

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES

July 16, 2008 – 3:00 P.M.

Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

The meeting was called to order by the chair Tilmon Brown at 3:05.

The Introductory Statement was read by the staff.

The members present were Tilmon Brown, Carlos Gant, Tom Karwinski, Bunky Ralph, Craig Roberts, Barja Wilson, and David Barr.

Staff present was: Devereaux Bemis; John Lawler; and Gabriel Jones (Intern).

The Minutes of the previous meeting were approved per a motion of Carlos Gant and a second of Craig Roberts.

The Mid-Month Requests were approved as submitted per a motion of Tom Karwinski and a second of Bunky Ralph.

A. MID-MONTH APPROVALS

1. **Applicant's Name:** Anna Summersell
Property Address: 79 S. Lafayette
Date of Approval: June 23, 2008
Replace rotten siding matching the existing in profile, dimension and material. Prime wood. Replace rotten wood on porch floor and columns as needed matching profile, dimension and material.
2. **Applicant's Name:** Diane Allen
Property Address: 560 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: June 23, 2008
Install new modified flat roof to match existing in profile.
3. **Applicant's Name:** Chip Nolan
Property Address: 508 Monroe Street
Date of Approval: June 24, 2008
Repair/replace rotten steps, balustrade, siding, skirt board as necessary to match existing in profile, material and dimension. Paint to match existing paint scheme.
4. **Applicant's Name:** Francis Johnson
Property Address: 26 McPhillips Avenue
Date of Approval: June 24, 2008
Construct a 12 x 16 outbuilding using the MHDC stock plans. Siding will Hardiplank painted to match the house. This replaces a previous COA dated March 24, 2004.
5. **Applicant's Name:** Mike Henderson Roofing
Property Address: 253 Dexter Avenue
Date of Approval: June 24, 2008
Repair decking with materials to match existing in profile, dimension and material. Re-roof with 30 3-tab shingles, onyx black in color.

6. **Applicant's Name:** Ryan J. Stuckas
Property Address: 1150 Old Shell Rd.
Date of Approval: June 25, 2008
Repaint house in following color scheme: trim-white, body-Roycroft suede, sash-copper red off Sherwin Williams chart.
7. **Applicant's Name:** Jill Black
Property Address: 157 Hannon Avenue
Date of Approval: June 25, 2008
Paint the residence white.
8. **Applicant's Name:** Fred South Construction
Property Address: 1260 Texas Street
Date of Approval: June 26, 2008
Replace rotten wood as necessary with new materials to match existing in profile, dimension and material on second floor porch. Paint new material to match existing color scheme.
9. **Applicant's Name:** William Clarke
Property Address: 312 McDonald
Date of Approval: June 26, 2008
Repair existing privacy fence with new materials to match existing in profile, dimension and material.
10. **Applicant's Name:** Eugene Caldwell
Property Address: 355 Marine Street
Date of Approval: July 1, 2008
Install new roof using 3 tab shingles, charcoal or black in color.
11. **Applicant's Name:** Eugene Caldwell
Property Address: 907 Selma Street
Date of Approval: July 1, 2008
Install new roof using 3 tab shingles, charcoal or black in color.
12. **Applicant's Name:** C.F. Stewart Construction, Inc.
Property Address: 654 Monroe Street
Date of Approval: July 3, 2008
Install new architectural shingled roof with new materials to match existing color.
13. **Applicant's Name:** Providence LLC
Property Address: 115 N. Julia
Date of Approval: June 17, 2008
Change to original ARB approved plan: amend exterior brick color to Arlington Antique.
14. **Applicant's Name:** Debra Kraus
Property Address: 105 S. Ann Street

Date of Approval: June 17, 2008

Replace rotten sills, rebuild brick piers, jack and level as necessary.

15. **Applicant's Name:** William Dixon

Property Address: 200 St. Emanuel Street

Date of Approval: June 18, 2008

Reroof the building using Owens Corning, 40 year, Architectural Shingle, Brown in color. Repair decking and fascia as needed matching existing in profile, dimension and material.

16. **Applicant's Name:** Larry Posner

Property Address: 113 Monroe Street

Date of Approval: June 18, 2008

Replace rotten eaves to match existing in profile and dimension, redeck as necessary, reroof with charcoal gray asphalt shingles.

B. OLD BUSINESS

C. NEW BUSINESS

1. **082-08-CA:** 153 S. Jefferson

Applicant: Terry Bush

Request: Request to install a vinyl window on the south side of the house and retain the rear deck.

Approved as amended.

2. **083-08-CA:** 10 St. Emanuel

Applicant: Will Dumas for Dumas Development

Request: Refinish front of building using paint and stucco. Add multi-light (true divided light) French doors and windows. Add Balconies and corresponding rail at top of structure (ironwork).

Approved

3. **084-08-CA:** 954 Augusta

Applicant: Forrest McCaughn

Request: Install 6-foot wood picket fence per the submitted plan. Paint color to match existing: Black/Green. One gate as shown.

Approved

4. **085-08-CA:** 107 Houston Street

Applicant: John Steensland

Request: Replace the existing sliding glass door on the rear patio with French doors (see enclosed). Replace the three Jalousie style windows on the rear patio with Casement casements (also enclosed).

Approved

5. **086-08-CA:** 351 Congress Street

Applicant: Clanford & Anita Pierce

Request: Install an 8-foot privacy fence along the west property line. Install a white picket fence along the north & east property lines 48 inches in height. Change the round columns to square columns on the front and rear on both floors.

Approved with conditions

6. **087 -08-CA:** 7 N. Cedar

Applicant: Casey Ginn

Request: Install new windows; repair porch & steps.

Approved with conditions.

D. OTHER BUSINESS and ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Board will be looking over the Guidelines with the intention of approving them in draft form.

The Board members felt they would like to share some of the insights they received at the NAPC conference. The Chair will be arranging for a Saturday morning retreat.

The Board members will be having lunch with their appointers and the earliest possible time.

E. ADJOURNMENT

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

082-08-CA: 153 S. Jefferson
Applicant: Terry Bush
Received: 06/24/08
Meeting: 07/16/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R1
Project: Install Vinyl window on N side.

BUILDING HISTORY

Records indicate the building was constructed in 1925 by Sarah J. McHugh. However, stylistically it would appear that the building was updated during the first third of the twentieth century.

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. The house sits at the corner of S. Jefferson and Church and is highly visible from both streets. The office issued a mid-month COA on May 29 to do repairs to the building the rear deck and the roof. Complaints were called to the office about the rear deck but there were no pictures of the deck to substantiate a problem. Calls were also sent to 311 concerning the replacement of windows on the building. Upon investigation, it was determined that the window on the N side had definitely been replaced. However, the others appeared to have been in the building for a year or more, based on the condition of the windows. A Notice of Violation was issued for the window on the north and that resulted in this application.
- B. 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. Where windows cannot be repaired, new windows must be compatible to the existing.
- C. The applicant is proposing to retain the vinyl window and the rear deck.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The use of the vinyl windows violates the guidelines. Though the other windows may have been in for some time, there is no way to tell at this point. Staff sees no reason to compound a problem by expanding the use of an unapproved material.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Bush was present to discuss the application. He stated he was interested in getting a historic marker and the back deck had been replaced because of extremely deteriorated condition. He said he would be willing to replace all the vinyl windows to wood in order to get a historic marker.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion occurred concurrently with the public hearing when the owner agreed to install wood windows. The Board discussed that a new design for the deck should come back to the Board.

FINDING OF FACT

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion the Board amends the facts in the Staff report to delete the current "C. The applicant is proposing to retain the vinyl window and the rear deck." Section C should now read:

"C. The applicant is proposing to replace all vinyl windows with 9/1 wood, true divided lights and will return to the Board with new deck plans."

The motion was seconded by Craig Roberts and unanimously approved.

Decision on the Application

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the facts as amended by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Tom Karwinski and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 7/16/09.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

083-08-CA: 10 St. Emanuel
Applicant: Will Dumas for Dumas Development
Received: 06/27/08
Meeting: 07/16/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Renovate the façade for apartments and offices.
Conflicts of Interest: Tilmon Brown disclosed that he owns property across the street from the subject property. Craig Roberts disclosed that he had worked with the applicant on another project. Both stated that these facts would have no bearing on their decisions.

BUILDING HISTORY

The building was probably constructed between 1891 and 1904. It shows up in an Overbey photograph from 1908. The building has been empty for a number of years.

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 three-story building with a glass, twentieth century storefront that has been boarded up. It is plan and very symmetrical.
- B. The Lower Dauphin Street Design Guidelines would place this structure in the Building Condition Example 1: Original design Intact; and states, “...preservation and restoration of the original design should be the goal.
- C. The applicant is proposing a change in use for the building.
 - 1. Add new stucco to the building
 - 2. Remove storefront opening and install two multi-light, double doors with an arched fanlight and a single centered multi-light door.
 - 3. Enlarge two window openings on the second and third floor and install balconies with double, multi-light, transomed, French doors.
 - 4. Install double casements on the second and third floor
 - 5. Install an iron rail on the roof.
 - 6. All windows and doors will be wood true divided lights.
 - 7. The balconies will be 4’3” deep.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The loss of the storefront violates the design guidelines. However, the change in use would indicate some type of alteration is necessary. Staff suggests the use of decorative stucco moldings to indicate the original outline of the storefront. Staff had advised the applicants to choose either traditional multi-light windows and doors or a more contemporary single light system. Having visited the property, staff now believes the center windows should be 2/2 and the remaining windows and doors should match.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Will Dumas was present to discuss the application. He stated that he had worked with the staff and was willing to work with the Board.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the overall plainness of the structure. Several Board members noted that the additions to the building did little to affect the overall character of the structure since it had such little character. It was noted that the changes were modern in concept and therefore were differentiated from the historic portions of the building. It was also noted that the Board generally approved iron balconies and that they were a removable element.

FINDING OF FACT

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion was seconded by Barja Wilson and unanimously approved.

Decision on the Application

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by David Barr and approved with one member voting no.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 7/16/09.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

084-08-CA: 954 Augusta
Applicant: Forrest McCaughn
Received: 06/308
Meeting: 07/16/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R1
Project: Install six-foot wooden fence, painted black/green.

BUILDING HISTORY

Records indicate Laura Bonifer built the house around 1878. However, changes later occurred to the house around 1920 when the porch was significantly altered. *[This is incorrect information.]*

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. The house sits in Oakleigh in the block just east of Washington Square. The back yard of the house interconnects to an alley *[public testimony indicated that this was an easement and not a dedicated alley]* that has numerous fences coming off it leading to the houses.
- B. The Guidelines state, “These should complement the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District. The height of solid fences in historic districts is generally restricted to six feet... The finished side of the fence should face toward public view.”
- C. The applicant is proposing to construct a fence .
 - a. The fence will be 6 feet high.
 - b. The fence will begin at the back corner of the house and run 36’3” to the rear property line.
 - c. It will be painted black/green.
 - d. A gate will be placed where it connects to the house.

STAFF ANALYSIS

Staff notes that these series of 6-foot rear fences creates a boxlike effect that would better serve the neighborhood with some sort of open work fence. However, this is a typical fence generally approved by the Board. Staff sees no problem with it.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Forrest McCaughn was present to discuss the application. He explained that the fence would dog leg to follow the property line and that the fence would have a picket top to match the adjacent fence. He also noted that the alley was not an alley but an easement and the building dates in the staff report were incorrect.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the request. It was noted that the paint would match the paint on the adjacent fence.

FINDING OF FACT

Noting the corrections to the Staff report made by the property owner, Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph and unanimously approved.

Decision on the Application

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 7/16/09.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

085-08-CA: 107 Houston
Applicant: John Steensland
Received: 07/03/08
Meeting: 07/16/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Install French doors and casement windows on rear of house..

BUILDING HISTORY

This is a one-story bungalow probably built circa 1920

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 one of a number of ODW houses that use the gable-fronted porch with end piers supporting shortened columns. It utilizes a short parapet wall instead of a balustrade on the porch. The rear of the building has an addition with metal jalousie windows and a metal sliding glass door.
- B. The guidelines state, “The size and placement of new windows for additions or alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building. [For doors]Replacements should respect the age and style of the building
- C. The applicant is proposing to install replacement windows & doors for non-historic windows & doors.
 - a. The windows will be single light clear casements.
 - b. They may be double paned.
 - c. The doors will be single light double doors.
 - d. The doors will be fiberglass.
 - e. The house sits on a corner.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This is a contributing building and the request is for non-historic materials to replace non-historic materials on a non-historic addition. The Board generally requires true divided lights on additions to historic buildings but does allow vinyl clad wood.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

There was no one present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the application and noted that the windows would replace inappropriate windows on a rear addition. The Board noted that these were on the rear of the house, completely invisible to the

public or the neighbors and that their effect would be no more harmful to the house than the current metal windows and door.

FINDING OF FACT

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion the Board finds the facts in the Staff report. The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph and unanimously approved.

Decision on the Application

Craig Roberts moved that, based upon the facts found by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 7/16/09.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

086-08-CA: 351 Congress
Applicant: Clanford & Anita Pierce
Received: 07/02/08
Meeting: 07/16/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: DeTonti Square
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: RB
Project: Install an 8' and 4' high fences. Replace round column with square columns.

BUILDING HISTORY

This is a new house constructed from the city lot sales of the 1990s.

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. The house sits at the corner on a corner and adjacent to Victoria Teal. There is a series of picket fences in the back yard and along Claiborne Street.
- B. For fences, the guidelines state, "These should complement the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District. The height of solid fences in historic districts is generally restricted to six feet, however, if a commercial property or multi-family housing adjoins the subject property, an eight-foot fence may be considered. The finished side of the fence should face toward public view."
- C. The applicant is proposing to build two fences and replace his porch columns
 - a. Request an 8' wooden fence along the west property line beginning 30 feet from the sidewalk. This is to buffer the applicant from the Victorian Teal building next door.
 - b. Request to build a 4-foot picket fence along the front of the property.
 - c. Replace the round columns on the front & rear with square columns.
 - d. Site plan indicates an 8' privacy fence along the E side of the property (Claiborne), but it is not listed in the application.
- D. Clarifications
 - a. Design for the 8-foot fence.
 - b. Design for the 4-foot fence.
 - c. Design, material and size of the columns.
 - d. If there is a request for a fence on the E property line.

STAFF ANALYSIS

Though the Victorian Teal is a business, it is located in a house and seems to have little activity. Four-foot high fences in the front violate the City's set back regulations and would require a variance. The suggested 8 foot fence along Claiborne is also possibly a violation of the City's set back regulations; and

a tall fence along the right of way is generally not considered appropriate in the districts. Staff cannot judge columns without samples.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Clanford Pierce was present to discuss the application. He noted that the building next door, Victorian Teal, is a business. He stated he wanted the 8-foot fence for the sake of privacy in his rear yard. He did not want people looking into his yard from the business. He stated that Mardi Gras people would wander throughout the neighborhood. The design of the 4-foot fence would match the fence already present and the taller fence would have a flat top with a cap. He did not have a design for his columns and agreed to return at a later date. He felt he needed the 4-foot fence because he was having problems with dogs and believed they could too easily jump a 3-foot fence.

Mrs. Ada Pair the owner of Victorian Teal on the adjacent property came to speak against the eight-foot fence. She pointed out that the fence would be very close to her building and would block the sun. She also stated that she would be looking out her window and be staring into her neighbor's fence. She noted that there was already a five foot fence on her property that gave the applicant sufficient privacy. She felt that putting an 8-foot fence within inches of her 5-foot fence would impair the historic district and decrease her property values. She pointed out to the Board that the proposed 8-foot fence would obscure the view of her house from the street and create impairment to the district.

Mr. Herbert Pair, Mrs. Pair's son, also spoke against the request. He reiterated some of Mrs. Pair's concerns, but also pointed out that the 8-foot fence would extend past their property and run behind two residential properties.

Mr. Pierce stated that one of his neighbors had no problem with an 8-foot fence.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the request at length. The Board noted that the Guidelines allowed for 8-foot fences adjacent to commercial properties. It was a general consensus that the Board should maintain the 6-foot residential height for the residences and that having three fence heights would not be an appropriate solution. It was discussed that the Victorian Teal did not have much traffic and that its parking was on the side opposite the applicant's house. It was noted that though the Board often allowed 8-foot fence heights adjacent to businesses, this was the exception and the 6-foot height was the general rule.

In discussing the request for the 4-foot fence, the Board noted that the size of the house and the large expanse of yard were unusual in the DeTonti Square district. No one believed that the proposed 4-foot fence was harmful to the historic district in this particular case. However, it was repeatedly pointed out to the applicant that this might violate the set back rules of the City and the applicant needed to clear this with Urban Development and Traffic Engineering before proceeding.

FINDING OF FACT

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion the Board amend the facts in the Staff report item C.c to read:

The applicant will return to the Board with a design for square columns to replace the round columns on the front & rear.

And add the following facts:

- e. The 4-foot fence will match the existing 4-foot fence.

f. The tall fence will be flat topped with a flat cap and painted white.
. The motion was seconded by Carlos Gant and unanimously approved.

Decision on the Application

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the facts as amended by the Board, that the application does impair the historic integrity of the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued with the condition that a 6-foot fence be constructed instead of the requested 8-foot fence. The motion was seconded by David Barr and approved with one member dissenting. The Board again reminded the applicant to check on the setbacks for the 4-foot fence.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 7/16/09.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

080-08-CA: 7 N. Cedar
Applicant: Casey Ginn
Received: 07/06/08 (+45 Days: 07/25/08)
Meeting: 07/18/08

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street Commercial District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B4
Project: General repairs to include new porch, windows and doors.

BUILDING HISTORY

This Creole Cottage would appear to be from around the turn of the 20th century, probably from the 1890s.

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. The building is in a distressed condition but is one of a series being renovated by the owner. Front porch was enclosed with jalousie windows.
- B. The Guidelines state that “Often one of the most important decorative features of a house, doorways reflect the age and style of a building. Original doors and openings should be retained along with any moldings, transoms or sidelights. Replacements should respect the age and style of the building.... 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.... 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 handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts, columns, proportions and decorative details.”
- C. The applicant is proposing to
 - a. Install new 1/1 or 6/6 windows.
 - b. Install two four paneled doors with transoms.
 - c. Replace the Victorian turned columns with square posts.
 - d. Install a handrail per the MHDC design.
 - e. Repair rotten sills
 - f. Repoint stucco piers.
 - g. Widen front porch steps and stucco them to match the existing.
- D. Information needed
 - a. Materials of doors and windows.
 - b. Decision on windows.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The building has existing Victorian turned posts that may be original to the building. There is an indication that the windows on the porch originally went to the floor. Staff sees no reason to remove the original turned posts unless they can be shown to be replacements. Staff would suggest that the owner consider windows to the floor. If the owner chooses to take the windows to the floor, staff would suggest the use of 6/9 windows. Otherwise the 2/2 will be acceptable.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Casey Ginn was present to discuss the application. He stated that the Victorian posts were not original to the building. He also said he had been having problems with the National windows he had used in other projects. He felt that they rotted too quickly and that they would be a problem on this house where the windows received substantial amounts of water from adjacent buildings. He asked if the Board would consider allowing a vinyl clad window.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussed the appropriateness of the vinyl clad windows. It was felt a decision could not be made without seeing a sample of the window and Mr. Ginn was encouraged to provide a sample of what he wanted. The Board was particularly concerned about the size and shape of the muntins. Since there were no photos of the original porch and since the date on the house was from a transitional period, members of the Board stated that Mr. Ginn could use either type of window, but the post design needed to be resubmitted.

FINDING OF FACT

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the Board discussion the Board amends the facts in the Staff report to read as follows:

- a. Install new 2/2 or 6/6 windows.
- c. Details of columns to be submitted
- g. Deepen the front porch treads and stucco them to match the existing.
- h. Return to the Board with any window or door material other than wood.

The motion was seconded by David Barr and unanimously approved.

Decision on the Application

Bunky Ralph moved that, based upon the facts as amended by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued. The motion was seconded by Barja Wilson and unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 7/16/09.