

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
December 7, 2011 – 3:00 P.M.
Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Bradford Ladd, called the meeting to order at 3:00. Cart Blackwell, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
Members Present: Gertrude Baker, Mary Cousar, Kim Harden, Thomas Karwinski, Bradford Ladd, Harris Oswald, and Craig Roberts.
Members Absent: Carlos Gant, Jim Wagoner, Janetta Whitt-Mitchell, and Barja Wilson.
Staff Members Present: Cart Blackwell.
2. Mr. Oswald moved to approve the minutes of the November 16, 2011 meeting. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.
3. Mr. Oswald 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: Richard Brown**
 - a. Property Address: 20 Macy Place
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/15/11
 - c. Project: Re-deck a porch with treated 1" x 4" tongue-and-groove decking. Repaint per the existing color scheme.
2. **Applicant: Stacy Real Estate**
 - a. Property Address: 56 South Catherine Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/15/11
 - c. Project: Replace rotten wood to match and repaint to match existing color scheme.
3. **Applicant: Kay Cruthirds**
 - a. Property Address: 306 Charles Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/9/11
 - c. Project: Repaint the house per the existing color scheme.
4. **Applicant: Wrico Signs for Roberts Brothers**
 - a. Property Address: 412 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/14/11
 - c. Project: Remove an existing hanging sign. Install a new hanging sign. The wooden sign will measure 42" square.
5. **Applicant: Jaime & Sydney Betbeze**
 - a. Property Address: 1210 Selma Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/14/11
 - c. Project: Install a six foot wooden gate (double) that will extend over the property's eastern drive. Said gate, which will be located behind the front plan of the house, will match the existing fencing enclosing the rear portion of the lot. Stabilize and repair the house's front steps. The antepodia will be re-stuccoed and painted when and where necessary.
6. **Applicant: Cooner Roofing**
 - a. Property Address: 1565 Bruister Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/16/11
 - c. Project: Reroof the house with architectural shingles.

- 7. Applicant: Susan Kaffer**
 - a. Property Address: 1608 Monterey Place
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/16/11
 - c. Project: Revised COA for the installation of a 12' x 6' 4" garden shed (initial midmonth issued on 17 October 2011). The design, materials, and detailing of said shed will remain the same. The location will change. Instead of a 5' setback the setback will be 8' from the property line.
- 8. Applicant: Marcio Simao**
 - a. Property Address: 1107 Savannah Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/17/11
 - c. Project: Replace rotten tongue-and-groove decking and repaint to match the existing color scheme.
- 9. Applicant: Teddy Lee**
 - a. Property Address: 278 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/21/11
 - c. Project: Repaint the building per the existing color scheme. Repair stucco work to match the existing in composition and finish (when and where necessary). Repair or replace the awning to match the existing.
- 10. Applicant: Richard Hackwood**
 - a. Property Address: 1709 Old Shell Road
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/21/11
 - c. Project: Remove existing asphalt. Install concrete paving.
- 11. Applicant: Dandy Dolbear**
 - a. Property Address: 124 North Ann Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/22/11
 - c. Project: Reroof the building. The sheathing will match the existing.
- 12. Applicant: Justin Crabtree for Cabo Coastal Cantina**
 - a. Property Address: 225 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/28/11
 - c. Project: Install a hanging metal sign from the underside of the building's balcony. The 2' x 6' metal sign will feature the name of the establishment.
- 13. Applicant: Sara W. Kindt**
 - a. Property Address: 1122 Caroline Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/28/11
 - c. Project: Install a 5' iron gate that will extend over the side drive. Said gate will be located in line with the façade.
- 14. Applicant: Sara W. Kindt**
 - a. Property Address: 1120 Caroline Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/28/11
 - c. Project: Install a 5' iron gate that will extend over the side drive. Said gate will be located in line with front plane of the main house. Repair and replace (when necessary any deteriorated woodwork). Said repairs will match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repaint the house per the existing color scheme.
- 15. Applicant: Robert Dueitt Construction**
 - a. Property Address: 14 North Reed Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/29/11
 - c. Project: Paint the house per the submitted Benjamin Moore color scheme. The body will be Glacial Till. The trim will be Swiss Coffee. The porch floor will be Shark Skin. The front door will be Caliente.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2011-77-CA: 261 Rickarby Street

- a. Applicant: Kim Harden for the City of Mobile
- b. Project: Section 106 Review - Install replacement security lighting on the building and a backflow preventer on the property.

APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

2. 2011-60-CA: 1407 Brown Street

- a. Applicant: Stephen Teel
- b. Project: New Construction – Construct a single family residence.

APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Discussion

- A. The Board discussed recently completed infill construction located on Michigan Avenue. The property in question opened up a larger discussion involved the enforcement of approved plans. Mr. Blackwell informed the Board that Urban Development and MDHC staff members have now established a system whereby the later will be keep abreast and will sign off on a phased basis larger new construction projects He said that the aforementioned procedure had not been implemented when the subject property was under construction. The Board looked at slides of the approved work, a result of a design review committee, and the finished building. Dissatisfaction was voiced.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2011-00-CA: 261 Rickarby Street
Applicant: Kim Harden for the City of Mobile
Received: 11/21/11
Meeting: 12/7/11

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Out-of-District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning:
Project: Section 106 Review - Install replacement security lighting on the building and a backflow preventer on the property.

BUILDING HISTORY

The u-shaped core of Woodcock School was completed in 1923. The central auditorium was constructed in 1946. In 1949 the building achieved its final form when the easternmost sections of the rear wings were added.

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 has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The City of Mobile acquired this property in 2009. The building is undergoing a phased renovation and adaptive reuse. This is a federally funded project. Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) requires that federal funded programs take into account the effects their undertakings have on historic properties. “Historic” properties are not only properties listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NR), but also properties that are eligible for listing. “Undertakings” include both new construction and rehabilitation. The City proposes the installation of replacement security lighting on the main building and the installation of a backflow preventer on the property.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Rehabilitation and the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.”
 - 2. “Lighting can be an important element in the historic districts. Therefore, where lighting impact the exterior appearance of a building or the district in which the building is located, it shall be reviewed for appropriateness as any other element.”

- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
1. Install new and replacement security lighting on the main building.
 2. Install a backflow preventer on the property.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the installation of new security lighting on the main building and the installation of a backflow preventer on the property.

The proposed lighting would largely be restricted to the side and rear elevations. The lights will not inflict glare onto either the right of way or surrounding historic landscape. Positioned unobtrusively about the soffits and eaves, the lighting would not impair the architectural, historical, or structural integrity of the building.

The backflow preventer would be located at an approved setback from Rickarby Street, between the façade and inner edge of the sidewalk. Said device would facilitate the complex's interior sprinkler system. Staff encourages the relocation of the proposed backflow preventer to a location closer to the bollards lining the property's side entrance. If the device cannot be relocated, Staff recommends the use of landscaping as a means of obscuring the feature.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2), Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the building. Staff recommends approval of lighting portion as proposed and encourages the relocation of the proposed backflow preventer. If the latter cannot be relocated, Staff recommends approval of that portion of the application on that condition that it be surrounded with appropriate plantings and mulch.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Kim Harden was present to discuss the application

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the City's representative. He asked Ms. Harden if she had any comments to add, questions to ask, or clarification to make with regard to the Staff Report. Ms. Harden addressed both the lighting and backflow preventer components of the two part application. She explained to the Board that the number of new lights had been reduced from thirty-four to ten on account of the high costs of the bids received. In reference to the back flow preventer, Ms. Harden told that she, Mr. Bemis, and Cindy Klotz, project architect from TAG, had visited the site in effort to investigate alternate locations for said device. She said that she was open to suggestions, but the backflow preventer had to be visible from and perpendicular to the street. Sighting and position are then fixed to large extent.

Ms. Baker asked Ms. Harden what a backflow preventer looked like. Ms. Harden clarified Ms. Baker's query.

Mr. Ladd suggested moving the backflow preventer closer to the building. Ms. Harden said that might be a possibility because of an existing foundation planting area that fronts the building. She told the Board that the bed could likely be expanded to accommodate the backflow preventer. Ms. Harden added that the location would still have to be approved by fire/safety officials.

Mr. Karwinski asked about the color of the proposed backflow preventer. Ms. Harden explained that ordinarily installations of this type are painted noticeable colors. She said that she was open to suggestions as to color. Mr. Karwinski recommended a non-obtrusive color.

Ms. Baker told the Board of another historic school building in the City whose integrity had been altered by a backflow preventer.

Mr. Karwinski suggested that the City hire an artist to design the backflow preventer.

Ms. Cousar asked Ms. Harden as to the use of the building. Ms. Harden explained that the City owns building and that the property is currently used as a day center for senior and handicapped citizens.

Mr. Karwinski asked Staff why the application was appearing before the Board when it is not located within a historic district that falls under Review Board jurisdiction. Mr. Blackwell reiterated the Staff Report. Ms. Harden further articulated the Staff Report and Mr. Blackwell's response. She told the Board that application was appearing before the Board at the request of the Alabama Historical Commission.

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

In accord with proper recusal practice, Ms. Harden exited the room.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Oswalt moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, amending facts to note the change in the number of lights.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Oswalt moved that, based upon the facts as amended 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.

Ms. Baker and Mr. Roberts voted in opposition.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 12/7/12

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2011-00-CA: 1407 Brown Street
Applicant: Stephen Teel
Received: 11/21/11
Meeting: 12/7/11

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: New Construction – Construct a single family residence.

BUILDING HISTORY

This section of Brown Street is not depicted on any Sanborn Maps dating prior to 1955. The 1955 Sanborn Map shows a vacant lot.

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 7, 2011. At that time, the applicant’s representative withdrew a proposal calling for the construction of a single family residence. The application returns to the Board in revised form. The revisions that take into account the earlier Staff recommendations.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for New Residential Construction in Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 1. With regard to placement and orientation, “placement has two components: setback, the distance between the street and a building; and spacing, the distance between its property lines and adjacent structures. New construction should be placed on the lot so that setback and spacing approximate those of nearby historic buildings. New buildings should not be placed too far forward or behind the traditional “facade line”, a visual line created by the fronts of buildings along a street. An inappropriate setback disrupts the facade line and diminishes the visual character of the streetscape. Current setback requirements of the City of Mobile Zoning Ordinance may not allow the building to be placed as close to the street as the majority of existing buildings. If the traditional facade line or “average” setback is considerably less than allowed under the Zoning Ordinance, the Review Boards will support an application for a Variance from the Board of Adjustment to allow for new construction closer to the street and more in character with the surrounding historic buildings.”
 2. With regard to massing and scale “MASS: Building mass is established by the arrangement and proportion of its basic geometric components - the main building, wings and porches, the roof and the foundation. Similarity of massing helps create a rhythm

along a street, which is one of the appealing aspects of historic districts. Therefore, new construction should reference the massing of forms of nearby historic buildings.

FOUNDATIONS: The foundation, the platform upon which a building rests, is a massing component of a building. Since diminished foundation proportions have a negative effect on massing and visual character, new buildings should have foundations similar in height to those of nearby historic buildings. In most historic residential areas, buildings are usually elevated above a crawl space on a pier foundation. Pier foundations are encouraged for new residential construction. When raised slab foundations are constructed, it is important that the height of the foundation relate to that of nearby historic buildings. For this reason, slab-on-grade foundations are not allowed for single family residences. For multi-family, where slab-on-grade is most practical, other design elements such as water tables and exaggerated bases can be effective in creating the visual appearance of a raised foundation.

MAIN BODY AND WINGS: Although roofs and foundations reinforce massing, the main body and wings are the most significant components. A building's form or shape can be simple (a box) or complex (a combination of many boxes or projections and indentations). The main body of a building may be one or two stories. Secondary elements, usually porches or wings extend from the main building. These elements create the massing of a building. Interior floor and ceiling heights are reflected on the exterior of a building and should be compatible with nearby historic buildings.

ROOFS: A building's roof contributes significantly to its massing and to the character of the surrounding area. New construction may consider, where appropriate, roof shapes, pitches and complexity similar to or compatible with those of adjacent historic buildings. Additionally roof designs of new residential buildings may incorporate eave overhang and trim details such as exposed rafters, soffits, cornice, fascia, frieze board, moulding, etc. as those of nearby buildings.

SCALE: The size of a building is determined by its dimensions - height, width, and depth - which also dictate the building's square footage. **SCALE** refers to a building's size in relationship to other buildings - large, medium, and small. Buildings which are similar in massing may be very different in scale. To preserve the continuity of a historic district, new construction should be in scale with nearby historic buildings.

3. With regard to façade elements "Façade elements such as porches, entrances, and windows make up the "face" or facade of a building. New construction should reflect the use of facade elements of nearby historic buildings. The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture. In order to coexist in harmony with adjacent structures in the historic districts, porches are strongly encouraged. Porches often create a visual cadence along the street. Designs for new porches should also reference historic porch location, proportion, rhythm, roof form, supports, steps, rails and ornamentation. Porches of new buildings should also be similar in height and width to porches of nearby historic buildings. Proper care should be taken in the detailing of new porches. Scale, proportion and character of elements such as porch columns, corner brackets, railings, pickets, etc. should be compatible with adjacent historic structures. Wood or a suitable substitute material should be used. In addition, elements such as balconies, cupolas, chimneys, dormers, and other elements can help integrate a new structure with the neighborhood when used at the proper scale.

Some architectural styles, such as those dating from the Victorian period, featured decorative elements in gables like barge boards and louvered vents. Later styles such as bungalows used decorative cornice brackets or show rafters as design elements. Depending on the character and style of new construction and its relation to surrounding historic structures, similar gable elements should be used. The number and proportion of openings - windows and entrances - within the facade of a building creates a solid-to-void ratio (wall-to-opening). New buildings should use windows and entrances that approximate the placement and solid-to-void ratio of nearby historic buildings. In addition, designs for new construction should incorporate the traditional use of window casements and door surrounds. Where a side elevation is clearly visible from the street, proportion and placement of their elements will have an impact upon the visual character of the neighborhood and must be addressed in the design.”

4. With regard to materials and ornamentation, “The goal of new construction should be to blend into the historic district but to avoid creating a false sense of history by merely copying historic examples. The choice of materials and ornamentation for new construction is a good way for a new building to exert its own identity. By using historic examples as a point of departure, it is possible for new construction to use new materials and ornamentation and still fit into the historic district. Historic buildings feature the use of a variety of materials for roofs, foundations, wall cladding and architectural details. In new buildings, exterior materials – both traditional and modern - should closely resemble surrounding historic examples. Buildings in Mobile’s historic districts vary in age and architectural styles, dictating the materials to be used for new construction. Traditional building materials which are not present on nearby historic buildings or buildings in the area that contains only Victorian-era frame houses, a brick ranch-style house would be conspicuous and disrupt the area’s visual continuity. Modern materials which have the same textural qualities and character as materials of nearby historic buildings may be acceptable. The degree of ornamentation used in new construction should be compatible with the degree of ornamentation found upon nearby historic buildings. Although new buildings should use decorative trim, window casings, and other building materials similar to nearby historic buildings, the degree of ornamentation should not exceed that characteristic of the area. Profile and dimensions of new material should be consistent with examples in the district.”
5. “Modern paving materials are acceptable in the historic districts. However, it is important that the design, location and materials be compatible with the property.”
6. “The appearance of parking areas should be minimized through good site planning and design. New materials such as grasscrete, which provides solid parking while still allowing grass to grow giving the appearance of a continuance of a front lawn, may be a feasible alternative.”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):

1. New Construction – Construct a single story brick-veneered residence.
 - a. The house will measure 32’ 10” in width and 60’ 1” in depth.
 - b. The house will be surmounted by a street facing, north-south oriented gable roof.
 - c. The roof will be sheathed with asphalt shingles.
 - d. The house will feature three-over-one wooden windows. The windows will be surmounted by flat or jack arches.
 - e. A hipped roof porch will be centered on the North or Façade Elevation.

- f. The porch will be set back 20' and 23' 10" from the right of way (On account of a curve on the southern side of Brown Street, the house will be set at a slight angle to the street)
- g. The three bay porch's foundation will feature a water table and concrete paving.
- h. Four square section wooden posts featuring necking and bases will support the porch's hipped roof. A wooden railing will extend between the posts. A matching railing will be located to either side of the front porch's north-facing front steps. .
- i. The three bay façade will feature a glazed and paneled wooden door with flanking three-over-one windows. A pair of six light windows will be centered above the front porch within the apex of the gable roof.
- j. The East (Side) Elevation will feature three paired three-over-one windows, a glazed door, and transom window. A flight of brick steps with a railing matching that employed on the front porch will access a stoop located off the aforementioned door.
- k. The South or Rear Elevation will feature a southeast corner porch. The porch will feature a single wooden posts and enclosing railings. Said railings will match those employed on the Façade and East Elevations.
- l. A glazed door will access the porch. Two three-over-one windows and a square-shaped single light window will be located to the west of the Rear Elevation's porch.
- m. The West Elevation will feature two three-over-one windows.
- n. The interior will have ceiling heights of 10'.
- o. A 13' wide drive will extend approximately 45' into the lot. A walk will provide access from the drive to the front porch and a second walk will provide access to the East (Side) stoop.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of a single family residence on a vacant lot. The application first appeared before the Board on September 7, 2011. The applicant's representative withdrew the application. This revised submission takes into account recommendations outlined in the earlier Staff Report.

Design review of new residential construction in Mobile's historic districts takes into account the following: placement and orientation; mass; scale; and façade elements.

Building placement and orientation should take into consideration setback and orientation. Setback is the distance from the front plane of a building to the street. The Guidelines for New Residential Construction in Mobile's Historic Districts state that setbacks should approximate those of nearby historic structures so not to disrupt the "façade line" that characterizes traditional streetscapes. Similarly the spacing and/or orientation of new construction, that is the distance between buildings, should be comparable to spacing of nearby historic buildings. In response to the September 7, 2011 Staff Report, this revised submission moves the house northward or toward the street. The forward placement of the house is commiserate with traditional setback lines that typify Brown Street, a street whose houses rarely exceed a twenty foot setback. Additionally, a drive to the side has been proposed instead of the parking pad that was initially submitted. By placing a drive to the side of the house, the rhythm of the streetscape and the visibility of the façade will be maintained.

Building mass concerns the arrangement and proportion of the parts that comprise a building. The Design Review Guidelines for New Construction in Mobile's Historic District state that building masses should be comparable to those of nearby historic buildings. Elevated atop a raised slab foundation, fronted by a centrally located porch, and surmounted by a forwarding facing gable, the proposed building takes its cue from traditional residential massing and distribution of components. Staff recommends the use of a watertable to break the massing an intimate the tripartite (foundation-wall-roof) layering that typifies traditional Gulf Coast residential construction.

Scale involves the comparison of a building's height, width, and length to those of other buildings. The Design Review Guidelines for New Construction in Mobile's Historic Districts state new construction should be commiserate with the scale of nearby historic structures. The proposed residence's scale is in keeping with other single story houses in the vicinity.

A façade is a building's principle elevation. Traditionally most Mobile residences featured some sort of porch umbrage. Fronted by a hipped roof, single story porch, the proposed façade is symmetrical in composition and simple in detail.

The Design Review Guidelines for New Construction in Mobile's Historic Districts state that materials should blend with the existing built landscape. The initial proposal called for a brick façade and rear elevation and wooden side elevations. Dual wall facings are not characteristic of Mobile's historic residential fabric. The revised application calls for brick faced walls on all four elevations.

CLARIFICATIONS & REQUESTS

1. Provide material samples (brick).
2. What is the proposed color scheme? Provide color samples of exterior surfaces that will be painted.
3. Has Urban Forestry been contacted with regard to the removal of any trees?

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-6), Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the building. Staff recommends approval of this application pending the answer of the aforementioned clarifications and the use of the recommendation regarding the use of a continuous watertable.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Ken Vincens was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Blackwell addressed the Board. He explained to the Board that he had contacted Urban Forestry with regard to the removal of any trees located on the property. He said that the applicant would need to contact said office, but they did not foresee any obstacles regarding the removal of any trees.

Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant's representative. He asked Mr. Vincens if he had any comments to make, questions to ask, or clarifications to make with regard to the Staff Report. Mr. Vincens answered no. He said that the Staff Report addressed the applicant's submission. Mr. Vincens distributed to the Board two sheets of brick samples for their review.

Ms. Cousar asked Mr. Vincens if the applicant was amendable to using the watertable recommended by Staff. Mr. Vincens answered yes.

Mr. Ladd asked Vincens asked which brick selection the application wanted to use. Mr. Vincens said that the applicant preferred the darker colored brick, but he was amenable to either the darker or the lighter samples.

Mr. Roberts asked Mr. Vincens if the applicant intended to live in the house upon its completion. Mr. Vincens explained to the Board that the applicant plans on selling the house.

Mr. Ladd asked his fellow Board members if they had any further comments to make or questions to ask.

Mr. Karwinski addressed the applicant's representative and his fellow Board members. He said that he lives in the area. Reminding the Board of the application's last appearance before them, Mr. Karwinski stated that a survey was needed to accurately locate existing site features and a better site plan was needed to show proposed landscaping. This was requested at the first meeting on this application has not been furnished with the re-submittal.

Mr. Vincens explained the applicant's intentions with regard to an existing Oak tree. He said that he hopes to retain it if at possible.

Mr. Karwinski said he wanted to bring up several further issues regarding the submitted site plan. He pointed out the presence of a power pole located on the eastern portion of the lot. Mr. Karwinski said that the proposed drive would have to be shifted on account of the power pole. He also pointed that the submitted drawings had the drive located on the lot line. Mr. Karwinski said that he would like to see a landscape buffer between the drive and the adjoining lot. He recommended narrowing the drive from eleven to nine feet to accommodate a landscape buffer. Mr. Vincens stated the neighboring property's fence extended several feet into the applicant's lot. He said that drive could be narrowed to accommodate a buffer area.

Mr. Karwinski said he would like to suggest that the side entry be reworked a site plan that was more worked out than that which was submitted.

Mr. Karwinski pointed out that the site plan calls for the front walk to extend from the proposed drive not from the street. He stated that the latter approach was more pedestrian friendly and historically appropriate. Mr. Vincens said the approach could be reconfigured.

Mr. Karwinski raised concern as to the detailing of the brackets.

Mr. Karwinski said he would like to see the side entry reworked. Mr. Vincens said that applicant might be amendable to minor changes, but not a drastic redesign. Mr. Karwinski said that his suggestions would make the house more saleable.

Mr. Ladd told Mr. Vincens that Mr. Karwinski's comments were only suggestions. Ms. Baker agreed. She reminded her fellow Board members of the alterations the applicant had already made. Ms. Baker said that a uniform material had been employed on the house, the parking pad eliminated, a drive proposed, and the siting adjusted so to meet both the earlier Staff Report and Board discussion. Ms. Baker said that she was not in favor of making additional requests. Ms. Harden said that while she agreed with Ms. Baker this was the first time the revised application had appeared before the Board. Ms. Cousar concurred with Ms. Baker. She reminded the Board that their task is to determine whether an application impairs a building and/or a district. Mr. Ladd and Ms. Cousar reiterated to Mr. Vincens that Mr. Karwinski was only making suggestions. Mr. Karwinski asked his fellow Board members if they wanted him to abstain from making suggestions. Ms. Baker answered no, but she recommended that the manner and tone in which suggestions are made could be improved. Mr. Roberts said that he understands and agrees with offering further design suggestions to the applicant, as Mr. Karwinski has been offering, to make it a better design and at the same time understands Ms. Baker's preference to adjust the points of the staff reports. Mr. Roberts said that the applicants are very fortunate to be offered professional suggestions

by some architect members of the Board. Ms. Baker said that all recommendations and actions should be grounded in the Guidelines. She told Mr. Karwinski that her remarks should not be taken as personal. Ms. Cousar said the same.

Mr. Karwinski, at this point, asked Staff to remove all his comments and suggestions from the record and let other Board members address the issues of this application.

FINDING OF FACT

Ms. Harden moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, amending facts to note that the front walk will extend from the sidewalk to the street and that the applicant can use either brick sample.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved. The motion received a second and was approved by the majority. The chair failed to call for a vote of those who objected to the finding of facts.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Oswalt moved that, based upon the facts as amended 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.

Mr. Karwinski voted in opposition.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 12/7/12

After the Board's vote on the application, Mr. Karwinski offered a free design consultation with the applicant to discuss possible improvements which Mr. Karwinski had sketched out. Mr. Karwinski suggested that Mr. Vincens remain since the agenda was very short as the discussion can take place immediately afterwards and with other Board members present. Mr. Vincens said that he was not able to stay but would call Mr. Karwinski to make an appointment to review the suggestions.