

**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES**  
**January 19, 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, Kim Harden, Thomas Karwinski, Bradford Ladd, Harris Oswalt, Craig Roberts, and Jim Wagoner.  
**Members Absent:** Carlos Gant, Bill James, Janetta Whitt-Mitchell, and Barja Wilson.  
**Staff Members Present:** Devereaux Bemis, Cart Blackwell, and John Lawler.
2. Mr. Oswalt moved to approve the minutes of the January 5, 2011 meeting. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.
3. Mr. Karwinski moved to approve the midmonth COA's granted by Staff. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.

**B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED**

1. **Applicant: Edith K. Previto**
  - a. Property Address: 66 South Royal Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 12/29/10
  - c. Project: Reroof the building to match the existing.
2. **Applicant: William Hodge**
  - a. Property Address: 1651 Dauphin Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 12/28/10
  - c. Project: Reroof the house with architectural shingles.
3. **Applicant: Brian and Kimberly Stewart**
  - a. Property Address: 1515 Eslava Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 12/29/10
  - c. Project: Remove vinyl windows and front door. Install plyboard over the door and window openings until the fenestration can be replaced.
4. **Applicant: Skip Shirah**
  - a. Property Address: 404 Chatham Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 1/5/11
  - c. Project: Repair and replace deteriorated woodwork where necessary. The work will match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repaint the house per the existing color scheme.
5. **Applicant: Linda McCafferty**
  - a. Property Address: 59 Lee Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 1/4/11
  - c. Project: Remove and replace existing roof with 25 yr GAF shingles.
6. **Applicant: Jesus Geronimo**
  - a. Property Address: 460 South Broad Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 1/5/11
  - c. Project: Place 8 foot by three foot sign on front of building in existing panel.
7. **Applicant: John C. Bell**
  - a. Property Address: 122 Ryan Avenue
  - b. Date of Approval: 1/6/11
  - c. Project: Install a four foot wooden picket fence per the submitted plans. The fence will be located to the rear of the property along the northern lot line and along an inner north-south line where it will tie into the rear plan of the body of the house.

8. **Applicant: Lucy Barr for Mr. and Mrs. Angus Cooper**
  - a. Property Address: 207 Lanier Avenue
  - b. Date of Approval: 1/6/11
  - c. Project: Install an interior lot fence (per submitted site plan). The six foot stucco-faced wall will feature a precast concrete cap. The wall will be punctuated regularly spaced piers. The fence will extend along the southern lot line from a point approximate to the rear plane of the addition to and along the western lot where it will tie into southwest corner of the garage. The fence will feature a western lot line vehicular entrance with a wooden gate (per submitted drawing). The fence will match the fence approved for the northern and the remainder of the western lot lines (date of approval 1 September 2010).
9. **Applicant: Graham Roofing**
  - a. Property Address: 1363 Government Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 1/6/11
  - c. Project: Reroof to the flat roof to match the existing.
10. **Applicant: Lucy Barr for Dr. and Mrs. Coleman Oswalt**
  - a. Property Address: 201 Lanier Avenue
  - b. Date of Approval: 1/6/11
  - c. Project: Install two stucco-faced posts with a wooden gate per submitted plan. The gate will be located at the rear garage (the post and gate treatment will match that of the adjacent property to the west, 207 Lanier Avenue).
11. **Applicant: Mark Keith**
  - a. Property Address: 553 Church Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 1/7/11
  - c. Project: Reissue of a COA dated 9/8/11 – Repair and replace siding to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Replace window sashes to match the existing. Paint per the Mobile Paints color scheme.
12. **Applicant: William Graham**
  - a. Property Address: 1760 Dauphin Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 1/7/11
  - c. Project: Install a storm door on the east-facing (side door).
13. **Applicant: Cynthia Callaway**
  - a. Property Address: 1502 Brown Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 1/7/11
  - c. Project: Install an interior lot fence. The fence will be a six foot, dog-ear topped, wooden enclosure. The fence will commence at the northwest corner. It will tie into the northeast corner of the house thereby enclosing the backyard.

## C. APPLICATIONS

1. **2010-06-CA: 1563 Luling Street**
  - a. Applicant: Tania Collins
  - b. Project: New Construction – Partially demolish the rear of the house; Construct a new rear addition.  
**APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**
2. **2010-07-CA: 108 Lanier Avenue**
  - a. Applicant: Mark Davis and Pete J. Vallas
  - b. Project: Alter fenestration on the detached garage.  
**APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**
3. **2011-03-CA: 263 South Cedar Street**
  - a. Applicant: David Thomas
  - b. Project: Reface windows.

**APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

**4. 2010-08-CA: 204 Michigan Avenue**

- a. Applicant: Cameron Pfeiffer
- b. Project: Alter later second story façade fenestration.

**APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

**D. OTHER BUSINESS**

1. Discussion

A. Satellite Dish Update

Mr. Bemis informed the Board of the Mobile Historic Development Commission's public meeting regarding the placement of satellite dishes in Mobile's Historic Districts. After relaying the attendance and procedures of the Thursday, January 13, 2011 meeting, Mr. Bemis told the Board that all three of the proposed satellite dish regulations were canvassed by those parties attending the meeting. He informed the Review Board that the MHDC will discuss the issue further at its February meeting. Mr. Bemis told the Review Board that if they had any concerns regarding satellite placement they should be conveyed in writing to Staff who will deliver them to the Board for discussion.

B. Disclosure Statements

Mr. Ladd initiated a discussion of property disclosure statements.

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**CERTIFIED RECORD**

**2011-00-CA: 1563 Luling Street**  
**Applicant: Tania Collins**  
**Received: 1/5/11**  
**Meeting: 1/19/11**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: New Construction – Partially demolish the rear of the house. Construct a new rear addition.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

The façade of this Craftsman-influenced bungalow features a gabled porch flanked by an engaged portecochere and an elevated terrace.

**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. With this submission, the applicant proposes the partial demolition of a rear portion of the house and the construction of a new rear addition.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. “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 compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.”
  - 2. “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 will be unimpaired.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted site plan):
  - 1. Partially demolish the rear of the house.
    - a. The southwest corner porch, enclosed utility porch, and southeast closet will be demolished.
    - b. A portion of the eastern wall extending beyond the closet will be removed and reconstructed.
    - c. The existing rear deck will be demolished.
  - 2. Construct a new rear addition.
    - a. The rear addition will be located in plane with house’s side elevations.
    - b. The roof pitch and form will be maintained and continued to cover the addition.
    - c. The addition will feature three-over-one vertically oriented wooden windows matching those found on the body of the house.

- d. The addition's walls will be faced with hardi-board siding of the same dimensions as the wooden siding facing the body of the house.
- e. The addition will rest on brick-faced foundation piers matching those supporting on the body of the house.
- f. Corner post will demarcate the transition from to the existing house and the rear addition.
- g. The addition's gable roof will be set perpendicular to the street and will continue the pitch of existing house's roof.
- h. The rafter treatment and window casings will match those found on the body of the house.
- i. The roof will be sheathed with asphalt shingles that will match, as close as possible, the color and form of the house's existing shingles.
- j. The East Elevation will feature a coupled three-over-one window grouping, two single three-over-one windows and smaller casement window. The coupled unit will be reused from that portion of the East Elevation slated for demolition and reconstruction.
- k. The eastern portion of the South (Rear) Elevation will feature two three-over-one windows.
- l. A louvered window will be located in the south elevation's attic gable.
- m. The western portion of the South Elevation will feature a screened porch. Intermediate framing will support the screening. The screened porch's South Elevation will feature a centrally positioned door flanked by single screened bays.
- n. A wooden stoop and a flight of steps will provide access to the screened porch from the backyard. Wooden pilings will support the stoop and the steps. Wooden railings will be located to either side of the stoop and the flight of steps.
- o. The four bays of the screened porch will occupy the southern portion of the West Elevation. The northern portion of the rear addition will be faced with siding.
- p. Paint the addition and body of the house per the submitted Behr Paints color scheme. The body will be Deer Run (a taupe hue), the trim will be Extra Pure White, and the accent will be Black.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application involves the partial demolition of the rear of the house and the construction of a new rear addition. The proposed addition will be minimally visible from the right of way. The built density of the area and the depth of this inner lot preclude public view of the rear elevation.

In addition to being minimally visible from the public view, the area slated for demolition is small in size. The proposed east and west sides of the addition will extend the depth of and continue the plane of the body of the house. The existing rear elevation was altered at an unknown date. Taking account the lack of visibility, amount of alteration, and lack of relative significance of the rear elevation, Staff does not believe the proposed demolition will adversely affect the architectural or the historical integrity of the building or the district.

In accord with the Secretary of the Interior's Standard's for Historic Rehabilitation, the work will be differentiated from, yet compatible with the massing, scale, and architectural features of the building. Corner posts will demarcate the transition from the body of the existing house to the proposed addition. The use of hardi-board siding featuring the same dimensions as the siding found on the body of the house will provide subtle material differentiation, while simultaneously conveying visual continuity. The window type and rafter treatment will match existing. Staff does not believe the proposed addition impairs the architectural or the historical integrity of the building or the district.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

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

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Shane Collins was present to discuss the application.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd asked Mr. Collins if he had any questions to ask or comments to make with regard to the Staff Report. Mr. Collins answered no. He added that if the Board had any questions to ask of him, he was here to answer them.

Addressing Mr. Blackwell, Mr. Karwinski pointed out that the elevation drawings depicting the addition called for either abutting siding or a corner post, while the Staff Report specified only the latter. Mr. Blackwell explained to the Board that the applicants had decided to use the corner post option after turning in the plans and discussing the proposal with Staff.

Mr. Ladd asked his fellow Board members if they had any further questions to ask the applicant. He asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. Upon hearing no response, Mr. Ladd closed the period of public comment.

## **FINDING OF FACT**

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

## **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 1/19/12**

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**CERTIFIED RECORD**

**2011-00-CA: 108 Lanier Avenue**  
**Applicant: Mark Davis and Pete J. Vallas**  
**Received: 1/4/11**  
**Meeting: 1/19/11**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Ashland Place  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Alter fenestration on the detached garage.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

Picturesquely composed, this English cottage-style house constitutes design tailored solution to then contemporary American living, one featuring a semi-public yet private screened corner porch and a plan negotiating public, private, and service spaces.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the change...will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the district...”

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on August 13, 2007. At that time the Board approved the installation of a north-facing dormer. The applicants return to the Board with an application calling for the alteration of fenestration on the detached garage/studio.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. “An accessory structure is any construction other than the main building on the property. It includes but is not limited to garages, carports, pergolas, decks, pool covers, sheds and the like. The appropriateness of accessory structures shall be measured by the guidelines applicable to new construction. The structure should complement the design and scale of the main building.”
- C. Scope of Work:
  - 1. Alter fenestration on the detached garage.
    - a. Remove the picketed double gate accessing the west-facing entrance (street-oriented entry) to the garage.
    - b. Install three double French door units of fourteen lights each within the garage bay.
    - c. The proportional pattern created by the door’s muntins match those utilized in the garage’s existing second story west-facing windows.
    - d. Remove the plywood panels covering the east-facing entrance (alley-oriented entry) to the garage.
    - e. Install the same tripartite window configuration as proposed for the west elevation.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

This property's garage is located in the northeast corner of the lot at the end of long driveway. The garage was remodeled in 2004 (approved December 3, 2004). The first story of the clapboard clad building was bricked and the second story was added.

The proposed alterations to the garage entail the installation of a tripartite grouping of double French doors within the front and rear vehicular entrances. The width of the bays would be maintained. The muntins and glazing would match the proportional pattern of the garage's second story fenestration, as well as maintain a sense of the openness now afforded by the open vehicular bays.

The proposed doors meet the design and material standards outlined in the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's historic districts. Based on the altered form of the garage, the compatibility of the proposed windows to the Guideline standards, and the correlation of fenestrated components, Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or the historical integrity of the district.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

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

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Pete J. Vallas was present to discuss the application.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd asked Mr. Vallas if he had any questions to ask or comments to make with regard to the Staff Report. Mr. Vallas answered no, adding if there were any specific questions from Board members, he was here to address them.

Mr. Karwinski said he had one comment which had already been addressed by Staff. He told his fellow Board members that Mr. Blackwell had clarified that the house on the subject property was the contributing structure while the garage, though under review, was not a historic or contributing structure.

Mr. Ladd asked if any other Board members had any questions to ask the applicant. Turning to the audience, he asked if there was anyone present to speak either for or against the application. Upon hearing no response, Mr. Ladd closed the period of public comment.

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 1/19/12**

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**CERTIFIED RECORD**

**2011-03-CA: 263 South Cedar Street**  
**Applicant: David Thomas**  
**Received: 11/22/09**  
**Meeting: 1/19/11**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Church Street East  
Classification: Non-Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Face the façade's four first story window units with a vinyl wrap

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This 2000 house constitutes recent infill construction in the Church Street East 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 property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on January 5, 2011. At that time, the Board heldover approval of an application which entailed the facing of the façade's four first story window units with wrapping. The applicant returns to the Board with a sample window section showing how the wrapping will be applied to the windows.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. "The type, size and dividing light of windows and their location and configuration (rhythm) on the building help establish the historic character of a building. Original window openings should be retained as well as original window sashes and glazing"
  - 2. "Where windows cannot be replaced, new windows must be compatible to the existing. The size and placement of new windows for additions and alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building."
- C. Scope of Work:
  - 1. Face the façade's four first story windows with a vinyl wrap.
    - a. The windows will feature the same one-over-one configuration as the existing.
    - b. The windows will not feature applied muntins.
    - c. The windows will have a white finish.

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

With regards to windows, the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts are directed toward historic and/or contributing structures, not new construction. The installation of vinyl windows is not allowed on historic buildings. This house constitutes traditional infill construction in the Church

Street East Historic District. Taking into account the house's recent date of construction (2000), the Guidelines for New Residential Construction Mobile's Historic Districts must be consulted.

The Guidelines for New Construction allow the use of vinyl clad windows, but do not specifically forbid the use of vinyl windows. Mill finished metal windows, along with windows featuring snap-in muntins are deemed inappropriate. Vinyl windows have been discouraged.

Initially, the applicant proposed the replacement of façade's four first story wooden windows with vinyl windows. At the January 5, 2011, the applicant informed the Board that he would like to face the existing windows with a vinyl wrap. While the Board voiced approval of the submission in conception and description, they requested that the applicant submit sectional drawings showing the appearance and application of the proposed wrap. The applicant has volunteered to bring a sample window section to the meeting.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

As submitted, Staff cannot recommend approval of this application.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

David Thomas was present to discuss the application.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd asked Mr. Blackwell to remind the Board of the applicant's submission. Mr. Blackwell explained to the Board that Mr. Thomas had last appeared before them at the January 5, 2011 meeting. At that time, the Board moved to holdover approval of a request calling for the alteration to fenestration for submission of drawings illustrating the specifications and scope of work. Mr. Blackwell said that the requested drawing were supposed to show how the proposed vinyl wrap would relate to the existing window frames. He told the Board that Mr. Thomas was returning with drawings addressing their concerns.

Mr. Ladd welcomed Mr. Thomas thanking him for returning to the Board. He asked Mr. Thomas if he had any comments to make or questions to ask regarding the Staff Report. Mr. Thomas distributed drawings to the Board that were executed by the distributor and installer of the proposed windows. Mr. Blackwell and Mr. Bemis told the Board that they had spoken with Mr. Thomas and the window company regarding the drawings.

Mr. Karwinski asked Mr. Thomas and Staff how the proposed wrap would adhere to the existing framing. He asked if a glue would be used. Mr. Bemis said he assumed some type of adhesive would be employed. Mr. Roberts asked why Staff did not midmonth this request. Mr. Bemis told Mr. Roberts that the Board requested the applicant to submit drawings showing how the wrap would be installed. He said that Staff had not seen the requested drawings prior to the meeting.

Mr. Karwinski said he had one comment to make. He prefaced his remarks by admitting that he was unfamiliar with process by which windows are wrapped with aluminum or vinyl covering. Mr. Karwinski told his fellow board members that this application would give the Board an opportunity to explore alternative window treatments. That said Mr. Karwinski noted such an exploratory approval was in this instance appropriate for the building in question being a non-contributing infill construction, not a historic or contributing buildings. Mr. Ladd and Ms. Harden agreed with Mr. Karwinski that utilizing this

application as a test case was a workable solution that if successful could possibly be employed on subsequent proposals.

Mr. Karwinski asked Mr. Thomas if the windows would be operable. Mr. Thomas answered yes.

Ms. Harden asked for further clarification as to what components would be replaced and refaced. A discussion ensued. Mr. Thomas clarified how the windows would be installed and the frame wrapped. Mr. Karwinski asked Mr. Thomas as to which windows would be replaced. Mr. Thomas told the Board that only the façade's four first story windows would be replaced. Mr. Ladd reminded his fellow board members that Mr. Thomas had previously informed them that façade's first floor windows were the only windows on his home that had been subject to decay.

Mr. Ladd asked if the Board had any further questions for the applicant. Mr. Ladd asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. Upon hearing no response, closed the period of public comment.

### **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 that work would correspond with drawings the applicant distributed at the meeting.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

### **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Mr. Wagoner 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: 1/19/12**

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**CERTIFIED RECORD**

**2011-08-CA: 204 Michigan Avenue**  
**Applicant: Cameron Pfeiffer**  
**Received: 1/5/11**  
**Meeting: 1/19/11**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Leinkauf  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Alter the façade's later second story fenestration.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This grandly proportioned and classically detailed house was constructed in 1905. The houses spacious rooms and fittings are among the finest of period and style.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states "the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the change...will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the district..."

**STAFF REPORT**

- A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on August 5, 2009. At that time, the Board approved both alterations to and restoration of various elements of the house's façade.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. "The type, size and dividing lights of windows and their location and configuration (rhythm) on the building help establish the historic character of a building. Original window openings should be retained as well as original window sashes and glazing."
  - 2. "New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment."
  - 3. "Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence."
- C. Scope of Work:
  - 1. Remove the façade's later second story French door and transom units.
  - 2. Install wooden nine-over-one double hung windows matching those found on the rest of the house.
  - 3. The moldings and surrounds of the windows will match those of the rest of the house.
  - 4. Install wooden siding in the wall expanses located below the windows.
  - 5. The siding will match the existing in profile and dimension.
  - 6. The work will be painted to match the existing color scheme.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

This house was radically altered over the course of the latter half of the twentieth century. The first and second story galleries were infilled circa mid century. On October 4, 1993, the Board approved the removal of the later infill. In the process of removing the second story infill, the surviving components of the second story gallery were removed. The Board approved the installation of either double or triple hung windows, not the French door and transom units that were installed. The current/owner applicants propose the removal of the French door units and the installation of nine-over-one wooden double hung windows like those found on the rest of the house. The mouldings and surrounds of the proposed windows will match the existing historic examples found on the house. The wall expanse below the windows will be sheathed in siding to match the existing.

While no photographic evidence survives to document this treatment, Staff believes the proposed scope of work to be the most historical appropriate for two reasons. First, the use of either full height or standard windows was the typical fenestration treatment for houses with second story galleries. Numerous surviving and documented examples substantiate the treatment. Secondly, the proposed window treatment is consistent with that found on the rest of the house. Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the building or the district.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-3), Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the building or the district. Staff recommends approval of this application.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Shane Traylor was present to discuss the application.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd asked the applicant to state his name for the public record. Mr. Traylor responded. Mr. Ladd asked Mr. Traylor if he had any questions to add or comments to make regarding the application. Mr. Traylor explained to the Board the nature of the request. He told the Board that the low threshold of the second story's later windows was allowing water from the open gallery to intrude into the house. Altering the pitch of the decking and raising the threshold failed to prevent water from infiltrating the house.

Mr. Karwinski said that he had several questions. He asked Mr. Traylor if the balcony's balustrade would be reconstructed. Mr. Traylor answered yes. Mr. Karwinski asked Mr. Traylor if he had considered using triple windows for the second and third bays. He pointed out that the use of triple windows would provide access to the balcony. Mr. Traylor said that while he was open to suggestions, the water issue would still need to be addressed. He told the Board that the threshold would have to be raised at least six more inches to prevent the infiltration of water. Mr. Traylor said that this surmise was based on direct observation and construction experience. Mr. Traylor and Mr. Karwinski discussed the pros and cons of using full length triple hung windows in the second and third window bays.

Ms. Harden and Mr. Roberts agreed with Mr. Traylor that from his account the threshold would have to be raised. Mr. Roberts said he had one additional comment. Speaking to Mr. Karwinski, he said that the Board's job was to address applications as submitted, not redesign proposals in the midst of the meeting. A discussion ensued. Mr. Bemis interjected by saying that while the Board is not to redesign a project,

Board members may make suggestions. He asked Mr. Traylor if the proposed windows would be consistent with height of the remainder of the second story windows. Mr. Traylor and Mr. Blackwell answered yes.

Mr. Ladd asked his fellow Board members if they had any further questions for the applicant. Upon hearing no response, he opened the meeting up to finding of facts.

#### **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 as written.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

#### **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Mr. Oswalt moved that, based upon the facts approved as 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: 1/19/12**