

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
December 20, 2017 – 3:00 P.M.
Multi-Purpose Room, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Harris Oswalt, called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. Cart Blackwell, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
Members Present: Harris Oswalt, Robert Brown, Jim Wagoner, Catarina Echols, Carolyn Hasser, Steve Stone, and Kim Harden.
Members Absent: Nick Holmes III, Craig Roberts, Robert Allen, David Barr and John Ruzic.
Staff Members Present: Cartledge Blackwell, Bridget Daniel, and Paige Largue.
2. Mr. Brown moved to approve the minutes from December 6, 2017. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.
3. Mr. Stone moved to approve the Midmonths. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED

1. **Applicant: Robert Maurin of Maurin Architecture**
 - a. Property Address: 615 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/20/2017
 - c. Project: Install two wooden doors.
2. **Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley of DBK, Inc.**
 - a. Property Address: 200 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/27/2017
 - c. Project: Install 5'0" guardrail and gate on East elevation. Install ADA chair lifts near existing steps that lead to balcony, heighten railing to 4'0" at this location, and extend platforms. Install new paneled door on East elevation instead of double door.
3. **Applicant: South Alabama Property Services on behalf of Linda Owen**
 - a. Property Address: 154 Houston Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/28/2017
 - c. Project: Paint house to match existing. Reroof to match existing with architectural shingles. Replace wood siding to match in dimension, profile and material.
4. **Applicant: Mary Kendall Butler**
 - a. Property Address: 7 N. Conception Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/30/2017
 - c. Project: Allow one (1) valance awning in black with white lettering "Bell a Bridesmaids" no more than 8" tall. Awning will be 1'10" x 23'0" on East elevation and 1'10" x 9'0" on South elevation.
5. **Applicant: Kristen McElhaney**
 - a. Property Address: 15 Macy Place
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/30/2017
 - c. Project: Install framed wood lattice and paint to match existing.
6. **Applicant: Lewis Golden of Hamilton and Co.**
 - a. Property Address: 1751 Old Shell Road
 - b. Date of Approval: 12/04/2017
 - c. Project: Replace 3 doors on a non-contributing building. Doors will be paneled with glass and painted.

7. **Applicant: KSM, Inc.**
 - a. Property Address: 653 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 12/05/2017
 - c. Project: Replace existing wooden fence to match existing.
8. **Applicant: Colonial Dames**
 - a. Property Address: 104 Theatre Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 12/05/2017
 - c. Project: Repair stucco and gallery on rear to match existing.
9. **Applicant: Elias Stevens**
 - a. Property Address: 107 Parker Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 12/06/2017
 - c. Project: Construct garage per MHDC stock design. Garage will be 14' x 20' and located in rear of lot meeting setback requirements. Garage will be clad in hardiboard siding with asphalt shingle roof.
10. **Applicant: Jeff DeQuattro**
 - a. Property Address: 1260 Texas Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 12/08/2017
 - c. Project: Relocate existing gate on existing fence further South on West elevation.
11. **Applicant: Bragan Jackson**
 - a. Property Address: 104 Hannon Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 12/11/2017
 - c. Project: Re-Roof with Architectural Shingles Charcoal Color to match existing.
12. **Applicant: Jason Burse**
 - a. Property Address: 1059 Augusta Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 12/11/2017
 - c. Project: Add an additional window to a secondary (a side) east elevation. The window will be treated to match existing.
13. **Applicant: Centre for the Living Arts**
 - a. Property Address: 301 Conti Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 12/11/2017
 - c. Project: Install one (1) 22'7" x 12'8" temporary banner sign according for nine (9) months. Install one (1) 25'5" x 12'8" temporary banner sign according for nine (9) months. Variance has been acquired.

A. APPLICATIONS

1. **2017-61-CA: 207 Lanier Avenue**
 - a. Applicant: Lea D. Verneuille of Walcott Adams Verneuille Architects on behalf of Mr. & Mrs. Angus Cooper, III
 - b. Project: Alteration of later additions and Construct of Additions – Alter a later porch; infill a later porch; Construct two three small rear additions; and conduct site improvements.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
2. **2017-62-CA: 200 Lanier Avenue**
 - a. Applicant: Mr. & Mrs. William M. Moore
 - b. Project: Construct a rear addition.

APPROVED IN CONCEPT. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Year in Review
2. Staffing

Mr. Blackwell stated it had been an honor to serve the Board for nine years, as he is leaving the city to take another position with a private organization. Mr. Blackwell informed the Board the Mobile County Personnel Board would be searching to fill the position of Deputy Director, however it may take until late Spring to find a replacement. The Chair on behalf of the Board wished Mr. Blackwell the best and thanked him for his guidance over the years.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2017-61-CA: 207 Lanier Avenue
Applicant: Lea D. Verneuille of Walcott Adams Verneuille Architects on behalf of Mr. & Mrs. Angus Cooper, III
Received: 12/4/17
Meeting: 12/20/17

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Ashland Place
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Alteration of later additions and Construction of Additions – Alter a later porch; infill a later porch; Construct two three small rear additions; and conduct site improvements.

BUILDING HISTORY

This house dates from 1912. The residence is one of three Spanish Colonial Revival dwellings in Ashland Place. All three were designed by Mobile architect C. L. Hutchisson.

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 September 1, 2010. At that time, the Board approved the construction of a rear addition onto a rear addition. The application up for reviews calls for alterations impacting later additions, construction of new additions, and site improvements
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Design an addition so that the overall characteristics of the site are retained.”
 - 2. “Design an addition to be compatible with the color, material, and character of the property, neighborhood, and environment.”
 - 3. “Design the building components (roof, foundations, doors, and windows) of the addition to be compatible with the historic architecture.”
 - 4. “Differentiate an addition from a historic structure using changes in material, color, and/or wall plan.”
 - 5. “Place an addition so that it is subordinate to historic residential structure.”

6. “Design an addition to be compatible with the historic residential structure.”
7. “Design an addition to be compatible in massing and scale with the original historic structure.”
8. “Use exterior materials and finishes that are comparable to those of the original historic residential structure in profile, dimension, and material. Modern materials will be evaluated for appropriateness or compatibility with the original structure on an individual basis.”
9. “Design a roof of an addition to be compatible with the existing historic building.”
10. “Design a new porch to be compatible with the existing historic building.”
11. “Use details that are similar in character to those on the historic structure.”
12. “Maintain the relationship of solids to voids (windows and doors) in an exterior wall as is established by the historic building.”
13. “Design doors and doorways to an addition to be compatible with the exiting historic building.”
14. “Deign a fence to be compatible with the architectural style of the house and the existing fences in the neighborhood.”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):

1. Alter a later porch situated between the original dwelling and a later addition on the South Elevation.
 - a. Infill a latter porch by advancing the plane of fenestration.
 - b. A recess will be retained providing subtle transition between old in new in terms of fenestration (as well as other respects).
 - c. Either sensitively remove and reemploy the existing fenestration or employ an expanse of casement windows.
 - d. The wall plane (which the fenestration) will be set will be stucco-faced to match the existing stucco.
 - e. Remove a small section of hardscaping in advance of the porch.
2. Infill a later porch on the South Elevation.
 - a. The infill will be situated behind the porch’s columns.
 - b. The infill will take the form of multi-pane steel windows.
 - c. A new stucco wall system will secure the fenestrated bays. Said wall expanses will be situated behind the porch columns. The finish of said wall system will match the existing.
 - d. The side (façade facing) or terminal bay of the porch (which faces East) will feature French doors with flanking lights and transom.
3. Construct three small rear additions.
 - a. Construct an expansion of the preceding porch and an enclosed space affiliated with it.
 - i. The proposed additions will maintain the elevation and feature the foundation treatment of abutting areas.
 - ii. Cascading steps with terminal antipodia (cheeks) will bracket steps accessing the open portion of the addition.
 - iii. The steps and porch paving will match the materials of the same construction in abutting locations.
 - iv. Stucco-faced piers will anchor the open portion of the addition.
 - v. The aforementioned piers will transition into parapet-like terminations with discrete metal flashings/caps.
 - vi. Truncated hipped roofs and awnings sheathed in clay roofing tiles matching those found on the body of the house will surmount and/or project from the porch portion of the addition.
 - vii. Fixed and operable steel casement-like fenestration will comprise the porch’s fenestration.

- viii. A bank of steel windows will comprise the enclosed portion of the addition's West Elevation.
 - ix. A nine-over-one or six-over-one wooden window will comprise the addition's South Elevation.
 - x. The enclosed portion of the addition will feature stuccoed walls and roofing treatments (forms and materials) matching those employed on locations abutting thereto.
- b. Construct two telescoping umbrages off of the former garage's South Elevation.
 - i. A porch and a pergola will comprise the umbrages.
 - ii. Transoms will be constructed above the existing doors informing the subject elevation. Said transoms and existing doors open onto the porch p the umbrage closest to the old garage.
 - iii. An outdoor fireplace and chimney will engage to and project from an existing chimney stack serving the interior.
 - iv. The aforementioned chimney stack will match a historic chimney stack in material, surface treatment, and upper detail.
 - v. Two Columns atop pedestals will inform the porch.
 - vi. The heights of the aforementioned pedestals will align to height of the elevation of foundation of the body of the house and feature a treatment informed by the same.
 - vii. The aforementioned columns will match those found on the body of the house.
 - viii. A hipped roof sheathed with clay tiles will advance from the hipped roof surmounting the old garage.
 - ix. A pergola will advance from the aforementioned porch.
 - x. Two columns atop pedestals will inform the pergola.
 - xi. The open roof structure will feature bracketed members.
 - c. Construct a small addition within the North Elevation's service court.
 - i. The small addition will occupy the West half of the service court.
 - ii. The addition will feature walls faced with stucco of the composition and finish of that informing the body of the house.
 - iii. A steel casement-like fenestration sequence comprised of a single door, sidelights, and transom will inform the addition's North Elevation.
 - iv. A truncated hipped roof sheathed with clay tiles will surmount the addition.
 - v. The aforementioned roof will negotiate the abutting hipped and truncated hipped roof structures.
- 4. Conduct site improvements.
 - a. Install/construct a below grade pool.
 - b. Construct inner lot fencing.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application calls for alterations to and additions to later rear additions informing the rear portion of a contributing residence.

Most of the proposed scope of work would impact the South (a side) Elevation. In accord with the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts, neither of the alterations to or the construction of additions would impair the overall site conditions (See B-1.).

A small inset porch located at the juncture of the original house and rear wing would be retained, but the plane of the first-story wall informing it would be advanced. There is no specific guideline for changes to recent construction for the porch was constructed in 2008. Though not an original feature, the subtle

transition between the old and the new would be retained via existing changes in wall plane, porch height, and roof structure so addition would still “read” as a sensitive reflection of and response to the original fabric. Said would be differentiated from, yet compatible with the existing fabric, be it historic or more recent (See B-4.). Two alternatives for fenestration are proposed. Either the existing fenestration would be sensitively removed and reinstated or a bank of casement windows would be employed in the new wall plane. Both design solution employs building components and associated wall facings that would be compatible with the historic architecture informing the property (See B-3.).

To the west (or further into the lot) there exists a five bay porch that was constructed contemporaneously with the small inset porch which is addressed in the preceding paragraph. The application calls for the infill of the porch. Said infill would take the form steel casement like installations found on traditional conservatories and sunporches. As with the proposed changes to the small inset porch, there is no specific guideline addressing changes to recent additions to historic buildings in specific. The infill is so design as to preserve the look and feel of a gallery. The stucco-faced walls which will secure the full bay fenestrated units will be recessed thereby allowing the porch columns to remain in the round. The stucco work will match the exiting. The placement of the fenestration, type of fenestration (for the design goal of sunporch), and wall surfacing are compatible with the historic architecture and character of the house, site, and larger environment (See B-2.).

A new addition would engage with and extend from the porch discussed in the preceding paragraph. By virtue of its situation on the lot, relation to the house (historic and later), and design the addition is subordinate to the contributing fabric (See B-5.). The proposed addition features both enclosed and open spaces. A corner entrance porch would comprise the latter. Said portion of the addition would abut the South Elevation’s longer porch. The enclosed portion of the addition would engage the open portion and would be perpendicular to the existing porch. The open portion of the proposed addition is so designed as to afford compatibility with and differentiation from the existing fabric (See B 4 & 6-7.). Material surfaces and bay sequencing reference historic conditions (See B-10.), but the height of the piers which graduate into parapets on the porch portion provide transition to the enclosed portions of the addition. Both foundation elevation and ceiling height would be maintained thereby further retaining relationships of massing and scale. The proposed stucco-faced walls would be match the composition and finish of the existing/historic (See B-8.). Fenestration would match that proposed for the larger porch infill and the main house. With regard to the former, modern materials are reviewed, steel among them, on a case by case basis. Given the porch-like feel, location, and design, the steel conservatory-like windows would be in keeping with the site specific and larger environmental contexts (See B-8.). With regard to the other fenestration reflecting that found on historic house, either a nine-over-one or a twelve-over-one sash window is proposed. Though twelve-over-one windows are the dominant fenestration pattern on the larger house, smaller windows with nine-over-one and six-over-one light configurations are also found so both of the proposed designs are compatible (See B-3). Truncated hip and parapeted roofing forms and clay tiles are proposed. Both the forms and materials of the roof are compatible with the historic fabric, as well as the more recent construction (See B-9.)

Two umbrages are proposed for construction off of the South Elevation of old garage. The umbrage closest to the building would be a porch, while the one that advances from it would be a pergola. In accord with the Design Review Guidelines, the two part sequence of umbrages is so designed as to be compatible with the design of the house (See B-10.). Through a proportional diminution in scale, the proposed telescoping umbrages are differentiated from, yet compatible with the historic fabric (See B 4 & 6-7.). The columnar treatment on both porch and the pergola portions of the addition match those employed on house. While on grade, the proposed porch is tied to the elevation of the house in terms of proportion and scale by way of the pedestals which they rest, in addition to other considerations. The roof of the porch is of the same form, material, and treatment as that found on the old garage (See B-9.). Spanish Colonial Revival residences often featured pergolas and their associated roof structures.

A service court is located off a portion of the North Elevation. Said location is situated behind a garage and is not visible from the public view. A small addition is proposed construction within the service court. In accord with the Design Review Guidelines, the proposed addition is designed so be compatible with the historic character, but also sensitively differentiated from the same (See B 4 & 6-7). Wall treatments (stuccoed to match the finish and composition of that on the historic body of the house), roof forms (truncated hip), and roofing materials (clay tile) respond to the existing. Negotiation in matters practical and aesthetic in terms of the layering of roof heights in the rather complex locations affords for differentiation in terms of parts of the whole and sequencing of construction. Fenestration type would match that proposed elsewhere on the addition.

An inner lot fence featuring a lower level of coping and an upper level of picketing would extend from South (a side) Elevation at a point setback from the front plane of the house. In keeping with the Design Review Guidelines, the two-part fence is so placed and designed as to be compatible with the architectural style of the house and existing fences in the district. Said fence meets height and material requirements.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-14), Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the property or the district. Staff recommends approval in full.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Lea D. Verneuille of Walcott Adams Verneuille Architects, the owner's representative and Mr. & Mrs. Angus Cooper, III, were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt welcomed the applicants and representative and asked if they had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make. Mr. Cooper responded that Mr. Blackwell had explained the application in full and expressed excitement for the project.

Mr. Oswalt then asked if any of his fellow Board members had any questions pertinent to the application which to ask Mr. Verneuille or Mr. and Mrs. Cooper.

Mrs. Harden inquired as to the extension of the new addition in regards to the existing footprint. Mr. Blackwell demonstrated the location of any advanced portions. The confusion was clarified.

No further discussion from the Board ensued.

Mr. Oswalt opened the application to public comment. With no one to speak either for or against the application, Mr. Oswalt closed the period of public comment.

FINDING OF FACT

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

The motion received a second and was approved unanimously.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration: December 21, 2018

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2017-62-CA: 200 Lanier Avenue
Applicant: Mr. & Mrs. William M. Moore
Received: 12/4/17
Meeting: 12/20/17

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Ashland Place
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Construct a rear addition.

BUILDING HISTORY

This classically detailed Arts and Crafts Movement informed “bungalow” dates from 1921. The residence was designed by Mobile architect C. L. Hutchisson. Hutchisson, Sr. designed more houses in the Ashland Place National Register District than any other architect.

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. According to MHDC files, this property has not appeared before the Architectural Review Board.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Design an addition so that the overall characteristics of the site are retained.”
 - 2. “Design an addition to be compatible with the color, material, and character of the property, neighborhood, and environment.”
 - 3. “Design the building components (roof, foundations, doors, and windows) of the addition to be compatible with the historic architecture.”
 - 4. “Differentiate an addition from a historic structure using changes in material, color, and/or wall plan.”
 - 5. “Place an addition so that it is subordinate to historic residential structure.”
 - 6. “Design an addition to be compatible with the historic residential structure.”
 - 7. “Design an addition to be compatible in massing and scale with the original historic structure.”
 - 8. “Use exterior materials and finishes that are comparable to those of the original historic residential structure in profile, dimension, and material. Modern materials will be evaluated for appropriateness or compatibility with the original structure on an individual basis.”
 - 9. “Design a roof of an addition to be compatible with the existing historic building.”
 - 10. “Use details that are similar in character to those on the historic structure.”
 - 11. “Maintain the relationship of solids to voids (windows and doors) in an exterior wall as is established by the historic building.”

12. “Design doors and doorways to an addition to be compatible with the exiting historic building.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
1. Construct a rear addition.
 - a. The addition will be situated at the Northeast corner of the body of the house.
 - b. The addition will measure in 25’ 11” in depth (East to West) and 20 in length (North to South).
 - c. The addition will be two-stories in height.
 - d. The addition will rest atop a foundation so treated as to match the existing.
 - e. The addition’s walls will be faced with either wooden or cementitious board siding sized to match the siding found on the body of the house. If the former, corner will be dovetailed or mitered and if the latter, the siding will feature a corner board.
 - f. The addition will feature twelve light transom windows matching those found on the body of the house. Said windows will either be wood or aluminum clad wood in composition.
 - g. Multi-light windows will be either wood or aluminum clad wood in composition.
 - h. The windows will be casement-like in appearance so as to resemble one of the dominant patterns on the house.
 - i. The first-story windows will feature twelve-lights and the second-story windows will feature ten-lights.
 - j. The eave treatment will match the existing.
 - k. The addition will feature a hipped roof.
 - l. The roof will be sheathed with roofing shingles matching the existing.
 - m. West Elevation (façade oriented).
 - i. To be provided.
 - n. South (a side) Elevation
 - i. To be provided.
 - o. East (rear) Elevation
 - i. The East Elevation will feature on first-story the following the fenestration sequence: a twelve-light single French door and an abutting twelve-light casement window; the body of a chimney; and a single twelve-light casement window.
 - ii. A bracketed wooden awning will extend over/from the aforementioned door and window pairing.
 - iii. The roofing shingles of the awning will match those employed on the house and the body of the addition.
 - iv. A flight of brick steps will access the aforementioned door.
 - p. North (a side) Elevation.
 - i. The North Elevation’s first-story will feature two twelve-light casement windows.
 - ii. The North Elevation’s second-story will feature two ten-light casement windows.
 - q.
 - 2.

CLARIFICATIONS/REQUESTS

1. Provide South and West Elevations (forthcoming).

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of a rear addition to a contributing residence.

By virtue of placement within the block, situation on the property, and relationship to the body of the house, construction of the proposed addition would maintain the overall characteristics of the prominent corner lot so is thus in accord with the design review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts (See B-1.). Said addition would also be compatible with the character of the property, neighborhood, and environment in multiple including but not limited to the following: stylistic, typological, and precedent.

The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts call for both differentiation from and compatibility with the old and the new (See B-3, 6, & 4.). Foundation heights & treatments, window light configurations, siding profiles, and dimensions, roof types, roofing surfaces, and other elements/constructions match those found on the body of the house. Taking the aforementioned into account, compatibility of form, type, finish, and feel accommodated. The height of the proposed addition affords with it differentiation between historic fabric and later construction. While two-story in nature, the placement of the proposed addition to the rear of the dwelling and within the lot would cause for subordination to the original core of the house (See B-5.). The camelback has considerable precedent in Mobile, especially with bungalows like the subject example. In addition to historic examples, Board approvals include 257 Chatham Street, 106 Levert Avenue, and 958 Palmetto Street.

As mentioned previously, the foundation height and treatment would match that found on the body of the historic body of the house. Materials, most prominently the clapboarding on the walls, would match the existing in profile, dimension, and finish (See B-7.). Hardiboard is listed as an option for the walls siding. The Design Review Guidelines allow for the use of modern composite materials on additions and new construction (See B-8.) Window and door designs are compatible to those found on the building (See B-12.). The windows possess a light structure that responds to windows found on the main house. The dominant pattern is one featuring twelve-lights. Other patterns exist as well. In response to the existing light configurations, the proposed light configurations are twelve-light on the first-story and ten-light on the second story. The latter is condition by proportion. The Design Review Guidelines also call for comparable relations of solids-to-voids (See B-11.). Two of four elevations have been provided – North and East. The North (a side/the inner lot) adopts a solid to void relationship that is responsive to the existing. The first-story of the East (rear) Elevation is not out of concert. The second-story of the rear does not feature fenestration. Staff recommends faux windows. Said construction would add rhythmic sequence of solids-to-voids (compliance with The Design Review Guidelines) without sacrificing the interior plan. Multiple elements of detail are drawn from the body of the house (See B-10.). The fields within the casings could be treated in a number of ways. In addition to the correspondences mentioned previously, the proposed windows proposed would feature casings designed to match those found on the body of the house. Other direct responses between the existing and the proposed in terms of detail include the eave treatment, which would match. The roof form and sheathing would match those found on the main house (See B-9.).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-12), Staff does not believe this application would impair the architectural or historical character of the property or surrounding district. Pending provision of provision & review of the South & West Elevations and the employ of faux windows at certain locations, Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. William Moore, owner, were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt welcomed Mr. Moore and asked if he had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make. Mr. Moore responded that Mr. Blackwell had explained the application in full. Mr. Oswalt then asked if any of his fellow Board members had any questions pertinent to the application which to ask Mr. Moore.

Mr. Brown stated the need for more information on the drawings. Mr. Stone agreed with Mr. Brown, and he inquired as to the size of the muntin on the new windows which looked to be a different dimension than the original windows. Mr. Blackwell stated the windows were imitating the existing casement windows. Mr. Moore explained an addition had been constructed in the 1940's and installed sash windows. He further explained the original portion of the house utilized casement windows, and the proposed plan involves installing casement windows on the addition.

Discussion ensued over the window schedule. Mr. Stone explained the discrepancy with employing a sash window mimicking a casement window and why the muntin was an enlarged dimension. Mr. Stone, Mr. Moore, along with the Board, discussed options for the proposed new windows.

Mr. Moore clarified for Ms. Harden the existing house is clad with wood siding.

Mr. Stone asked Mr. Moore to clarify the size of the existing double casement. Mr. Moore responded his belief was the window was 7'0" in width. Ms. Harden asked Mr. Moore if the dimension of the muntin could be larger to give the appearance and proportion of the double casement window. Mr. Stone proposed employing a window with an overall larger width.

Mr. Moore expressed he was amenable to changing the window schedule. Discussion ensued over options as to window configuration and schedule. Mr. Blackwell suggested using blind fenestration where appropriate and iterated the solid-to-ratio void for additions from the Design Review Guidelines. Further discussion took place regarding window placement and the roofline.

Mr. Blackwell suggested the approval of the application in concept and meeting with the Design Review Committee after the New Year on site. He then noted staff will email the Board after the New Year to set up a time and a Design Review Committee would be formed based on availability.

No further discussion from the Board ensued.

Mr. Oswalt opened the application to public comment. With no one to speak either for or against the application, Mr. Oswalt closed the period of public comment.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Stone 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. Stone moved that, based upon the facts as approved by the Board, the application the application be approved in concept with a Design Review Committee to review windows on site and approve a window schedule after the New Year.

The motion received a second and was approved unanimously.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration: December 21, 2018