

**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES**  
**July 23, 2014 – 3:00 P.M.**  
**Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street**

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

1. The Chair, Harris Oswalt, Sr., called the meeting to order at 3:00. Cart Blackwell, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:  
**Members Present:** Bob Allen, David Barr, Carolyn Hasser, Nick Holmes III, Harris Oswalt, and Steve Stone, and Jim Wagoner.  
**Members Absent:** Robert Brown, Kim Harden, Bradford Ladd, and Craig Roberts.  
**Staff Members Present:** Cart Blackwell, and Keri Coumanis.
2. Mr. Wagoner moved to approve the minutes for the July 2, 2014 meeting. The motion received a second and was unanimously approval.
3. Mr. Stone moved to approve midmonth COA's granted by Staff. The motion received a second and was unanimously approval. The motion received a second and was unanimously approval.

**B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED**

1. **Applicant: Omega Psi Phi Fraternity**
  - a. Property Address: 57 North Broad Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 6/26/14
  - c. Project: Remove an existing (cracked brick walkway) located between the inner edge of the sidewalk and the front steps. Install a walkway in the same location.
2. **Applicant: Timothy Ryan McKee**
  - a. Property Address: 354 South Broad Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 6/20/14
  - c. Project: Repair roof matching the existing shingles; repair/replace siding as necessary matching existing in profile, dimension and material; replace the front porch deck using 5/4 tongue and groove decking; remove porch enclosure.
3. **Applicant: City of Mobile**
  - a. Property Address: 1151 Spring Hill Avenue
  - b. Date of Approval: 6/20/14
  - c. Project: Construct a handicap ramp.
4. **Applicant: National Society of the Colonial Dames, Alabama**
  - a. Property Address: 104 Theatre Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 6/27/14
  - c. Project: Install can lights, spotlights, and courtyard lighting.
5. **Applicant: Ruth Rye for Beverly Hayes**
  - a. Property Address: 264 Marine Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 7/1/14
  - c. Project: Install a six foot privacy fencing enclosing the rear lot. Install a second expanse of fence, one in plane with body of the house (northwest corner of the house), that will extend along the east lot line.
6. **Applicant: Edward Inge with Pheonix Restoration Services**
  - a. Property Address: 350 South Ann Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 7/1/14
  - c. Project: Repair and when necessary replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material. Touch up the paint per the existing color scheme. Reroof to match.
7. **Applicant: Ruth Rye**

- a. Property Address: 1006 Old Shell Road
  - b. Date of Approval: 7/1/14
  - c. Project: Remove later iron posts supporting the porch roof. Install period appropriate battered posts with underlying bases and surmounting caps.
- 8. Applicant: Sally M. Bachran and George M. Penados**
- a. Property Address: 1159 Texas Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 7/1/14
  - c. Project: Level and repoint the foundation piers. Repair and/or replace deteriorated siding to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repair and when necessary replace any deteriorated woodwork to match the existing. Repair the damaged roof and windows to match the existing in kind. Install plywood over the rear wall until this first phase of the building restoration is completed.
- 9. Applicant: Robert Campbell**
- a. Property Address: 10 South Lafayette Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 7/1/14
  - c. Project: Install a six foot interior lot privacy fence. Said fence will be located behind the front plane of the house. Construct a 12' x 12' wooden storage shed. Said gable roofed shed will meet setback and lot coverage requirements. The shingles roofing the shed will match those on the house. Construct a shed roofed covering over the existing deck.
- 10. Applicant: Brenda Bush**
- a. Property Address: 50 Lemoyne Place
  - b. Date of Approval: 7/1/14
  - c. Project: Construct a garden shed according to the either the MHDC stock design or a submitted design. Both would be approximately 8' x 8 in plan. Said structure would be painted and roofed to match the main house. Install six foot rear lot privacy fence to be located behind the front plane of the house.
- 11. Applicant: Grover Boutin**
- a. Property Address: 7 South Monterey Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 7/2/14
  - c. Project: Reconstruct a suspended overhang over the front entrance Said overhang (and reconstruction) is documented by physical evidence and period photographs. The wooden overhang will feature cooper flashing and will be constructed to afford improved water runoff. Repaint the steps. Re-install retractable awnings on the four porches as documented in period imagery.
- 12. Applicant: Dr. and Mrs. George Inge**
- a. Property Address: 1555 Dauphin Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 7/2/14
  - c. Project: Construct an 8' tall masonry wall. The wall will be located behind the front plane of the house (one located adjacent to a multi-family property) and will extend from the rear portion of an advanced bay located of East Elevation a small distance to the east lot line. A gate will provide access to the porch steps and rear lot walkways. The masonry wall will extend southward down the eastern lot line and turn a corner to extend along the southern lot line.
- 13. Applicant: Ken and Erica McElhaney**
- a. Property Address: 1615 Government Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 7/3/14
  - c. Project: Touch up the paint per the existing color scheme.
- 14. Applicant: Julia Cox**
- a. Property Address: 1664 Government Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 7/2/14
  - c. Project: Build wood handicap ramp at rear porch, not visible from street.

**15. Applicant: Jake and Melissa Epker**

- a. Property Address: 2306 DeLeon Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 7/3/14
- c. Project: Paint the house per the submitted Benjamin Moore color scheme: body, Distant Grey; trim and columns, a lighter version of the aforementioned (1/2 paint mix); and doors, Wyeth Blue.

**16. Applicant: Marjorie B. Smith**

- a. Property Address: 1315 Spring Hill Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 7/3/14
- c. Project: Reroof with asphalt shingles. Repair deteriorated woodwork. Touch up the paint per the existing color scheme.

**17. Applicant: Wrico Signs for Dairy Queen**

- a. Property Address: 1354 Government Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/7/14
- c. Project: Construct a monument sign and two walls signs per submitted designs. The total square footage of the signage will not exceed 64 square feet. The two painted aluminum wall signs will measure 25 square feet each. The signs will feature the name of the dining venue. The single-faced 5' tall rock wall sign will feature a painted aluminum emblem advertising the commercial franchise.

**18. Applicant: Patricia and Gary Collie**

- a. Property Address: 10 Oakland Terrace
- b. Date of Approval: 7/8/14
- c. Project: Repaint the house per the submitted Sherwin Williams color scheme. The body will be Downing Slate. The trim will be Classical White. The accents will be Shutter Green. The porch decking will be Temp Star.

**19. Applicant: Chris Huff**

- a. Property Address: 11 Semmes Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 4/10/14
- c. Project: Replace crushed limestone on driveway.

**20. Applicant: Shirla Lunsford-Gaston**

- a. Property Address: 56 North Georgia Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 7/11/14
- c. Project: Rebuild porch to match the existing in profile, dimension and materials. Reroof with 25 year architectural shingle, black in color.

**21. Applicant: Mr. and Mrs. Norman Wood**

- a. Property Address: 110 Ryan Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 7/14/14
- c. Project: Reinstall a metal chimney cap atop the chimney stack.

**C. APPLICATIONS**

**1. 2014-CA-33: 18 South Julia Street**

- a. Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley with Douglas Burtu Kearley Architect for Tracy Tarvers
- b. Project: Ancillary – Construct a wing onto and enclose a porch projecting from an existing ancillary building

**APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

**2. 2014-CA-34: 404 Marine Street**

- a. Applicant: Kenneth B. Kiser
- b. Project: Demolition – Demolish a fire-damaged residence.

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

**3. 2014-CA-35: 15 McPhillips Avenue**

a. Applicant: Sue Wagoner

b. Project: Fenestration – Remove and replace later windows.

**TABLED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

**D. OTHER BUSINESS**

1. Guidelines

2. Discussion

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

**2014-33-CA: 18 South Julia Street**  
**Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley with Douglas Burtu Kearley for Tracy Tarvers**  
**Received: 7/2/14**  
**Meeting: 7/23/14**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way  
Classification: Contributing (main house)  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Ancillary – Construct a wing onto and enclose a porch projecting from an existing ancillary building.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This house dates from 1872. With its side hall body and recessed side and integral service wings, the Italianate residence constitutes a paradigmatic example of a Postbellum Side Hall with Wing house. Other contemporaneous wooden examples are located on the southern side of Washington Square (among other locations). Larger concentrations of this distinctive Mobile typology were located within and just without of the area bound by the present day Henry Aaron Loop.

**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 Review Board on June 13, 2002. At that time, the Old Dauphin Way Review Board approved the installation of fencing. With this application, the new owner proposes alterations to an ancillary building. Said ancillary structure is not depicted on the 1955 Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. “An ancillary structure is any construction other than the main building on the property. It includes but is not limited to garages, pergolas, decks, pool covers, sheds and the like. The appropriateness of accessory structure shall be measure by the guidelines applicable to new construction. The structure should complement the design and scale of the main building.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
  - 1. Ancillary – Construct a wing onto and enclose a porch projecting from an existing ancillary building.
    - a. Construct an addition to an ancillary building.
      - i. The addition will measure 14’ by 16’ in plan.
      - ii. The addition will project from the South side of an existing building.

- iii. The addition will rest atop brick foundation piers matching those supporting the existing portions of the building.
  - iv. The walls of the addition will be faced with board-and-batten siding matching that employed on the existing portions of the building.
  - v. A gabled roof (with a hipped North end) will surmount the addition.
  - vi. The roofing shingles will match the existing.
  - vii. A two bay porch featuring turned porch posts relocated from elsewhere on the building (See 1-b-i below.) will constitute the addition's South Elevation.
  - viii. A four paneled wooden door and six-over-six wooden window, one matching those employed on the existing building), will open onto the aforementioned porch.
- b. Enclose ancillary building's east-facing porch.
    - i. The turned wooden post will be salvaged and reused on the southern wing of the building (See 1-a.).
    - ii. The siding enclosing the porch will match that employed on the building of the building.
    - iii. Two six-over-six wooden windows (one salvaged) will be employed on the East Elevation.

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application involves the construction of an addition onto and the enclosure of a porch located on an existing ancillary building. Situated behind the contributing main house, the non-contributing building is minimally visible from the public view. On account of the size of the lot and the location of the addition, the proposed work poses neither lot coverage, nor setback issues. In accord with the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts, the elevation of the building, the siding material, wall heights, roof structure, and salvaged materials complement the design and scale of the main building (See B-1.).

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

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

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Douglas Burtu Kearley was present to discuss the application.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt welcomed the applicant's representative. He asked Mr. Kearley if he had any clarifications to address, comments to make, or questions to ask. Mr. Kearley replied that Mr. Blackwell had outlined the application in full.

Mr. Oswalt asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. No comments ensued from the audience.

Mr. Oswalt asked if any of his fellow Board members had any questions to ask the applicant's representative. Mr. Allen asked for clarification regarding the windows. Mr. Kearley addressed Mr. Allen's concern.

No further Board discussed ensued.

Mr. Oswalt closed the period of public comment.

**FINDING OF FACT**

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Mr. Stone moved that, based upon the facts as approved by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the 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: 7/23/15**

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

**2014-34-CA:** 404 Marine Street  
**Applicant:** Kenneth B. Kiser  
**Received:** 6/26/14  
**Meeting:** 7/23/14

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Demolition – Demolish a fire-damaged residence.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This single-story wooden side hall dwelling dates circa 1897. The gabled roof residence originally featured full-length windows that opened onto a three bay front gallery. A recessed south-facing gallery once distinguished the side elevation.

**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 was last appeared scheduled to appear before the Architectural Review Board on December 4, 2014. Prior to aforementioned meeting, the owner withdrew an application calling for the demolition of the fire-damaged building. The owner had submitted an earlier demolition request that appeared before the Board on February 6, 2013. During that first review of the demolition application, the Board, while acknowledging the condition of the building, requested the property be mothballed and listed for sale. The applicant followed up on both stipulations
- B. With regards to demolition, the Guidelines read as follows: “Proposed demolition of a building must be brought before the Board for consideration. The Board may deny a demolition request if the building’s loss will impair the historic integrity of the district.” However, our ordinance mirrors the Mobile City Code, see §44-79, which sets forth the following standard of review and required findings for the demolition of historic structures:
  - 1. *Required findings; demolition/relocation.* The Board shall not grant certificates of appropriateness for the demolition or relocation of any property within a historic district unless the Board finds that the removal or relocation of such building will not be detrimental to the historical or architectural character of the district. In making this determination, the Board shall consider:
    - i. The historic or architectural significance of the structure;
      - 1. This single-story side hall dwelling is a contributing building located within the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. Two-story masonry side hall



dwellings lined the residential thoroughfares Mobiles' Antebellum downtown core. Less expensive wooden houses, such as this once representative example, were constructed in the City's rapidly expanding suburbs in the decades following the Civil War. Most were constructed as rental housing or as speculative investments. A recessed side gallery and fine proportions informed this example.

- ii. The importance of the structures to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;
  1. Located on a portion of Marine Street greatly affected by fires of recent years and late 20<sup>th</sup>-Century demolitions, this mid block residential building contributes to the built density, rhythmic spacing, and historical character of Marine Street and southern quadrant of the Oakleigh Garden District.
- iii. The difficulty or the impossibility of reproducing the structure because of its design, texture, material, detail or unique location;
  1. With the exception of houses, substantial foundation sills, the building materials are capable of being reproduced.
- iv. Whether the structure is one of the last remaining examples of its kind in the neighborhood, the county, or the region or is a good example of its type, or is part of an ensemble of historic buildings creating a neighborhood;
  1. One-story side hall dwellings are found within and around Mobile's historic districts. Examples featuring recessed side galleries are fewer in number. Fire, neglect, and demolitions have taken their toll of a once more sizable housing typology.
- v. Whether there are definite plans for reuse of the property if the proposed demolition is carried out, and what effect such plans will have on the architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological, social, aesthetic, or environmental character of the surrounding area.
  1. If granted demolition approval, the applicant would salvage any usable materials, demolish the building, level the lot, and install sod on the site.
- vi. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
  1. The current owner acquired the property in 1998. No purchase price was provided.
- vii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
  1. Following the fire, the applicant has not considered alternative uses of the building. At the Board's request, he posted a for sale by owner sign on the fire. Later (again at the Board's request) the applicant secured a broker and listed the property on MLS.
- viii. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
  1. The applicant has listed the property for sale with an asking price of \$19,900.
- ix. Description of the options currently held for the purchase of such property, including the price received for such option, the conditions placed upon such option and the date of expiration of such option;
  1. N.A.
- x. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
  1. N.A.
- xi. Financial proof of the ability to complete the replacement project, which may include but not be limited to a performance bond, a letter of credit, a trust for

completion of improvements, or a letter of commitment from a financial institution.

1. Application submitted.
- xii. Such other information as may reasonably be required by the board.
  1. See submitted materials.
  2. *Post demolition or relocation plans required.* In no event shall the Board entertain any application for the demolition or relocation of any historic property unless the applicant also presents at the same time the post-demolition or post-relocation plans for the site.”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plan):

1. Demolish a fire-damaged contributing residential building.
2. Salvage any usable building materials.
3. Remove debris.
4. Level the lot.
5. Install sod.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

When reviewing demolition applications for principle buildings with a contributing status, the following considerations are taken into account: the architectural significance of the building; the condition of the building; the impact a proposed demolition would have on the streetscape; and the nature of any proposed redevelopment.

The National Register listing for Oakleigh Garden District designates this house as a contributing building. A single-story dwelling, the house is a representative of the side hall typology. Original fenestration, porch posts, and railings have been removed. A distinctive recessed side gallery has been enclosed. While single-story wooden side halls survive in relatively large numbers, examples featuring recessed porches are less numerous. Both varieties were frequently constructed as rental or speculative housing in Mobile’s western suburbs over the course of the latter half of the 19<sup>th</sup>-Century.

In addition to the alteration of historic fabric, this house experienced extensive damage as a consequence of an arson-related conflagration. The fire damage was both structural and cosmetic. Additionally, the building already suffered from deferred maintenance. Exposure to the elements since the fire has augmented fire and previously existed deterioration.

This building contributes to the built density and rhythmic spacing of Marine Street. An inner lot residence located adjacent to vacant lot (to the south), the demolition would result in a voided inner lot expanse on Marine Street. Three historic buildings (of five) would remain on block’s southern border, two to the South (including one corner lot dwelling facing Elmira Street) and one to the North (facing Selma Street).

This application has appeared before the Board on two previous occasions. In both instances, the Board acknowledged the extent of the damage affecting the building and the affect the building’s condition was having on the streetscape/environs. The applicant was required to list the property for sale and mothball the building. Both conditions have been met. As with the earlier applications, the applicant proposes the demolition of the building, the leveling of the lot, the removal of debris (in a cleanly manner), the leveling of the site, and the planting of sod.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-2), Staff believes this application will impair the architectural integrity of the building and

the surrounding district. Taking into account the condition of the building and the applicant's follow ups with the Board's requirements, Staff recommends approval of the demolition.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Kenneth B. Kiser was present to discuss the application.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt welcomed the applicant. He asked Mr. Kiser if he had any clarifications to address, comments to make, or questions to ask. Mr. Kiser answered no.

Mr. Oswalt asked his fellow Board members if they had any questions to ask the applicant.

Mr. Allen said that while he realized that the building was beyond reasonable repair, he had concerns as to the wording of the Staff Recommendation.

Mr. Holmes pointed out that the Staff Recommendation provided conditions that substantiated the rationale behind the demolition of the building, namely deferred maintenance, fire damage, and procedure.

Mr. Allen agreed with Mr. Holmes, but reminded the Board that it was unadvisable for them to approve the demolition of a contributing building.

Discussion ensued. The Board deemed that the extent of the fire-damage negated the building's contributing status.

Mr. Oswalt asked in there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. No comments ensued.

Mr. Oswalt closed the period of public comment.

### **FINDING OF FACT**

Mr. Holmes 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 them to note that on account of the fire the subject building no longer lost its contributing status.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

### **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Mr. Holmes 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: 7/23/15**

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

**2014-35-CA:** 15 McPhillips Avenue  
**Applicant:** Sue Wagner  
**Received:** 6/23/14  
**Meeting:** 7/23/14

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Fenestration – Remove and replace later windows.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

With its stuccoed surfaces, parapet walls, and low pitched roof, this duplex features seminal characteristics of the Mission-informed variant of the Colonial Revival design impulse.

**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 June 18, 2014. At that time, the Board tabled an application calling for the removal and replacement of later windows on account of lack of information and further clarification. Following up on the Board’s concerns, the applicant’s representatives provided revised submission imagery of the proposed window treatments.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation 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. “The size and placement of new windows for additions and alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.”
  - 3. Under unacceptable materials, vinyl is listed.
- C. Scope of Work (Per Submitted Plans):
  - 1. Remove later metal and vinyl windows from the house’s South (side) Elevation and install vinyl windows as per the following sequence:
    - A. Remove a tripartite (Chicago style) metal window
    - B. Install a new tripartite window that will take the form of picture window with flanking sliding windows in the location of the aforementioned window. See image #1 of submitted imagery.
    - C. Remove a metal window.
    - D. Install a one-over-one vinyl sash window in the location of the aforementioned window. See image #2 of submitted imagery.

- E. Remove a pair of jalousie (partial length) windows.
- F. Install a pair of sliding vinyl windows in the location of aforementioned windows. See images #s 3 and 4 of submitted imagery.

## **CLARIFICATIONS**

1. Provide imagery or a model of the sliding components and treatment of the tripartite window and the pair of raised windows.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS/REQUESTS**

This application involves the removal of later windows and the installation of vinyl windows. The application last appeared before the Board on June 18, 2014. The Board tabled the application for clarification and lack of information.

The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that 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 and when original windows are not intact alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building (See B-1.).

The subject windows – one picture, one single, and a pair of raised windows – occupy original fenestrated bays, but are not the original fenestrated units. Only the duplex dwelling's façade possesses its original windows. The original windows are wood in composition and casement in type. Minimally visible at an oblique, the subject windows are located within the middle portion of the South (side) Elevation and do not directly engage the street. The proposed windows are vinyl in composition and varied in construction. Vinyl windows have been approved on two test case approvals, one for new construction and a second for replacement of lost windows. The latter approval, which was issued for 58 Bradford Avenue, involved the installation of vinyl sash windows on house lacking all of its original windows. Based on the size of the openings and the design of the house, the windows would have originally been sash windows.

The three part picture or Chicago window would retain its tripartite composite. Instead of flanking metal casement windows, the outer windows would be sliding (accordion) in construction. No imagery has been provided of the accordion component of the said windows. The single aluminum window would be replaced with one-over-one sash window. The pair of kitchen type windows (jalousies at present) would be replaced with sliding windows. No exacting imagery has been proved.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-2) and clarification listed above, Staff does not recommend approval of this application for reason of lack of information. While the applicant's representative has provided some imagery, the imagery has not been fully tailored to the subject windows. As articulated in the application, Staff believes this application would impair the architectural character of the building.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Henry Santelices with Window World was present to discuss the application.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt welcomed the applicant's representative. He asked Mr. Santelices if he had any clarifications to address, comments to make, or questions to ask.

Mr. Santelices stated that he was present to address the Board's concerns. He added that the present windows constituted a fire hazard.

Mr. Holmes and Mr. Allen reiterated and expanded upon the Staff Report and presentation. Mr. Holmes stated that the Board requires drawings that represent the windows as proposed for installation.

Mr. Santelices stated that who could not provide renderings of products which have not been constructed.

Mr. Holmes said that elevation and section drawings would be required, as well s clarifications as per the muntin treatment.

Mr. Santelices voiced his unfamiliarity with the possibility of executing internal, external, and midpoint muntins. Mr. Holmes and Mr. Stone cited examples executed by Marvin and Pella, two window manufacturers.

Mr. Holmes asked if casement windows could be executed. Mr. Santelices answered yes, but the applicant would have to agree to their use.

Mr. Holmes again reiterated the submission of drawings (elevation, section, and muntin), as well as a sample model.

Mr. Santelices was informed that it would be advisable if the application was tabled than denied.

The Board tabled the application for lack of information.

**TABLED.**