

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD AGENDA
June 1, 2011 – 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, Thomas Karwinski, Harris Oswalt, Craig Roberts, and Janetta Whitt-Mitchell.
Members Absent: Gertrude Baker, Carlos Gant, Kim Hardin, Bill James, Bradford Ladd, Jim Wagoner, Janetta Whitt-Mitchell, and Barja Wilson.
Staff Members Present: Cart Blackwell, Sandra Franks, and John Lawler.
2. Mr. Oswalt moved to holdover approval of the minutes of the May 18, 2011 meeting. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.
3. Mr. Roberts moved to approve the midmonth COA's granted by Staff. The motion received a second and passed unanimously. Discussion ensued on midmonth #11.

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED

1. **Applicant: Bradley Roe**
 - a. Property Address: 119 North Julia Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/10/11
 - c. Project: Reissue of an expired COA calling for the construction of a garage. The garage was halfway completed according to plans. The reissue of the COA will allow its completion.
2. **Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley for William Cutts**
 - a. Property Address: 250 Chatham Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/10/11
 - c. Project: Reissue of an expired Certificate of Appropriateness dating from June 13, 2005. The Certificate of Appropriateness called for the installation of a 4' iron fence. The installation of 4' high iron fencing falls within Staff or Midmonth approvals.
3. **Applicant: Wendell Quimby**
 - a. Property Address: 701 Spring Hill Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/10/11
 - c. Project: Reroof the building to match the existing.
4. **Applicant: Juanita Owens**
 - a. Property Address: 100 Michael Donald Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/12/11
 - c. Project: Repair and replace rotten woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repaint per a previously selected color palette.
5. **Applicant: Steve Miller**
 - a. Property Address: 209 South Georgia Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/13/11
 - c. Project: Replace rotten wood to match existing and repaint as per existing.
6. **Applicant: Sue Stewart**
 - a. Property Address: 205 Michigan Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/17/11
 - c. Project: Paint the house per the submitted Valspar color scheme. The body will be Polished Silver. The trim will be white.

7. **Applicant: Jamey Watt with Watt Construction for Paulette Walsh**
 - a. Property Address: 715 Monroe Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/19/11
 - c. Project: Replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing. Touch up paint to match.
8. **Applicant: Suzanne Fearn**
 - a. Property Address: 1561 Monterey Place
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/19/11
 - c. Project: Construct a storage building per MHDC stock plans. The shed will meet setback requirements.
9. **Applicant: Cooner Roofing for the Government Street Presbyterian Church**
 - a. Property Address: 51 South Jackson Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/19/11
 - c. Project: Repair and replace rotten woodwork to match the existing. Replace gutters to match the existing. Repaint to match the existing color scheme.
10. **Applicant: Dixie Carlson**
 - a. Property Address: 1653 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/19/11
 - c. Project: This updates the COA for 11/30/09. Paint house, body Hotel St Francis Fawn. Trim and accents Flaming Torch. Shutters brown. Columns and balustrade white. Repair any rotten woodwork and siding to match existing in profile and dimension. Reroof as necessary to match existing.
11. **Applicant: McGill Toolen Catholic High School**
 - a. Property Address: 1414 or 1418 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/20/11
 - c. Project: Remove two sections of wooden fencing. Remove an eight foot section of wooden fencing located between the northwest corner of the lot and the front plane of the apartment house of the neighboring property to the north. Remove the southernmost section of the eastern lot. Install extensions of the approved ornamental metal on the aforementioned locations.
12. **Applicant: Chris Pringle**
 - a. Property Address: 221 or 221 ½ Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/20/11
 - c. Project: Remove a section of aluminum storefront. Repair rotten woodwork. Reinstall said section of aluminum storefront.
13. **Applicant: Gerry Graham for Robert Bantens**
 - a. Property Address: 1565 Monterey Place
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/23/11
 - c. Project: Reroof the house with 3-tab shingles.
14. **Applicant: Robert Dobson**
 - a. Property Address: 200 South Broad Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/20/11
 - c. Project: Repaint house Vanilla Cream and white trim. Replace rotten siding and fascia as necessary.
15. **Applicant: Benjamin Cummings for the Oakleigh Garden District Society**
 - a. Property Address: Washington Square/251 Chatham Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/23/11
 - c. Project: Revise a Certificate of Appropriateness issued on 11/13/10 calling for the reinstallation of sculptural components on the Square's fountain. This revision calls for

16. Applicant: Randy Pope

- a. Property Address: 501 Government Street
- b. Date of Approval: 5/19/11
- c. Project: Reroof with metal roof to match the existing..

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2011-35-CA: 1712 Laurel Street

- a. Applicant: Richard Tippy for Stephen & Lorna Hodges
- b. Project: New Construction – Construct a rear addition.

APPROVED AS AMMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

2. 2011-37-CA: 18 North Monterey Street

- a. Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley for Kathryn Peterson & Owen Drey
- b. Project: Alter a side-facing gable.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

3. 2011-38-CA: 956 Savannah Street

- a. Applicant: Edwena Seals
- b. Project: Demolition Request – Demolish a fire damaged house.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

- 1. Alternative Decking Treatments
- 2. Discussion

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2011-36-CA: 1712 Laurel Street
Applicant: Richard Tippy for Stephen & Lorna Hodges
Received: 5/11/11
Meeting: 6/1/11

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: New Construction – Construct a rear addition.

BUILDING HISTORY

This single story Arts & Crafts influenced house was constructed circa 1920. The façade features a porch with a clapboarded railing and a front door with an articulated door surround.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The applicants propose the construction of a small rear addition.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Rehabilitation and Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 1. “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.”
 2. “New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment will be unimpaired.”
 3. “Original window opening should be retained.”
 4. “Original doors and openings should be retained along with any moldings, transoms, or sidelights. Replacements should respect the age and the style of the building.”
- C. **Scope of Work (per submitted site plan):**
 1. Construct a rear addition.
 - a. The addition will measure 27.5’ by 22’ in plan.
 - b. The addition will rest atop either a slab foundation or brick foundation piers.
 - c. The addition will feature wooden siding matching the existing.
 - d. Corner posts will be utilized to demarcate the existing house from the addition.
 - e. The addition’s gable roof will maintain the pitch of rear wing’s gable roof.

- f. The roofing shingles will match the existing.
 - g. The addition will feature six-over-one wooden windows matching those found on the body of the main house.
 - h. Windows from the North and East Elevations will be reutilized on the addition.
 - i. The eave detailing and brackets will match that found on the body of the house.
 - j. The East Elevation will feature two six-over-one windows. See C (3) a-c.
 - k. The North Elevation will feature three six-over-one windows and a paneled & glazed door. The existing louvered vent will be reused or replicated.
 - l. The West Elevation will feature one six-over-one window and a paneled & glazed wooden door.
2. Remove a secondary door from the South Elevation.
 - a. A multi light wooden window will replace the door.
 3. Alter fenestration on the East Elevation.
 - a. Remove two windows comprising the rear block's tripartite window grouping.
 - b. The windows are not visible from the public view.
 - c. The two windows will be reused on the addition's East Elevation.
 - d. Center the remaining window.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of a rear addition and the alteration of existing fenestration.

The proposed addition would be minimally visible from the street. The submitted design successfully negotiates the main house's irregular grouping of a main block and an off set rear wing. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation state that in applications involving the additions to historic structures the old should be differentiated from the new. The proposed addition will be differentiated by corner posts thereby allowing the new construction to "read" as a later intervention to an older structure. As proposed the addition will be constructed atop either a concrete slab foundation or a raised pier foundation like that employed on the main house. Staff recommends the use of the latter. The roof will feature the form and continue the pitch of the rear wing. Siding, windows, roofing materials, and detailing will match the existing. Continuity massing and detail will allow the addition to complement the historic house. The proposed design and materials meet the standards outlined in the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts. Staff does not believe the proposed addition will impair the architectural or the historical integrity of the building.

The unused door is located on the front of the recessed rear wing. Though facing the street, the South Elevation's secondary door is minimally visible from the public right of way. Siting and landscaping not only obscure the door, but also allow cause it to resemble a window. The Guidelines address main, prominent, and/or significant entrances, not secondary non-character defining points of ingress and egress.

Similarly, the fenestration alterations proposed for the main house's east elevation affect a secondary feature and elevation. The windows cannot be seen from the public right of way. The windows would be reused on the addition. On account of the location and treatment of the proposed alterations to existing fenestration, Staff does not believe the proposed changes will impair the architectural or the historical integrity of the building or the district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-4), Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the building or the district. Staff recommends approval of this application on the condition that the application employ a pier supported foundation instead of a continuous foundation treatment.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Stephen Hodges and Richard Tippy were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt welcomed the applicant and his representative. He asked the two gentlemen to state their names. Upon hearing their responses, Mr. Oswalt asked Mr. Hodges and Mr. Tippy if they had any comments to add, questions to ask, and clarifications to make with regard to the Staff Report.

Mr. Hodges said that he had nothing to add. Mr. Tippy said that he and Mr. Hodges had meet with Mr. Blackwell on the site. He stated that the submitted design reflects their on site discussion. Mr. Tippy pointed out that the proposal calls for both matching treatments and differentiation between old and new. He said that he and Mr. Hodges were present to discuss the foundation treatment. Mr. Oswalt stated that foundation treatment was the only matter of concern. Mr. Tippy said that Mr. Hodges would prefer a slab foundation for reason of increased room heights.

Mr. Karwinski said he had one comment to make. He told the applicant, his representative, and his fellow Board members that a step down resulting from a slab foundation would result in awkwardness of appearance. He suggested the use of a vaulted ceiling. In adopting this approach, increased ceiling height could be gained without sacrificing design aesthetics. Mr. Tippy agreed. He told the Board that he had mentioned this alternative to the applicant, but it was not his decision. Mr. Hodges agreed to employ a pier foundation treatment on the addition. Said addition's piers and siding would be at the same level.

Mr. Oswalt asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. Upon hearing no response, he closed the period of public comment. Mr. Oswalt asked his fellow Board members if they had any further questions to ask. Ms. Whitt-Mitchell asked for clarification regarding the foundation treatment and heights.

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 facts to delete the option of a slab foundation.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 6/1/12

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2011-36-CA: 19 North Monterey Street
Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley for Kathryn Peterson & Owen Drey
Received: 5/16/11
Meeting: 6/1/11

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Alter a side-facing gable.

BUILDING HISTORY

This transitional house dates from circa 1914. The asymmetrical massing belies the continued influence of Queen Anne planning methods while the simple detailing indicates an ongoing wave of neoclassical resurgence.

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 December 3, 2007. At that time the Board approved the construction of a fence. In this submittal, the applicants propose the alteration a secondary side gable.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Rehabilitation and Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 1. “The type, size and dividing lights of windows and their location and configuration (rhythm) on the building help establish the historic character of a building. Original window openings should be retained as well as original sashes and glazing.”
 2. “A roof is one of the most dominant features of a building. Original or historic roof forms, as well as the original pitch of the roof should be maintained. Materials should be appropriate to the form and pitch and color.”
 3. “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.”
 4. “New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment will be unimpaired.”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):

1. Alter the North or Side Elevations gable.
 - a. The gable will be heightened 4' above the existing horizontal cornice line.
 - b. The gabled wall dormer will feature siding that will match the existing.
 - c. The gabled wall dormer will feature a six-over-one wooden window.
 - d. The detailing and composition of the gable surround will be replicated.
 - e. The roof pitch of the gable will remain the same.
 - f. The roofing shingles will match the existing.
 - g. The work will be painted to match the existing color scheme.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the alteration to a side elevation gable. The house features a complicated roof configuration. A primary hipped roof is skirted and punctuated by secondary gables and dormers. Some of the dormers date from construction of the home. Later dormers, gables, and other roof forms ensued (The most recent are Board approvals.)

This proposal calls for raising the height of a North or side Elevation's gable four additional feet. The house is situated on a corner lot. The gable faces a New Hamilton Street. Though the proposed alteration would be largely concealed by the tree canopy, the historic roof form and window configuration would be changed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-4), Staff believes this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the building or the district. Staff does not recommend approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Douglas B. Kearley 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. Kearley if he had any comments to add, questions to ask, or clarifications to make with regard to the Staff Report.

Mr. Kearley explained the reason of the addition. He told the Board that the applicant's were expecting their fourth child. He said that in order to convert the interior volume behind the gable into a room certain usability and code requirements would have to be meet. With regards to usability, the ceiling would have to be raised. In order to meet egress codes, the window type would have to be altered. Mr. Kearley stated that the roof had been previously altered. He said that he understood that the gable faced a street, but the gable was neither a character defining feature nor was the street a major thoroughfare. Mr. Kearley said he photographs of Board approved alterations to primary facades. He provided the Board with photographs of several projects.

Mr. Roberts said that while he appreciated Staff's steadfastness to the Secretary of the Interior's standards, he said that in this case said adherence was not necessary. He agreed that the roof had been altered on several occasions. As had been stated previously, he pointed out the secondary location.

Mr. Oswalt asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. Upon hearing no response, he closed the period of public comment.

FINDING OF FACT

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the facts as 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 passed. Mr. Karwinski voted in opposition.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 6/1/12

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2011-37-CA: 956 Savannah Street
Applicant: Edwena Seals
Received: 5/13/11
Meeting: 6/1/11

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

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

BUILDING HISTORY

This single story, hipped roof Craftsman-influenced dwelling dates from 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 property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. A neighboring property burned to the ground on February 8, 2011. The subject dwelling suffered extensive damage as consequence of the fire. The owner/applicant appears before the Board with a request to demolish the burned out building.
- B. The 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 house is contributing structure in the Oakleigh Garden District. The single-story hipped roof dwelling is one of many minimally detailed Arts & Crafts influenced houses located across the Southeast. Like many other regional examples, the house features a full-length gallery.
 - ii. The importance of the structures to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;
 - 1. This house is located on Savannah Street, a street in the heart of the Oakleigh Garden District. As characteristic of the larger district,

- 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. This single-story house of Craftsman inspiration is one of many Arts & Crafts informed houses featuring single story porches. These simple box-like hipped roof dwellings are found across the Southeast.
 - 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/applicant purchased the property in 2006 at a purchase price of \$10.00.
 - vii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
 - 1. The fire damage was so extensive that the applicant has not entertained the idea of restoring the house.
 - viii. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
 - 1. The property has not been listed for sale.
 - 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. Application 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 (per submitted plans):
1. Demolish a single story Craftsman-influenced dwelling.
 2. Level the lot.
 3. Plant grass on the lot.

STAFF ANALYSIS

When reviewing applications calling for the demolition of property's principal building, four primary areas of concern are taken into account: the architectural significance of the building; the effect of the demolition on the streetscape; the condition of the building; and the nature of the proposed redevelopment.

With regard to architectural significance, this structure is a contributing residential building in the Oakleigh Garden Street. The fire damaged house is one of many single story Craftsman-influenced houses. A large number of these dwellings are box-like in form and simple in detail. Like the subject dwelling, they feature full-length galleries and hipped roofs. Houses of this type are found across Mobile and the Southeast.

Prior to the devastating fire of February 8, 2011, this house was integral component of the 900 block of Savannah's Street. The block comprised one of the most physically intact residential blocks in the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. The fire had a tremendous impact on the streetscape. The blaze, which originated 958 Savannah Street, engulfed that building in addition to largely destroying the subject building. 960 Savannah Street also suffered extensive damage. The 900 block's surviving buildings are situated on relatively small, albeit deep lots. All buildings are located in close proximity to the street. The demolition of the fire-gutted dwelling will leave a hollow in the center of the block, but the effect thereof would be more pronounced if the building was located on a corner lot.

As per condition, 956 Savannah Street was in a good state of repair prior to the fire. The fire took out the western wall and destroyed the sill system, wall system, and roof structure. Vandals subsequently looted the building.

On account of the extent of fire damage, the applicant's have not investigated restoring the house. The proposal calls for the leveling of the lot and the planting of grass.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Though the loss of this contributing building will impair the streetscape and the district, Staff regrettably recommends approval of the demolition on account of the extent of fire damage.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

No one was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Blackwell addressed the Board. He told the assembled Board members that he had communicated with Ms. Seals in person, by letter, and via the phone. Mr. Blackwell asked the Board if they wanted to review the application despite her absence. He reminded the Board of the property's condition. Mr. Oswalt said the application could be reviewed. He concurred with Mr. Blackwell and the Staff Report regarding the building's condition. A

limited discussion as to any proposed development of the fired damaged block ensued. There was no one in the audience to speak for or against the application.

FINDING OF FACT

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the facts as amended by the Board, the application does impair the historic integrity of the district and the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition 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: 6/1/12