

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
February 17, 2010 – 3:00 P.M.
Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Jim Wagoner, called the meeting to order at 3:00. Keri Coumanis, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
Members Present: Gertrude Baker, Carlos Gant, Kim Hardin, Bill James, Thomas Karwinski, Bradford Ladd, Andrew Martin, Harris Oswalt, Craig Roberts, and Jim Wagoner,
Members Absent: Carlos Gant, Janetta Whitt-Mitchell, and Barja Wilson.
Staff Members Present: Cart Blackwell, Keri Coumanis, and John Lawler.
2. Mr. Karwinski moved to approve the minutes of the January 20, and February 3, 2010 meetings. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.
3. Mr. Karwinski moved to approve the midmonth COAs granted by Staff. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED

1. **Applicant: Cypress Home Improvement, LLC**
 - a. Property Address: 31 South Monterey Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/26/10
 - c. Project: Repair and replace wood siding to match the existing siding in profile, scale, and dimension.
2. **Applicant: David Cooner Roofing Company**
 - a. Property Address: 61 South Hallet Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/26/10
 - c. Project: Replace roofing shingles to match the existing in color, profile, and dimension. Remove a demolished chimney stack rising from the body of the roof. The chimney stack is not engaged to wall or the principal chimney. It has minimal visibility from the public right of way.
3. **Applicant: Daniel Newsome**
 - a. Property Address: 354 West Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/22/10
 - c. Project: Reroof the house. The shingles will match the existing in profile, dimension, and material.
4. **Applicant: Mike Henderson**
 - a. Property Address: 1365 Brown St.
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/25/10
 - c. Project: Reroof with Timberline charcoal gray.
5. **Applicant: Bay Town Builders for Palmer Hamilton**
 - a. Property Address: 256 South Broad
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/27/10
 - c. Project: Repair and replace wooden siding to match the existing in profile, scale, and dimension. Paint to match the existing.
6. **Applicant: John H. McMillian**
 - a. Property Address: 408 Regina Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/27/10
 - c. Project: Replace roofing shingles. The shingles will match the existing. Repair and replace rotten woodwork to match the existing in profile and dimension.
7. **Applicant: Paul Shestak**
 - a. Property Address: 201 South Warren Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/28/10

- c. Project: Repair damaged brick wall. The work will match the existing in profile, dimension, and material.
- 8. Applicant: Jennifer Sheahan**
 - a. Property Address: 256 Marine Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/28/10
 - c. Project: Paint the house per submitted Mobile BLP color scheme. The Body will Viola. Paint the trim white.
- 9. Applicant: Eric Roberts**
 - a. Property Address: 1555 Springhill Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/29/10
 - c. Project: Improve upon the property per plans approved by the ARB to include: Install a wood privacy fence. The fence will be 8'-0" tall with standard width dog-eared boards. It will run along the south boundary from Kilmarnock to Catherine. Install an open ironwork fence. The fence will be 3'-6" tall and look similar to the submitted photograph. It will run along the north, east and west boundaries per the submitted site plan. There will be an iron gate for vehicles at the entrance to the parking area. Install a small metal post and chain barrier on the right-of-way no taller than 3'-0". Remove the hollow tree at the front of the building. Mr. Roberts will need to receive approval from Right-of Way regarding the small post and chain barrier as well as Urban Forestry regarding the tree removal.
- 10. Applicant: Brew Port LLC**
 - a. Property Address: 225 Dauphin
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/28/10
 - c. Project: Repaint building in Benjamin Moore colors: body-crownsville gray; balcony- night horizon; trim either green tea or oak ridge.
- 11. Applicant: Eddie N. Pace**
 - a. Property Address: 77 South Ann Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 1/28/10
 - c. Project: Enclose existing, rear, second floor porch of non-contributing, circa 1986 home; siding to match existing; new windows to be wooden, fixed, single-paned windows.
- 12. Applicant: Advantage Signs Company**
 - a. Property Address: 1509 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/2/10
 - c. Project: Install new lettering panel for Wavenet as a new tenant on an existing monument sign.
- 13. Applicant: David C. Webb**
 - a. Property Address: 1564 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/5/10
 - c. Project: Install a three foot French Gothic-topped picket fence (per submitted plan). The fence will sit atop the retaining wall and extend across the Dauphin Street-facing front lawn (south lot line). The fence will extend into the lot where it will alternately terminate just before the façade's projecting northeast corner bay window and the west elevations first setback.

C. APPLICATIONS

- 1. 2010-14-CA: 564 Dauphin Street**
 - a. Applicant: Christopher Corey
 - b. Project: After the Fact Approval – Retain vinyl graphic signage.
DENIED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
- 2. 2010-15-CA: 1616 Government Street**
 - a. Applicant: Image Designs Inc. for World Gym

b. Project: Sign Approval – Remove a non-conforming wall sign and install a new sign.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

3. 2010-16-CA: 64 Bradford Avenue

a. Applicant: Paul and Therese Morris

b. Project: Replace the existing 105 siding with lap siding.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

4. 2010-17-CA: 1500 Dauphin Street

a. Applicant: Tilmon Brown for Melanie Bunting

b. Project: Alterations to the rear elevation – Reopen and glaze an enclosed second story back porch.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

5. 2010-18-CA: 104 Levert Avenue

a. Applicant: Lea Verneuille for Corinna K. Luce

b. Project: Construct side and rear additions.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

6. 2010-19-CA: 255 Church Street

a. Applicant: Gator Sign Factory for Anita Nguyen LLC

b. Project: Sign Approval – Reface an existing wall sign and two existing monument signs.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

7. 2010-20-CA: 50 South Franklin Street

a. Applicant: Tilmon Brown for the Mobile Archdiocese; Thomas Karwinski, Architect.

b. Project: Reconstruct the northern portion of a demolished two-tiered rear porch.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

8. 2010-21-CA: 362-364 Michigan Avenue

a. Applicant: Mary Odom for Carlos Barnard Bell

b. Project: New Construction – Construct a single family residence.

HELDOVER. CERIFIED RECORD ATTACHED>

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Guidelines
2. Discussion

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2010-14-CA: 564 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Christopher Corey
Received: 1/28/10
Meeting: 2/17/10

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: After the Fact Approval – Retain vinyl graphic signage mounted on the façade’s window.

BUILDING HISTORY

This building is one unit within a block of circa 1950s single story store fronts.

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 applicant proposes retaining vinyl graphics affixed to the façade’s large plate-glass windows.
- B. The Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and Government Street state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Signs painted directly on windows, walls or hung in windows are permitted. Such signs will be counted toward the maximum size requirement, and are limited to 20% of the window area
 - 2. “The overall design of the signage including mounting framework shall relate to the design of the principal building on the property. Buildings with a recognizable style such as Greek Revival, Italianate, Victorian, Queen Anne, Neo-classic, Craftsman, et. al., should use signage of the same style. This can be done through the use of similar decorative features such as columns or brackets.”
 - 3. “For buildings without a recognizable style, the sign shall adopt the decorative features of the building, utilizing the same materials and colors.”
 - 4. “The total maximum allowable sign area for all signs is one and one half square feet per linear front foot of the principal building, not to exceed 64 square feet.”
 - 5. “The size of the sign shall be determined by measuring the area within each face of a geometric shape enclosing all elements of informational or representational matter including blank masking. Structural supports not bearing information shall not be included in the computation of display area.”
 - 6. “The structural materials of the sign should match the historic materials of the building. Wood, metal, stucco, stone or brick, is allowed. Plastic, vinyl or similar materials are prohibited. Neon, resin to give the appearance of wood, and fabric may be used as appropriate.”

7. "Signs shall be mounted or erected so they do not obscure the architectural features or openings of a building."
8. With regard to multi-tenant buildings, the "owner shall submit an overall sign plan addressing the placement, materials, and design."

C. Scope of Work:

1. Retain vinyl signage mounted to the façade's window.
 - a. The sign measures approximately 6' in height and 5' in length.
 - b. The total linear square footage of the building is 15' 9" inches
 - c. The sign is single-faced.
 - d. The sign does not feature illumination.
 - e. The sign is mounted over the mullion separating two windows so that the vinyl is puckered and wrinkled.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts and Government Street state that signs should be mounted in such a way as to not obscure a building's architectural features. As installed, the sign is poorly mounted and extends across the façade's two plate glass window panels.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff believes the mounting of the sign impairs the architectural and historical character of the district. Staff recommends that the sign be relocated to one of the window panes, not bridging the two.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

No one was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Roberts asked Staff if they recommended moving the sign. He pointed out that the building was a non-contributing structure. A discussion of the sign's location on the façade ensued. Mr. Wagoner said that he believed the entire sign would not fit on one window panel.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application, 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 amended by the Board, the application does impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness not be issued.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DENIED.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2010-15-CA: 1616 Government Street
Applicant: Image Designs Inc. for World Gym
Received: 2/2/10
Meeting: 2/17/10

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Out-of-District – Government Street Signage Corridor
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-3
Project: Sign Approval – Remove a nonconforming wall sign. Install a new sign.

BUILDING HISTORY

This application pertains to a unit within a multi-tenant, non-contributing commercial building adjacent to the Old Dauphin Way Historic District.

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 is a non-contributing building located outside the Old Dauphin Way Historic District, but falls within the ordinance for signage along Government Street. The applicant has appeared before the Board on two previous occasions regarding non-conforming signage. The applicant first appeared before the Board on September 17, 2008 with a request to retain a non-conforming sign. The Board tabled the application, recommending that the applicants take some time to investigate the Sign Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts. The applicant reappeared before the Board on November 19, 2008 with a second non-conforming sign proposal. The Board tabled the application for ninety days. After that time, the applicant was to return to the Board with plans to replace the non-conforming sign. The applicant failed to comply with the Board’s ruling. The applicant reappears before the Board with a proposal calling for the removal of the non-conforming wall sign and the installation of new sign in the same location.
- B. The Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and Government Street state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “The overall design of all signage including the mounting framework shall relate to the design of the principal building on the property. Buildings without a recognizable style such as Greek Revival, Italianate, Victorian, Queen Anne, Neo-classic, Craftsman, et. al., should use signage of the same style. This can be done through the use of similar decorative features such as columns or brackets.”
 - 2. For buildings without a recognizable style, the sign shall adopt the decorative features of the building, utilizing the same materials and colors.”

3. "The total maximum allowable sign area for all signs is one and one half square feet per linear front foot of the principal building, not to exceed 64 square feet. A multi-tenant building is also limited to a maximum of 64 square feet."
 4. "The structural materials of the sign should match the historic materials of the building. Wood, metal, stucco, stone or brick, is allowed. Plastic, vinyl or similar materials are prohibited. Neon, resin to give the appearance of wood, and fabric may be used as appropriate."
 5. "Internally lit signs are prohibited."
 6. "Lighted signs shall use focused, low intensity illumination. Such lighting shall not shine into or create glare at pedestrian or vehicular traffic, nor shall it shine into adjacent areas."
 7. With regard to multi-tenant buildings, the "owner shall submit an overall sign plan addressing the placement, materials, and design."
- C. Scope of Work:
1. Remove the non-conforming wall sign.
 2. Install an aluminum wall sign.
 - a. The sign measures 16' in length and 2' in height.
 - b. The sign features applied surface vinyl lettering.
 - c. Four wall lamps will illuminate the sign.
 - d. The sign's total square footage amounts to 32 square feet.
 - e. The sign will be fastened to the building's fascia.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This is the applicant's third appearance before the Board regarding signage issues. In the two previous proposals, the applicant requested after the fact approval of a non-conforming wall sign. The sign featured a plastic face and internal illumination. The proposed sign meets the size, material, and design standards set by the Sign Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts and Government Street.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or historical character of the surrounding districts. Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

No one was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Wagoner discussed with the Board the history of this application. Mr. Oswalt asked Staff whether the other signs on this multi-tenant building comply with the standards set by the Guidelines. Mr. Blackwell told the Board that an application is forthcoming from one of the other tenants. Mr. James asked Staff if a removal date could be assigned for the existing sign. Ms. Coumanis said a deadline could be set by the ruling if the Board so chose.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Karwinski moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application, 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. Karwinski 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.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 2/17/11

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2010-16-CA: 64 Bradford Avenue
Applicant: Paul and Therese Morris
Received: 1/29/10
Meeting: 2/17/10

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Replace 105 siding with lap siding.

BUILDING HISTORY

This single story wooden house dates from circa 1946.

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 October 30, 2006. The Board denied the applicant’s request to replace to replace 105 siding with lap siding. The applicant returns to the Board with a second request to replace the 105 siding with lap siding. The siding is deteriorated in part and not uniform in installation. The vertical board window aprons are a result of later alterations.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “The exterior of a building helps to define its style, quality, and historic period. The original siding should be retained and repaired. Replacement of exterior finishes, when required, must match the original in profile, dimension, and material.”
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. Remove the existing 105 siding.
 - 2. Replace the existing 105 siding with pine lap siding
 - 3. Lap siding will extend over and under the windows.
 - 4. Continue the currently interrupted fascia board around the house.
 - 5. Finish out the windows lintels around the whole of the house.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This house is non-contributing structure. However, the Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state that a building’s exterior material and finish serve as indicators of its architectural style, craftsmanship, and period. As with many houses constructed during the late 1940s and 1950s, this features 105 siding. The Guideline’s clearly state that the replacement of exterior finishes, when required, must match the original in profile, dimension, and material.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff believes this application impairs the architectural and historical character of the building and the district therefore does not recommend approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Angelo Semifero was present to discuss the application. Mr. Wagoner asked Mr. Semifero if he had comments to add or clarifications to make with regard to the Staff Report. Mr. Semifero said he did not have any corrections to make, but he pointed out the lack of congruity in the siding. Some of the siding aligns, while some does not. He told the Board his objective was to give the house a uniformity of appearance.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Wagoner asked Mr. Semifero if he planned to remove the awnings. Mr. Blackwell informed the Board that approval to remove the awnings was granted on October 30, 2006.

Mr. Roberts asked Mr. Semifero why he wanted to reface the house with traditional lap when more modern materials like Hardiplank were available. He pointed out that this house was a non-contributing property. Mr. Semifero pointed out that while Hardiplank was an option, financially it made little difference.

Mr. James addressed the siding selection from a different angle. He asked Mr. Semifero why he wanted to use a traditional material on a modern house. Mr. Semifero reiterated that he wanted to give the house a uniform appearance since the present siding does not align and is in poor condition. Ms. Harden said that not all the siding was deteriorated. Mr. Semifero agreed, but he said that more issues and disrepair would likely be uncovered once the work began.

Mr. Roberts asked Staff about the gable facings. Ms. Coumanis informed the Board that asbestos shingles sheath the gables. Ms. Harden asked Mr. Semifero if removing and replacing the asbestos shingles with lap siding was also part of the application. Mr. Semifero said no. Mr. Karwinski told the applicant and the Board that while he did not think replacing the siding would impair the building, the subsequent detailing of the windows and the fascia should be subject to Staff approval. Mr. Roberts informed the Board that Staff was bound by the Guidelines to recommend denial, but the condition of the current siding should be taken into account in the Board's ruling.

Mr. Wagoner asked if there was anyone from the audience who would like to speak for or against the application. Bill Smith and Warren Bettis spoke on behalf of the applicant. As owners of neighboring properties, they said any repairs to the house would be beneficial to the street's property values and historical integrity.

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 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.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 2/17/11

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2010-17-CA: 1500 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Tilmon Brown for Melanie Bunting
Received: 2/1/10
Meeting: 2/17/10

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Alterations to the rear elevation – Reopen and glaze the secondary story of an enclosed back porch.

BUILDING HISTORY

This 1909 house features a monumental Southern Colonial Revival portico and Arts and Crafts-informed overhanging eaves.

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 proposal concerns the rear elevation. The applicant proposes removing siding sheathing the rear elevation’s enclosed second story porch. The rear elevation was altered on at least two separate occasions. At a date unknown, plywood siding and nonconforming windows were utilized to enclose the porch. In response to a 2001 request by the MHDC Marking Committee, the plywood and windows were removed and replaced by lap siding. The applicant proposes replacing the siding with three glazed bays defined by piers and top rail-like divider.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture. Historic porches should be maintained and repaired to reflect their period. Particular attention should be paid to the handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions and decorative details.”
 - 2. “The form and shape of the porch and its roof should maintain their historic appearance. The materials should blend with style of the building.”
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. Remove the lap siding sheathing the rear elevation’s enclosed second story porch.
 - 2. Remove an intermediate post that divides the expanse of siding covering the enclosed porch.
 - 3. Install two intermediate posts with trim to match the existing corner posts.
 - 4. Install a top rail that would visually divide and structural support the glazed panels.
 - 5. Infill the reopened porch bays with glazing.

Clarifications

1. Will the infilled porch's east facing bay be reopened and glazed in the same manner?

STAFF ANALYSIS

This porch has been altered on at least two separate occasions. Currently, the rear elevation “reads” as a closed expanse of wall. The proposed removal of the siding, installation of posts, and insertion of glazing, would recapture some of the historical and architectural integrity once afforded by the setback bays of the open porch.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or historical integrity of the building, therefore recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

No one was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Wagoner asked Staff if the application could be approved with the clarification unanswered. Ms. Coumanis and Mr. Blackwell answered yes if the Board thought the application as proposed did not impair the house or the district.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application, 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 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.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 2/17/11

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFEID RECORD

2010-18-CA: 104 Levert Avenue
Applicant: Lea Verneuille for Corinna K. Luce
Received: 2/1/10
Meeting: 2/17/10

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Ashland Place
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Construct additions on the south and east elevations.

BUILDING HISTORY

This house dates from 1948. Constructed of older bricks and once featuring a side porch on the north, the house epitomizes the post World War II popularity of utilizing salvaged materials from downtown in of a design influenced by contemporary styled English cottages.

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 8, 2004. The Board approved alterations to the detached garage. The applicant returns to the Board with a proposal entailing the construction of two additions. One of the proposed additions would be located on the south elevation, while another would be located on the east or rear elevation. The side addition would necessitate the demolition of a projecting bay and later wooden porte-cochere. The rear addition would extend into the backyard from the elevation’s middle bay. Though listed as non-contributing, if the district were resurveyed the house would be listed as a contributing structure.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Rehabilitation state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.”
 - 2. “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize a property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and the environment.”
- C. Scope of Work :
 - 1. Project I – Construct an addition off the South Elevation.
 - a. Demolish a later porte-cochere, projecting side bay, stoop, and steps.
 - b. The foundation will maintain the same level and utilize the same details as the existing.
 - c. The roofing material will match the existing.

- d. West Elevation
 - 1. The west elevation measures 21' 3" in length.
 - 2. The west elevation features three glazed bays defined by pilasters.
 - 3. A rooftop balustrade will surmount the west elevation.
 - e. South Elevation
 - 1. The 33' 7" long south elevation is comprised of three distinct sections.
 - 2. The western portion of the south elevation will feature two glazed bays defined by pilasters.
 - 3. The balustrade crowning the west elevation will also surmount the two glazed bays of this flat roofed section of the addition.
 - 4. The central section of south elevation will feature a tripartite grouping of wooden sash windows.
 - 5. A gable end pierced by a six-over-six wooden sash window will surmount the central section of the south elevation.
 - 6. The brick and wood trim will match the existing.
 - 7. The eastern portion of the south elevation will feature board and batten siding and a six-over-six wooden sash window.
 - 8. A shed roof will surmount the eastern portion of the south elevation.
 - f. East Elevation
 - 1. The east elevation of the south addition will feature a glazed & paneled door and a six-over-six window.
 - 2. Brick steps will access the door.
 - 3. Wood railings will surmount the steps.
 - 4. A gabled accent will surmount the door.
 - 5. Board and batten siding will face the east elevation.
2. Project II – Construct an addition off the East or Rear Elevation of the House.
- a. The addition will feature board and batten siding over a continuous brick foundation.
 - b. The foundation will utilize salvaged bricks.
 - c. The foundation detailing will match the existing detailing.
 - d. A hipped roof with two east facing gables will surmount the addition.
 - e. South Elevation
 - 1. A one bay porch will extend across the rear addition's south elevation.
 - 2. The porch will be paved in bricks laid in herringbone pattern.
 - 3. A flight of brick steps and a wooden railing will access the porch.
 - f. East Elevation
 - 1. A wooden six-over-six window will occupy the recessed southern bay of the east elevation.
 - 2. A paneled and glazed door will access the porch.
 - 3. A projecting gabled bay will feature three glazed windows.
 - g. North Elevation
 - 1. The north elevation will feature two six-over-six wooden windows and one large glazed window.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application calls for a side and a rear addition. The total square footage of the proposed addition is 900 square feet. The existing square footage amounts to 1,940 square feet. The additions are then under the 50% limit established by previous board rulings. The side addition is set back from the street. The rear addition is not visible from the street. According to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation, additions should be differentiated from yet compatible to existing building. The design utilizes materials salvaged from the site and replicates the forms and details of the house, in such a way as

to provide an overall unity of design. The side addition's three south-facing glazed bays provide transition and differentiation from the body of the house. The board and batten siding of the rear addition provides the same effect.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on (B) 1 and B (2), Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or historical character of the district. Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Lea Verneuille and Corinna K. Luce were present to discuss the application. Mr. Wagoner asked Mr. Verneuille and Ms. Luce if they had any comments to add or clarifications to make with regard to the Staff Report. Mr. Verneuille answered no. He added that Staff had been very helpful.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Wagoner asked the Board if they had questions to ask or comments to make with regard to the application. Mr. Karwinski said he had one comment. He asked Mr. Verneuille why he chose to surmount the front portion of the side addition with a balustrade. Mr. Karwinski said the proposed balustrade seemed to elaborate for the house. Mr. Verneuille addressed Mr. Karwinski concern saying that he understood his reasoning. He said that the only ornamentation on the façade was concentrated on the door surround. Ms. Luce added that additional ornament, namely finials, could be found on the porte-cochere. They agreed that while there was no precedent for more elaborate treatment on the house, there existed comparable ornament on houses of the same date and style. Mr. Verneuille said he and Ms. Luce had deliberated on the treatment of that section of the addition. In the end, they chose the proposed railing with its more detailed treatment.

Mr. Wagoner asked if there was anyone from the audience who wanted to speak for or against the application.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Karwinski 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. Karwinski 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.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 2/17/11

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2010-19-CA: 255 Church Street
Applicant: Gator Sign Factory for Anita Nguyen
Received: 2/1/10
Meeting: 2/17/10

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Sign Approval – Reface an existing wall sign and two existing monument signs.

BUILDING HISTORY

This late 1960s motel complex occupies an entire city block.

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. In 1993, the Board of Adjustment granted this property a sign variance of 118.56 square feet. The property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board with a signage related request on June 28, 2004. At that time the Board approved the installation of two monument signs and one wall sign. The total square footage of the signage measured 89.28 square feet. Those signs were later refaced. The current applicants return to the Board with a request to reface the existing signage.
- B. The Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and Government Street state, in pertinent part:
1. “Signs painted directly on windows, walls or hung in windows are permitted. Such signs will be counted toward the maximum size requirement, and are limited to 20% of the window area
 2. “The overall design of the signage including mounting framework shall relate to the design of the principal building on the property. Buildings with a recognizable style such as Greek Revival, Italianate, Victorian, Queen Anne, Neo-classic, Craftsman, et. al., should use signage of the same style. This can be done through the use of similar decorative features such as columns or brackets.”
 3. “For buildings without a recognizable style, the sign shall adopt the decorative features of the building, utilizing the same materials and colors.”
 4. “The total maximum allowable sign area for all signs is one and one half square feet per linear front foot of the principal building, not to exceed 64 square feet.”
 5. “The size of the sign shall be determined by measuring the area within each face of a geometric shape enclosing all elements of informational or representational matter including blank masking. Structural supports not bearing information shall not be included in the computation of display area.”

6. “The structural materials of the sign should match the historic materials of the building. Wood, metal, stucco, stone or brick, is allowed. Plastic, vinyl or similar materials are prohibited. Neon, resin to give the appearance of wood, and fabric may be used as appropriate.”
7. “Signs shall be mounted or erected so they do not obscure the architectural features or openings of a building.”
8. With regard to multi-tenant buildings, the “owner shall submit an overall sign plan addressing the placement, materials, and design.”
9. “Internally lit signs are prohibited.”
10. “Lighted signs shall use focused, low intensity illumination. Such lighting shall not shine into or create glare at pedestrian or vehicular traffic, nor shall it shine into adjacent areas.”

C. Scope of Work:

1. Reface the existing south elevation wall sign with a new aluminum-faced signage.
 - a. The sign measures 4’ 29” in height and 14’ in length.
 - b. The total square footage of the sign is 60 square feet.
 - c. The sign will utilize backlit channel illumination.
 - d. The sign will feature with the name of the establishment and two emblems.
2. Reface the existing sign atop the monument sign platform at the intersection of Joachim and Church Streets with resin-based wood-like sign face
 - a. The sign measure 3’ in height and 4.88’ in length
 - b. The total square footage of the sign is 14.64 square feet.
 - c. The sign will be illuminated by an existing low intensity spotlight
 - d. The sign will feature the name of the establishment.
3. Reface the existing sign atop the monument sign platform at the intersection of Church and Jackson Streets with a resin-based wood-like sign face.
 - a. The sign measures 3’ in height and 4.88’ in length.
 - b. The total square footage of the sign is 14.64 square feet.
 - c. The sign will be illuminated by an existing low intensity spotlight.
 - d. The sign will feature the name of the establishment.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The total square footage of proposed signage is under the maximum amount allowed by a 1993 sign variance. The proposed signage meets the design and the material standards set by the Sign Design Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and Government Street. The refacing of the signage will cause neither structural damage nor obscure architectural detailing.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1) - B (10), Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or historical character of the district. Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. H. Daniels was present to discuss the application. Mr. Wagoner asked Mr. Daniels if he had any comments to add or clarification to make with regard to the Staff Report. Mr. Daniels answered no.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Roberts asked Mr. Daniels if the proposed colors were the same as those illustrated in the Board members’ packets. Mr. Daniels

answered yes. Two colors, Fort Gaines Blue and Church Street Gray, were recommended for the lettering and background. Mr. Wagoner reminded his fellow Board members that the applicant would have to be amenable to altering the color scheme. Mr. Roberts asked Mr. Daniels if he would consider a color recommended by the Architectural Review Board. Mr. Daniels said he was amenable to changing the color scheme of the signs to one suggested by the Board. Ms. Coumanis informed the applicant and the Board that the sign contractor might not be able to match the recommended colors.

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, amending the application to allow the use of Fort Gaines Blue lettering on a Church Street ground if that option was possible.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Roberts 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.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 2/17/11

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF REPORT

2010-20-CA: 50 South Franklin Street
Applicant: Tilmon Brown for the Mobile Archdiocese; Thomas Karwinski, Architect
Received: 2/2/10
Meeting: 2/17/10

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Reconstruct the northern portion of the house's demolished two-tiered rear porch.

BUILDING HISTORY

Completed in 1854, the Elkus House is one of Mobile's grandest surviving Greek Revival side hall houses. The monumental stuccoed door surround, which features huge battered jambs supporting a broad lintel, provides a contrast to the delicacy of the wrought iron balcony.

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 January 20, 2010. The applicant proposed the removal of the brackets from the front elevation's balcony and the installation of a metal stair unit on the rear elevation. The Board approved an altered application entailing the removal of the front elevation's later balcony decking. The applicant's representative returns to the Board with an altered application for the rear elevation. Instead of a metal stair unit, the Archdiocese now proposes reconstructing the northern portion of the demolished two-tiered porch. The porch originally formed an L-shape for it extended across the rear elevation of the main house and along a demolished service wing. The remaining southern portion of the porch has been extended to the west and faced with siding.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. "The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture. Historic porches should be maintained and repaired to reflect their period. Particular attention should be paid to the handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions and decorative details."
 - 2. "The form and shape of the porch and its roof should maintain their historic appearance. The materials should blend with style of the building."
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
 - 1. Remove the existing brick wall enclosing the rear entrance and utility area.
 - 2. Rework the courtyard area's paving to provide pads for the mechanical units and water runoff.
 - 3. Install a six foot metal fence around the rear entrance and utility area.

4. A planting bed located just off the sidewalk will extend along the north side of the rear entrance and utility area
5. Remove the later concrete steps, concrete stoop, and pipe railing which provide access to the two rear entrances.
6. Remove the bracket extending from the northeast corner of the house.
7. Remove and relocate wall-mounted utilities as specified.
8. Install a new 4 light awning window over the first floor's north-facing door.
9. Install new Hardiplank trim about the first floor's north-facing door.
10. Reconstruct a two-tiered porch per the submitted plans.
 - a. A brick or stuccoed block foundation will support the porch.
 - b. A dog-leg metal stair unit will provide access from the ground to the first floor gallery.
 - c. The stair unit will be painted black
 - d. Tongue-and-groove decking will cover the galleries two sloped floors.
 - e. A hatch and ladder will provide emergency ingress and egress.
 - f. Two boxed columnar posts and one pilaster will define the bays of the two galleries.
 - g. The original shed roof will surmount the two-tiered porch.
 - h. Repair and replace wooden members as needed on the roof's entablature.
 - i. A wooden picket balustrade will extend between the porch bays.
 - j. A paneled lattice screen will occupy the lower gallery's north facing bay.
 - k. Rework the siding as necessary to construct the porch.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The reconstruction of the northern portion of this house's two-tiered porch will partially recapture historical and architectural integrity of the rear elevation. The proposed reconstruction will occupy the footprint of the original porch, as defined by the surviving shed roof. The detailing and treatment of the porch is proportionate to the house, as well as being appropriate to the house's period and style.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1) and B (2), Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or the historical character of the building or the district. Pending approval of the fence height from the Department of Traffic and Engineering, Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

No one was present to discuss the application. Mr. Karwinski recused himself from the Board Discussion and left the room.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Baker asked Staff about the height of the fence. Mr. Wagoner and Ms. Coumanis clarified Ms. Baker's question. Mr. Wagoner informed the Board that he saw the application as currently proposed as an improvement over the initial proposal. Mr. Wagoner asked if there was anyone from the audience who wanted to speak for or against the application.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Ladd moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application, 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 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.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 2/17/11

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2010-21-CA: 362-364 Michigan Avenue
Applicant: Mary Odom for Carlos Barnard Bell
Received: 2/1/10
Meeting: 2/17/10

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Leinkauf
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: New Construction – Construct a single family residence.

BUILDING HISTORY

Two vacant lots on the west side of Michigan Avenue comprise this property.

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 applicant proposes the construction of a two story house with an attached garage.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standard’s for Historic Rehabilitation and the Guideline’s for New Residential Construction in Mobile’s Historic Districts, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “The goal of new construction should be to blend into the historic district, but to avoid creating a false sense of history. . .
 - 2. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment. . .
 - 3. 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 not be unimpaired.”
 - 4. “Because of development trends and patterns, the visual character of Mobile’s historic districts can vary within the districts and from street to street. It is possible that a design which is appropriate for one street in a historic district could be inappropriate on an adjacent street. In order obtain compatibility, designers for new buildings may reference “nearby” buildings.” The term “nearby buildings” includes those buildings located on adjacent properties, on the same street, and on streets of a similar character within the historic district. The term applies only to historic buildings or those which contribute to the historic significance or visual character of the various historic districts and excludes non-contributing buildings.”
 - 5. With regard to placement and scale “Placement has two components: setback, the distance between the street and a building; and spacing, the distance between its property lines adjacent

6. With regard to mass “Building mass is established by the arrangement and proportion of its basic geometric components – the main building, wings, porches, the roof and the foundation. Similarity of massing helps to create a rhythm along a street, which is one of the appealing aspects of the historic districts. Therefore, new construction should reference the massing of forms of nearby historic districts.”
7. 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 the massing and visual character, new buildings should have foundation heights similar in height to those of nearby historic buildings. In most residential areas, buildings are usually elevated above a crawl space on a pier foundation. Pier foundations are encouraged for new residential construction. When slab foundations are constructed, it is important that the height of the foundations 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 foundation”
8. “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 buildings.”
9. “To preserve the continuity of a historic district, new construction should be in scale with nearby historic buildings.”
10. “New construction should reflect the use of façade elements of nearby historic buildings.”
11. “Designs for new porches should consider porch location, proportion, rhythm, roof form, supports, steps, rails and ornamentation.”
12. “The number and proportion of openings – windows and entrances – within the façade of a building creates a solid-to-void ratio (wall-to-opening). One way of achieving compatibility may be to use windows and entrances that approximate the placement and solid-to-void ratio of nearby historic buildings. In addition, designs for new construction may incorporate the traditional use of window casements and door surrounds. Where a side elevation is clearly visible from the street, proportion and placement of elements will have an impact upon the visual character of the neighborhood and must be addressed in the design.”

C. Scope of Work:

1. Construct a two story single family residence with an attached garage.
 - a. The house will rest on a continuous 2’ foundation.
 - b. A configuration of hipped roofs will surmount the house.
 - c. The house will feature four light wooden true-divided-light windows
 - d. The house will be faced with a brick veneer.
 - e. East Elevation
 1. The asymmetrically massed, six bay east elevation measures 64 feet in length.
 2. A centrally located two-story body will be surmounted by a hipped roof

3. A three bay monumental pedimented and shingled portico with paneled wooden boxed columns will project from the southern portion of the two story body of the façade.
 4. Wood siding will sheath the walls fronted by the portico.
 5. An eight light French door with transom and two four light windows with transoms will comprise the portico's first floor fenestration.
 6. The same fenestration pattern, minus the transoms, will comprise the second story portico fronted fenestration.
 7. A four light window with transom and a four light window minus a transom will comprise the northern portion of the two-story center block's fenestration.
 8. A flight of brick steps flanked by antipodia will access the portico.
 9. A single story hipped roof bay with a fixed shutter windows will be located to the south of the east elevation's two story center block.
 10. A pair four light windows will comprise the fenestration of the single story hipped roof northern portion of the east elevation.
- f. South Elevation
1. A large single pane window and two four light windows will comprise the 40' 2 1/2" south elevation's fenestration.
- g. West Elevation
1. A recessed porch with an angled door and four light windows flanked by two pairs of four light windows will comprise the southern portion of the west elevation's fenestration.
 2. A large projecting blind bay will occupy the northern portion of the west elevation.
 3. The west elevation measures 64' in length.
- h. North Elevation
1. A double garage door will comprise the fenestration the 50' long north elevation's fenestration.

Clarifications

1. Is the house setback 25' from the sidewalk or Michigan Avenue?
2. What is the setback from the north property line?
3. What is the roofing material and color?
4. What are the roof heights?
5. Are the windows true-divided-light?
6. What is the shutter material?
7. What materials will be used to pave and deck the portico?
8. What is the design of the garage door?
9. What are the dimensions and the paving material of the driveway?

STAFF ANALYSIS

The Proposal does not conform to the Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts. With regard to siting, treatment, and materials, this application leaves much to conjecture. Given the above clarifications, more information is required to adequately review this application. Certain points can be made:

- With regard to B (1) -The proposed design does not blend with the historic properties located on Michigan Avenue and within the Leinkauf Historic District.

- With regard to B (2) - The proposed design is not compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features of historic houses located on Michigan Avenue and within the Leinkauf Historic District.
- With regard to B (4) - While the design utilizes features, such as wooden windows and shingled gables, and forms, such as a monumental portico, the overall design does not take into account the overall design, massing and character of the streets two dominate house types: the Arts and Crafts informed bungalow and the classically detailed American four square.
- With regard to B (5) - The exact siting of the house is unclear. If the 25' setback commences at the inner edge of the sidewalk (that farthest from the street), the setback is consistent with neighboring houses. If the 25' setback commences at the outer edge of the sidewalk (that nearest the street), the house would disrupt the façade line and diminish the visual integrity of the streetscape.
- With Regard to B (6) - The overall massing and scale of the proposed house fail to take into the adjacent houses, the streetscape, and the district. Most of the houses along Michigan Avenue are bungalows or classically detailed four square house types. The more complex massing of the proposed house is not in accord with the boxy geometry of those historic houses.
- With regard to B (7) - Historic homes rest on foundations featuring brick piers or expressed water tables and these are generally required in prominent locations.
- With regard to B (8) - The large expanse and configuration of the roof is not compatible with neighboring historic houses. The roofs of the surrounding historic houses are lower in pitch and less complicated in configuration than proposed roof.
- With regard to B (9) - The overall scale of the proposed design is not in keeping with scale of nearby buildings.
- With regard to B (10) -While the proposed façade features a monumental portico, wooden windows, a shingled pediment, and other traditional features, their combination and arrangement is not keeping with houses located along the street and in the district
- With regard to B (11) - The design features a monumental pedimented portico, of which several examples are found on the street, but the relationship of the portico to the body of the house and the detailing of its components fail to observe nearby porch configurations and detailing.
- With regard to B (12) - Lengthy expanses of blank walls are not appropriate or in keeping with historic fenestration patterns.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-12), Staff believes this application impairs the architectural and historical character of the district. Staff does not recommend approval of this application

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mary Odom and Thomas Briand were present to discuss the application. Ms. Odom explained that she was representing the property owner, her brother Mr. Bell. Mr. Wagoner asked Ms. Odom and Mr. Briand if they had any comments to make or clarifications to make with regard to the Staff Report. Ms. Odom answered yes. She informed the Board that in developing the design, she had observed a mixture of house styles and types along Michigan Avenue. She said that certain changes should and could be made. Ms. Odom pointed out the lack of fenestration on the north elevation as a worthwhile change.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Briand addressed some of the clarifications listed and bulleted points listed in the Staff Report. He told the Board all the questions

and comments were worthwhile. He provided the Board with an altered façade elevation reflecting concerns raised in the Staff Report. Mr. Briand clarified that the setback would commence 25' from the inner edge of the sidewalk. He said that the foundation was a floating slab which could be further articulated by a watertable. As proposed, the front porch features concrete flooring and brick border. Mr. Briand said the porch could be floored with wooden decking like some of the historic homes on the street. He added that dentil moldings could be added to the eaves, the roof pitch could be lowered, and operable shutters could be employed.

Mr. Wagoner thanked Ms. Odom and Mr. Briand for their efforts in addressing the Staff Report, but told them and reminded the Board that it was not in the Board's authority to redesign a proposal anew. He asked Ms. Odom and Mr. Briand if they would be amenable discussing the proposed changes in a Design Review Committee. Mr. Wagoner told Ms. Odom and Mr. Briand that in doing so they could then return to the Board with an altered application. Ms. Odom and Mr. Briand answered yes. Mr. Briand added that he would appreciate the direction. It would help him revise the application and the drawings. Mr. Wagoner moved to holdover the application in order to convene a Design Review Committee.

HELDOVER