr. Wagoner asked if the original six-over-six windows were in situ when the Restore Mobile completed its work and the property was sold. Mr. Brown replied yes. Mr. Henderson stated that by the time the house was in his possession some windows were not in working order.

Mr. Wagoner stated that the Board was not questioning Mr. Henderson good intent, but that the Design Review Guidelines are readily available online. Mr. Wagoner went on to explain when you acquire a house in a historic district it is the owner's responsibility to seek the legal means when performing work on a structure. Mr. Wagoner then stated as a Board they have to legally carry out what the guidelines outline.

Mr. Holmes then asked Mr. Brown if there was an easement on the structure. Mr. Brown replied that Restore Mobile did not pursue an easement on this particular property.

Mr. Holmes then asked if a realtor will tell you if a property is in a historic district. Mr. Wagoner replied that the burden is on the buyer.

Mr. Stone noted that when you modify a permit you would have to acquire another Certificate of Appropriateness. Mr. Henderson said he pulled a permit for interior work and came to the MHDC offices. Ms. Largue stated that she expressed to Mr. Henderson at that time any exterior work required a Certificate of Appropriateness. He elected not renew or expand upon the existing.

Mr. Allen asked if the windows were on the Certificate of Appropriateness for Restore Mobile. Mr. Henderson replied it was not.

Mr. Blackwell stated the name of four local historic window restoration/traditional fabrication concerns had been given to Mr. Henderson.

At this time, the Board discussed scenarios of how to handle the application. Mr. Brown again expressed Restore Mobile's position. Mr. Stone stated the Board would like an inventory of working six-over-six windows on site. Mr. Blackwell noted there were enough sashes to add window units to the original building. Ms. Largue concurred with Mr. Blackwell's statement. It was noted there are four, four-over-four windows installed and two four-over-four windows currently in route to the site.

Ms. Mutert then stated that Mr. Henderson had not pulled a permit for the exterior work and that the previous Certificate of Appropriateness resulted in the building permit pulled by Restore Mobile. She noted that Mr. Henderson should have pulled a new permit once he became owner. Mr. Blackwell continued by saying Staff can amend the application and recommend the infill of the rear porch and installation of period appropriate doors, but cannot recommend approval of windows.

Mr. Holmes suggested that Staff go to site to take inventory of existing six-over-six windows. He said that it might be possible for the applicant to possibly rework the muntin pattern and keep the four installed in the addition off the rear and restore the existing in the original portion of the house. Mr. Henderson and Mr. Brown were concerned this would not look correct on the house. Mr. Holmes again suggested the alteration of the muntin pattern of the four rear windows as solution.

Mr. Henderson expressed his concern for the safety of his house. Mr. Blackwell suggested he mothball the property if he had not done so already. It was noted by some Board members that the property seemed well secured already.

Staff volunteered to coordinate a meeting whereby window craftsmen/women and the applicant might meet on the site and examine the windows. Mr. Stone volunteered to join the meeting.

No one else was present to speak either for or against the application.

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 as amended to address the further review of the windows, approval of period appropriate secondary doors, and the infill of a rear gallery.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Holmes moved that, based upon the facts as approved by the Board, the installation of period appropriate secondary doors and the infill of the rear porch do not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued for those portions of the scope work.

Mr. Holmes moved that the remainder of the application be tabled until the September 7, 2016 meeting of the Architectural Review Board. Staff will meet with applicant to examine the windows and see if the muntin pattern of the four-over-four windows can be altered in manner that is concert with the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.