

## ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES

July 7, 2010 – 3:00 P.M.

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

### A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Harris Oswalt, called the meeting to order at 3:00. Cart Blackwell, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:  
**Members Present:** David Barr, Gertrude Baker, Carlos Gant, Bill James, Thomas Karwinski, Harris Oswalt, Craig Roberts.  
**Members Absent:** Bradford Ladd, Jim Wagoner, Janetta Whitt-Mitchell, and Barja Wilson.  
**Staff Members Present:** Cart Blackwell, John Lawler, and Sandra Franks.
2. Mr. Karwinski moved to approve the minutes of the 2009 meeting as amended by the Board. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.
3. Upon clarification of the addresses for midmonth applications 19 and 20, 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: Pamela Dykes**
  - a. Property Address: 66 South Ann Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 6/8/10
  - c. Project: Paint exterior per existing color scheme.
2. **Applicant: Chris Cruthirds**
  - a. Property Address: 1058 Old Shell Road
  - b. Date of Approval: 6/8/10
  - c. Project: Repair front pier replace front sill and stabilize front porch. Replace house fascia. Repair/replace front columns matching the original in profile, dimension and material. Redeck and reroof using a 30 year architectural shingle, gray in color. Reconstruct a later rear porch using 5/4 tongue and groove wood with the MHDC standard step rail and balustrade. All repairs to match the original in profile, dimension and materials. Tree trimming is to be approved by Urban Forestry.
3. **Applicant: Cynthia Karns**
  - a. Property Address: 1564 Blair Avenue
  - b. Date of Approval: 6/8/10
  - c. Project: Repaint per the existing color scheme.
4. **Applicant: A. R. McMorris Inc.**
  - a. Property Address: 202 Government Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 6/10/10
  - c. Project: Install new front door, solid wood, dark brown stain, stucco around it to match building.
5. **Applicant: Diversified Roofing**
  - a. Property Address: 1151 Dauphin Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 6/9/10
  - c. Project: Reroof two rear flat roof sections of the church with a flat built up roof and flashing, all to match the existing.
6. **Applicant: Bo Stacey**
  - a. Property Address: 56 South Catherine Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 6/14/10
  - c. Project: Replace the northwest rear elevation window to match the original wooden windows.

- 7. Applicant: Steve and Mary Watford**
- Property Address: 1367 Brown Street
  - Date of Approval: 6/14/10
  - Project: Repair woodwork when necessary. The repairs will match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Reroof the house with 3 tab shingles. Repaint per a forthcoming color scheme.
- 8. Applicant: Montdrakgo Caldwell**
- Property Address: 350 Marine Street
  - Date of Approval:
  - Project: Repair and replace rotten woodwork to match the existing. Reroof the house with architectural shingles. Remove the existing 2" by 4" balustrade and install an MHDC stock balustrade on the porch. Level the foundation and replace damaged sills. Repair damaged windows. Reinstall tongue-and-groove decking on the porches. Replace concrete block foundation piers with brick piers. Remove the concrete steps on the front and back porch steps. Construct wooden steps with railings to match the porch balustrade. Repaint the house per the submitted Valspar color scheme: body, Battleship Grey; Trim, Delicate White.
- 9. Applicant: Eugene Morgan**
- Property Address: 158 S. Warren
  - Date of Approval: 6/15/10
  - Project: Replace rotten trim, and repaint to match.
- 10. Applicant: Pat Woolf**
- Property Address: 1115 Church Street
  - Date of Approval: 6/15/10
  - Project: Redeck porch with tongue and groove, repaint green.
- 11. Applicant: Virginia Snider**
- Property Address: 407 Church Street
  - Date of Approval: 6/16/10
  - Project: Repoint house's west elevation with lime/sand mortar mix.
- 12. Applicant: Sharleen Begnaud**
- Property Address: 9 South Joachim Street
  - Date of Approval: 6/20/10
  - Project: Install a double-faced wooden wall sign measuring 3' x 2' in dimension. The sign will feature the name and logo of the establishment.
- 13. Applicant: Family, Land, and Properties, LLC**
- Property Address: 605 Saint Francis Street
  - Date of Approval: 6/21/10
  - Project: Replace the existing six foot wood privacy fencing to match the existing. Remove the existing section of wooden privacy fencing to the west of the house. Install a six foot iron gate featuring fleur-di-lys finials. The same style gate will be put in place of the existing wooden gate located in the driveway to the east of the house. Reinstall gravel in the rear lot's parking lot. Landscape the areas around the parking pad. The work in the rear lot will not be visible from the street. Install French drains to the east and west of the house, along the drive and lot line respectively. Remove the existing lattice skirting. Install framed, suspended, and recessed lattice skirting between the foundation piers. Repair and replace siding and woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repaint the house per the existing color scheme.
- 14. Applicant: Sailor Cashion**
- Property Address: 9 South Lafayette Street
  - Date of Approval: 6/22/10
  - Project: New wooden Craftsman style front door.

**15. Applicant: James Twilley**

- a. Property Address: 154 South Lawrence Street
- b. Date of Approval: 6/23/10
- c. Project: Repair the shutters. Work is to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repaint per the existing color scheme.

**16. Applicant: Debbie Hartley**

- a. Property Address: 61 LeMoyné
- b. Date of Approval: 6/23/10
- c. Project: Reroof, Black Onyx asphalt shingle.

**17. Applicant: Ashley Davis**

- a. Property Address: 155 Davitt Street
- b. Date of Approval: 6/24/10
- c. Project: Reroof the house with architectural shingles..

**18. Applicant: Slade Spare**

- a. Property Address: 18 Oakland Terrace
- b. Date of Approval: 6/24/10
- c. Project: Repaint the house per the submitted Olympic color scheme. The body will be Thin Ice. The brickwork will be Secret Passage. The porch decking will be Knight's Armor. The porch ceiling will be Souvenir.

**19. Applicant: Jose Attar**

- a. Property Address: 1200 Government Street
- b. Date of Approval: 6/28/10
- c. Project: Remove the asphalt parking lot from the backyard. Plant grass and landscape the backyard. Enclose the backyard with in 8' wooden interior lot privacy fence. The fence will not extend beyond the rear plane of the house and will be located along the property's eastern and northern rear lot lines.

**20. Applicant: E. A. Keeble**

- a. Property Address: 966 Augusta Street
- b. Date of Approval: 6/28/10
- c. Project: Replace porch columns to match (including capitals and bases), repair/replace balusters to match, replace steps and newels, redeck with tongue and groove to match.

**C. APPLICATIONS**

**1. 2010-50-CA: 11 Macy Place**

- a. Applicant: Wells Builders for Ken and Patti Haynie
- b. Project: Replace the house's windows.

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

**2. 2010-51-CA: 460 George Street**

- a. Applicant: Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund
- b. Project: Demolish the fire damaged house.

**APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

**3. 2010-52-CA: 1554 Fearnway**

- a. Applicant: Don Bowden with Bowden Architecture for Byron and Megan Jorns
- b. Project: Remodel the house's facade.

**APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

**D. OTHER BUSINESS**

- 1. Guidelines
- 2. Discussion

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

**2010-50-CA: 11 Macy Place**  
**Applicant: Wells Builders Inc. for Ken and Patti Haynie**  
**Received: 6/8/10**  
**Meeting: 7/7/10**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Replace the house's windows.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

With its stuccoed walls, arched openings, and tiled roof, this circa 1925 house adopts characteristics of the Arts and Crafts informed Mission 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 has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. In September of 2000, a previous owner removed the original steel casement windows. Working without a Certificate of Appropriateness, the then owner installed the current vinyl windows. The cheaply made windows have since deteriorated. The new owner/applicant's representatives propose replacing the vinyl windows with higher quality aluminum clad wooden windows.
- B. The Design 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. “Where windows cannot be repaired, new windows must be compatible to the existing. The size and placement of new windows for additions or alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.”
- C. Scope of Work:
  - 1. Replace the deteriorated and unauthorized vinyl windows with aluminum clad windows.
    - a. The windows will be casement type.
    - b. The case windows will be set in wood frames.

Clarifications

- 1. Will the windows feature muntins?
- 2. How will the façade's arched windows be treated?

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

As previously mentioned, the original steel casement windows were removed in 2000. With regard to material and design, the replacement vinyl windows were of an inferior quality. The proposed aluminum clad wooden casement windows replicate the original type. The proposed replacement windows are a higher quality and better design than the unauthorized replacement windows. Given that the original windows were removed prior to the purchase by the present applicant, the window type replicates the originals, and the replacements are better crafted than the existing, the proposed windows would increase the architectural and historical integrity of the house.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-2) and pending the above clarifications, 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**

Martin Patrick and Aaron Wells were present to represent the applicant and discuss the application.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt asked the applicant's representatives if they had any clarifications to make or comments to add with regard to the Staff Report. Mr. Wells addressed the two clarifications listed in the Staff Report. First, he told the Board that the proposed windows would feature applied muntins. Secondly, he said that the transom bar dividing the existing window frames from the arched tops would not be replicated. The proposed window treatment would be a single unit that would encompass the whole of the window bay.

Mr. Oswalt asked the Board if they had any comments to make or questions to ask the applicant's representatives. Mr. Roberts asked Mr. Wells if the windows would be operable or fixed. Mr. Wells informed the Board that the windows would be fixed. Mr. Roberts addressed the Board, the applicants, and the audience. He told those assembled that he was pleased to see a submission for modern, yet traditional windows. Mr. Roberts pointed out that the original casement windows, as evidenced in a Staff File photograph, featured transom bars dividing the casement windows from the arched tops. He asked Mr. Patrick and Mr. Wells if the applicant would be amenable to replicating that treatment. Mr. Patrick said the manufacturer and the installer could comply with the request. Mr. Wells said that he thought the applicants would agree to a condition calling for a transom.

Mr. Roberts asked his fellow board members to give their professional opinions on the proposed window treatment, particularly how the design could be improved. He said that while the application as submitted did not impair the house or the district, the design could still be improved.

Mr. Karwinski told Mr. Wells and Mr. Patrick that the front windows should reflect the detailing of the façade's French casement windows. He said that he was more flexible regarding the window treatment on the side elevations. Mr. Karwinski informed the Board and the applicant's representatives that the installation of the proposed windows was of greater concern than the design of the window units themselves. He pointed out the window treatment at 17 Macy Place, another Spanish Colonial Revival residence, featured casement windows. Mr. Karwinski noted that the framing and filling out of those windows could serve as an example for how to improve the design of the proposed windows. Mr.

Karwinski suggested the use of a brick mold as means of improving the window design. He asked Mr. Wells and Mr. Patrick if the proposed window units would require additional framing for proper structural installation. Mr. Wells and Mr. Patrick replied, saying that while the windows would require some framing, the filling out would be far less than that of the existing, thus more approximately the appearance of the original window treatment. They told the Board that it was their aim to replicate, as much as possible, the original fenestration. Consequently, Mr. Wells said, they would reduce the filler as much as possible.

Mr. James discussed the framing out of the windows with Mr. Wells and Mr. Patrick. Mr. Roberts asked the applicant's representatives what type of framing material would be used. Mr. Patrick told the Board that a hardboard or another composite material would be used to frame the windows. Mr. James asked Mr. Patrick and Mr. Wells to what extent, or lack thereof, would the proposed windows differ from the replacement windows. They said that the framing out or filling would be reduced, thus more closely resembling the original window bays. Mr. James asked Mr. Wells what color the windows would be. Mr. Wells said the owners proposed using a color called "stone white."

Mr. Oswalt reminded his fellow Board members that they must address the application as proposed. He asked the applicant's representatives if they were amenable to altering the proposal to take into account the Board's suggestions regarding the use of a brick mold surround and a transom bar. Mr. Wells and Mr. Patrick said they had no objection. Mr. Oswalt asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. Upon hearing no response, Mr. Oswalt 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, amending the facts to allow the use of a brick mold and a transom bar to be approved by Staff.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

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

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 7/7/11**

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

**2010-51-CA: 460 George Street**  
**Applicant: Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund**  
**Received: 6/9/10**  
**Meeting: 7/6/10**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Demolish the fire damaged house.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This circa 1900 house began its evolution as a shotgun. A side wing and rear galleries were added shortly thereafter.

**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. An April 9, 2010 fire gutted the interior and the portions of the exterior. The structural unsound building poses safety concerns. The applicant proposes demolishing the structure, leveling the lot, and planting grass.
- B. In 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;  
This building is a contributing structure within the Oakleigh Garden District. The distinctive plan, a product of an early addition, constitutes what is in effect a marriage of the Victorian advanced side bay and the vernacular shotgun type. Later additions and enclosures skirt the sides and rear of the dwelling.
    - ii. The importance of the structures to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;
      - 1. While not an exemplar of a particular architectural style or building type, contributes to the physical density and visual rhythm of the streetscape.

- iii. The difficulty or the impossibility of reproducing the structure because of its design, texture, material, detail or unique location;
    - 1. 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. While the house is not a surviving example of a single architectural style, the early expansion of the house constitutes the marriage of two house types well represented in the Oakleigh Garden District.
  - 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 applicants will salvage the few remaining materials from the house, level the site, and plant grass on the lot.
  - vi. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
    - 1. The owner acquired the property on March 30, 2006 at a price of \$21,000.
  - vii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
    - 1. The applicant initially planned to stabilize and then restore the house, but upon realizing the extent of the damage and the safety hazard decided against restoration. If granted demolition approval, the applicant will level the lot and plant grass.
  - viii. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
    - 1. Not applicable.
  - 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. Not applicable.
  - x. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
    - 1. Not given
  - 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; and
    - 1. Check submitted.
  - xii. Such other information as may reasonably be required by the board.
    - 1. See submitted materials.
3. *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

- 1. Demolish the house.
- 2. Plant grass on the lot.



## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

Fire damage varies from configuration to configuration. The source of the fire, condition of the building, duration of the fire, and material of the building determine the degree of damage. In this instance, the fire began in the center of this wood frame house. In spreading out from the source, the entirety of the finishes and a significant portion of the structural elements were damaged beyond repair.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-3), Staff believes the demolition of the house impairs the integrity of the district, but based on the extent of the fire damage, recommends approval of the demolition application.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Tommy Tyrrell was present to discuss the application.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt asked Mr. Tyrrell if he had any questions to ask or clarifications to make with regard to the Staff Report. Mr. Tyrrell referenced the insurance reports from the fire.

Mr. Oswalt asked the Board if they had any comments to make or questions to ask Mr. Tyrrell. Mrs. Baker asked Staff why a site plan was not included in the board members' packets. Mr. Blackwell explained that since the application did not call for rebuilding, extensive landscaping, or parking, no site plan was required.

## **FINDING OF FACT**

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

## **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Mr. Karwinski moved that, based upon the facts as approved by the Board, the application does impair the historic integrity of the district or the building, but a Certificate of Appropriateness should be issued on account of the extent of the fire damage.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 7/7/11**

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

**2010-52-CA: 1554 Fearnway**  
**Applicant: Don Bowden with Bowden Architecture for Byron and Megan Jorns**  
**Received: 6/21/10**  
**Meeting: 7/7/10**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way  
Classification: Non-Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Remodel the facade.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This 1949 “ranch house” is constructed of salvaged brick. Combining contemporary fashion and historical tradition, the façade features curved bay windows flanking a porch with cast iron supports.

**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**

- B. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review on June 2, 2010. At that time, the applicants withdrew the application for remodeling the façade. Taking into account the recommendations made by the Board, the applicant’s representative submits an altered application for reconsideration.
- C. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  - a. “A building’s base, or foundation, gives the building a sense of strength and stability, and serves to ‘tie’ the structure to the ground. Traditionally, residential buildings were raised on piers. Occasionally, certain early styles and mid-20<sup>th</sup> century styles used continuous foundations.”
  - b. “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.”
- D. Scope of Work:
  - a. Remodel the façade
    - i. Remove the existing inoperable wooden louvered shutters.
    - ii. Install operable wooden paneled shutters.
    - iii. Remove the existing door surround and door.
    - iv. Install a new surround and a new wooden door.
      - 1. The wooden door will feature a single paneled section below a glazed upper section.

- v. Remove the existing cast iron porch supports.
- vi. Install paneled wooden columnar posts.
- vii. Construct slightly advanced wooden porch piers beneath the new columnar posts.
- viii. Remove the existing porch pavers.
- ix. Install new porch tiles.
- x. Demolish the existing front steps.
- xi. Salvage the bricks from the existing front steps.
- xii. Construct a new set of brick steps featuring antepodia at either end.
- xiii. Remove the existing front walkway.
- xiv. Install a new concrete walkway bordered with bricks salvaged from the existing.
- xv. Paint per the submitted Sherwin Williams color scheme:
  - 1. The porch posts and window trim will be Extra White.
  - 2. The trim and detailing will be Maison Blanche.
  - 3. The shutters will be Andiron.
  - 4. The door will be Foothills.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

This house is one of several mid 20<sup>th</sup>-century ranch houses featuring salvaged brick and traditional ironwork that can be found in the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. Numerous other examples of the genre can be seen in the City’s western suburbs. While not listed as a contributing building when surveyed in 1984, this building would now be considered a contributing structure on account of its age and style.

This altered proposal for remodeling the façade does not feature the more pronounced Arts and Crafts influenced detailing that characterized previous submission. The eyebrow dormer has been omitted and the tapered piers have been straightened. The character defining cast iron porch supports would still be replaced. As explained at the previous meeting, the iron posts would have to be altered in height and form prior to reinstallation in order to address settling and structural issues. The proposed post treatment, paneled columnar piers, would maintain to some degree the balance of old and new that informs the whole of the house’s historical integrity – traditional materials and/or forms used on a modern form.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-2), Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or the historical character of the district. Staff recommends approval of this application on account of the aforementioned structurally-informed alterations entailed in the remodeling. Staff does recommend that the applicant reuse, save, or sell the ironwork.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Byron and Megan Jorns were present to discuss the application.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt asked the applicants if they had any comments to make or questions to ask with regard to the Staff Report. Mr. Jorns told the Board that the discussion during June 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting effectively addressed their concerns.

Mr. Roberts reminded Board, Staff, and the applicants of the transactions of the June 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting. He said that during the meeting the applicant’s representative mentioned alternative treatments for the façade. Mr.

Roberts told the Board that those earlier alternatives, as well as additional recommendations made at the June 2 meeting, were reflected in the revised application. Mr. Roberts voiced his approval of the current submission.

A discussion on the process and designation of contributing and non-contributing buildings ensued.

#### **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. Mr. Oswalt voted in opposition.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 7/7/11**