

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
March 16, 2011 – 3:00 P.M.
Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Bradford Ladd, called the meeting to order at 3:00. Cart Blackwell, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
Members Present: Gertrude Baker, Thomas Karwinski, Bradford Ladd, Harris Oswalt, and Janetta Whitt-Mitchell.
Members Absent: Carlos Gant, Kim Harden, Craig Roberts, Jim Wagoner, and Barja Wilson.
Staff Members Present: Devereaux Bemis and Cart Blackwell.
2. Mr. Oswalt moved to approve the minutes of the April 2, 2011 meeting. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.
3. Mr. Oswalt 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: Scogin Construction**
 - a. Property Address: 1116 Palmetto Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/21/11
 - c. Project: Repair and replace wooden siding to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material.
2. **Applicant: Joe Sledge**
 - a. Property Address: 114 Ryan Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/22/11
 - c. Project: Install insulation under the house and within the walls. Remove siding to install the insulation. Reinstall said siding.
3. **Applicant: Clark, Greer, Latham & Associates**
 - a. Property Address: 100 North Catherine Street / 1506 Old Shell Road
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/23/11
 - c. Project: Install a six foot interior lot privacy fence along the eastern lot line. The fence will step down three feet in height as it approaches the Old Shell Road.
4. **Applicant: Nicholas Holmes, Jr.**
 - a. Property Address: 1255 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/24/11
 - c. Project: Erect temporary construction fence on south side of property west of Ann Street. Replace metal siding and roof, doors to match existing on Arts Building.
5. **Applicant: Patsy Brandau**
 - a. Property Address: 66 Semmes Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/25/11
 - c. Project: Paint the house per the submitted Behr color scheme. The body will be Pelican Bay. The trim will be white. The detailing will be Thunder Bay.
6. **Applicant: Restore Mobile**
 - a. Property Address: 54 North Julia Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/25/11
 - c. Project: Repaint the house per the submitted Sherwin Williams color scheme. The body will be Rembrandt Ruby and the trim will be Classic White.
7. **Applicant: H. R. Construction**
 - a. Property Address: 1459 Brown Street

- b. Date of Approval: 2/25/11
- c. Project: Replace rotten wood, repaint as existing.
- 8. Applicant: Lance Carbary with Roof Doctors**
 - a. Property Address: 2 Water Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/28/11
 - c. Project: Repair the existing roof.
- 9. Applicant: Vrocher-Holmes**
 - a. Property Address: 463 Dexter Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/28/11
 - c. Project: Install a wooden handicap access ramp.
- 10. Applicant: Pat Woolf**
 - a. Property Address: 1115 Church Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/15/11
 - c. Project: Repaint, shutters, skirtboards, and brick dark green, body yellow (Daffodil, SW 6901 Sherwin Williams chart), trim buff. Erect three foot picket fence across front.
- 11. Applicant: Gulf States Engineering**
 - a. Property Address: 225 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/1/11
 - c. Project: Install two plain wall-mounted exterior lights over entrances at Joachim and Dauphin Streets. Lights are from Harris Lighting, 1200-WP Series, 12 inch square each and flat black.
- 12. Applicant: Clark, Greer, Latham & Associates**
 - a. Property Address: 1506 Old Shell Road, 100 N. Catherine Street, and 106 N. Catherine Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/1/11
 - c. Project: Reissue a COA of 1 October 2009 authorizing the “Demolish or relocate the house at 1506 Old Shell Road. Demolish the convenience Store at 100 North Catherine Street. Demolish or relocate the storage building at 106 North Catherine Street. Cut down four Live Oak trees. Install a parking lot, per submitted plan (set plan back into the lot, 4' or closest to north property line as possible). Parking spaces with occupy four sides of the property, as well as two aisles in the lot stormwater detention median will occupy the center of the lot. Two curbcuts will provide and ingress and egress to the lot. Landscape the property with trees and additional plantings.”
- 13. Applicant: Emad Zayed**
 - a. Property Address: 1100 Elmira Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/2/11
 - c. Project: Paint the building per the submitted Valspar color scheme. The body will be Royal Blue. The detailing will be red in hue. Reroof the building with charcoal gray shingles.
- 14. Applicant: Reginald Rogers**
 - a. Property Address: 1621 Lamar Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 3/2/11
 - c. Project: Repaint as per the existing.

C. APPLICATIONS

- 1. 2011-18-CA: 353 State Street**
 - a. Applicant: Douglas Burtu Kearley for Buffy & Bob Donlon
 - b. Project: Alter a later rear porch.

APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

2. 2011-19-CA: 656 Church Street

- a. Applicant: John E. Baker
- b. Project: Construct an enclosed addition to the existing carport.

APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

3. 2011-17-CA: 1010 Caroline Avenue

- a. Applicant: Joshua & Corrina Murray
- b. Project: Demolish a house.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

- 1. Guidelines
- 2. Discussion

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2011-18-CA: 253 State Street
Applicant: Douglas Burtu Kearley for Buffy & Bob Donlon
Received: 3/2/11
Meeting: 3/16/11

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Detonti Square
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Alter the treatment of a later rear porch.

BUILDING HISTORY

This 1873 building is one of Mobile's grandest Italianate residences. The overall side hall with recessed wing form was the predominant residential type of Mobile's civic commercial elite during the decade preceding the prior to the Civil War. Wealthy patrons continued to favor this distinctive house type into the 1880s.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on January 22, 2007. At that time, the Board approved the construction of a rear deck. The applicant's representative appears before the Board with an application entailing the alteration of the later rear porch.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. "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 the handrails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions and decorative details."
 - 2. "The form and shape of the porch [historic] and its roof should maintain their historic appearance. The materials should blend with the style of the building."
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
 - 1. Alter the treatment of the later rear porch.
 - a. Remove the existing screening located within the expanses of the porch bays.
 - b. Install sections of hardboard siding in the lower portion of the porch bays.
 - c. The East Elevation will feature two vertically oriented clad-wood sliding windows in each of its two porch bays.
 - d. The South Elevation's westernmost bay will be faced with hardboard siding.

- e. The South Elevation's center bay will feature two vertically oriented clad-wood windows.
- f. The South Elevation's easternmost bay will feature two fixed clad wood windows and a four paneled wooden door beneath a fixed transom. Said door is an existing feature.
- g. The West Elevation's southernmost bay will be faced with hardiboard siding.
- h. The West Elevation's northernmost bay will feature two vertically oriented clad-wood windows.
- i. A stuccoed faced chimney will rise from the southwest corner of the porch. The two bays possessing continuous siding will front the chimney shaft.
- j. The color scheme will match the existing.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the alteration of a later rear porch. The porch was constructed during the 2005-2006 restoration and renovation of the larger historic house complex. The porch is not visible from the public right of way. The overall form of the porch will remain the same.

The application calls for the installation of hardiboard siding and clad-wood windows within the existing porch bays. A chimney, whose shaft would be obscured by the siding, would be constructed in the southwest corner of the porch. The later porch abuts a rear wing that is in part wood frame and faced in construction. A wooden deck and pergola are located just south of the porch.

The proposed design and materials blend with the treatment of this portion of the larger residence. Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical integrity of the building or the district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or the historical character of the building or the district. Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Douglas B. Kearley was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Blackwell explained to the Board that he had misidentified several drawings in their packets. He noted that the drawings were correctly identified in the submitted plans. Ms. Baker acknowledged the discrepancy.

Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant. He asked Mr. Kearley if he had any comments to make or questions to ask with regard to the Staff Report. Mr. Kearley answered no.

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

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Oswalt moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, amending facts to note the correct labeling of the building elevations.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Karwinski 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: 3/16/12

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2011-19-CA: 656 Church Street
Applicant: John E. Baker
Received: 2/21/11
Meeting: 3/16/11

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Construct an enclosed addition to an existing carport.

BUILDING HISTORY

This circa 1900 shotgun dwelling features square section columnar posts and a pedimented gable.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on January 7, 2009. At that time, the Board approved the construction of a rear addition to the main house.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “An accessory structure is any construction other than the main building on the property. It includes but is not limited to garages, carports, pergolas, decks, pool covers, sheds and the like. The appropriateness of accessory structures shall be measured by the guidelines applicable to new construction. The structure must complement the design and scale of the main building”
- C. **Scope of Work (per submitted plans):**
 - 1. Construct an enclosed addition to an existing carport.
 - a. The proposed addition to the carport will be located 7 feet from the existing western privacy fence (which is set back over four feet from the inner edge of the sidewalk).
 - b. The addition will be located to the western side of the carport, behind an existing enclosure located within the confines of the carport.
 - c. The addition will measure 22’ x 8’ in plan
 - d. The addition’s foundation will be treated in the same manner as the main house. It will rest on brick piers that will be interspersed between, boxed, framed, and recessed wooden lattice skirting.
 - e. The walls of the addition will feature wooden siding of same dimension as that already found on the carport.
 - f. The addition’s shed roof will continue the pitch of the existing carport’s gable roof.
 - g. The addition’s metal roofing panels will match the existing metal roof.
 - h. The addition’s south elevation will feature a wooden door matching the door used on the carport’s existing storage cubicle.

- i. The addition's north elevation will feature a wooden door matching the door used on the carport's existing storage cubicle.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of an enclosed, shed-roofed addition to an existing carport. The carport is located to the side of the main house, a corner lot shotgun. The proposed addition will function as a storage room. It would be constructed off the western side of the carport. An existing six foot wooden privacy fence, which is setback from the inner edge of the sidewalk, will obscure the proposed addition. The addition will be located approximately 7' from the fence, therefore it raises no setback concerns.

The design and the materials of the proposed addition meet the design and material standards outlined in the Design Review Guidelines for Residential Construction in Mobile's Historic Districts. The shed-roofed carport addition features a foundation treatment matching that of the main house, a siding matching that of the main house and the carport, and a roofing material matching that of the main house and carport. Staff does not believe this application impairs the architectural or the historical integrity of the building or the district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

John Baker was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant. He asked Mr. Baker if he had any comments to make or questions to ask regarding the Staff Report. Mr. Baker explained that he intended to remove the existing storage installation located to the west of the proposed carport addition, as well as install a gravel walkway.

Ms. Baker asked the applicant for further clarification regarding the location of the proposed carport addition. Mr. Baker addressed Ms. Baker's query. Thinking of usability, Mr. Oswalt asked Mr. Baker about the height of the proposed addition's western wall. Mr. Baker told the Board that the height would be 7', but the space would be open to the roof, thereby allowing improved access and increased storage.

Mr. Karwinski said he had two comments. He pointed out that the massing of the main house is defined by symmetrical gable. The carport adopts a similar format. Mr. Karwinski stated that by adding a shed roof to the one side of the carport the property's design profile would appear lop-sided. As a preventative, he suggested that the addition should be setback about 18" at both the front and the rear to maintain a distinction between the carport's gabled roof and the proposed side addition's shed roof. Mr. Blackwell asked Mr. Baker if he was amenable to Mr. Karwinski's suggestion. Mr. Baker answered yes.

Mr. Karwinski asked his fellow Board members if they had any thoughts regarding the design. A discussion ensued. Mr. Karwinski further suggested that the roof pitch of the proposed addition roof be less sloped. Mr. Blackwell asked Mr. Baker if he was willing to alter the pitch of the roof. Mr. Baker answered yes.

Mr. Ladd 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. Ladd asked his fellow Board members if they had any additional comments to make or questions to ask. No further discussion ensued.

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, amending fact to note that addition will be setback approximately 18” at both the front and rear and that the addition’s roof would be less sloped in its descent.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Oswalt 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: 3/16/12

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2011-17-CA: 1010 Caroline Avenue
Applicant: Joshua and Corrina Murray
Received: 3/4/11
Meeting: 3/16/11

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Demolition Request – Demolish a shotgun.

BUILDING HISTORY

This shotgun dwelling is one of a row of five shotguns that were constructed circa 1910.

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 appeared before the Architectural Review Board on November 5, 2008. At that time the Board denied a request to demolish the structure. After investigating options including the renovation and the sale of the building, the applicant’s return to the Board with a proposal entailing the demolition of the structure. The property appeared before the Architectural Review most recently at the March 2, 2011. The application was tabled for submission and review of a site plan depicting proposed landscaping.
- 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 severely deteriorated shotgun is a contributing structure located within the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. That said the building has been extensively altered over the later half of the Twentieth Century
 - 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 situated on Caroline Avenue. Located between fashionable Government and Dauphin Streets, Caroline Avenue was lined with working and later middling housing stock. Most dwellings were constructed between 1900 and 1930. The predominant number of early working class houses were shotguns. Most served as rental properties.
- 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. Shotgun houses are a ubiquitous regional house type found across the American South. Examples of this building type can be encountered throughout the City and County of Mobile. Caroline Avenue possesses a high concentration of shotgun dwellings, most examples being of better design, construction, and condition than the subject property.
- 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. The property would then be landscaped for use by the neighboring properties.
- vi. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
 1. The owner/applicants purchased the property in 2006 for a purchase price of \$12,000.
- vii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
 1. After gathering estimates for restoring the building proved cost prohibitive, the applicants first placed the house on the market and later offered it to a revolving fund. The house failed to sell and the revolving fund declined the offer. The latter's refusal was based on the lack of cost effectiveness and physical condition of the building.
- viii. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
 1. The property was listed for sale for the amount of purchase (\$12,000), but failed to attract a buyer.
- 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. Not applicable.
- 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 shotgun house.
 2. Level the lot.
 3. Plant grass and install landscaping (see attached list of plantings)
 4. Construct a three wooden foot picket fence. The fence will be in line with front plain of the body of 1012 Caroline Avenue. The fence will extend from the southeast corner of the body of 1012 Caroline Avenue to the southwest corner of the porch at 1008 Avenue.
 5. Install a paved patio behind 1012 Caroline.

STAFF ANALYSIS

* Conflict of Interest – MHDC director Devereaux Bemis is the uncle of applicant Joshua Murray. Mr. Bemis was not involved in either the review of the application or the writing of the Staff Report.

When reviewing applications entailing the demolition of a 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 the architectural significance of the building, the shotgun house type is ubiquitous to the southern built landscape, particularly urban contexts such as downtown Mobile. Examples of shotguns are found in all but one of the City’s historic districts. Old Dauphin Way’s Caroline Avenue possesses a significant number of the easily identifiable housing type - one known for its one room widths and several room depths. While the façades of some shotguns feature sophisticated stylistic detail, most examples of the genre (including this house) adopted simple detailing that was in accord with their vernacular roots and often rental or speculative usage.

Though listed as a contributing building, the façade of this shotgun has been extensively altered. The installation of later iron porch posts atop brick pedestal piers, the insertion of subsequent fenestration units, and the possible alteration of the roof type are noticeable unsympathetic interventions. Caroline Avenue’s other shotgun dwellings feature finer detailing and stylistic treatment. The numerous changes to simple structure, while indicative the later remodeling that befell many shotguns and demonstrative of the spread of mechanized prefabricated components, do no represent significant historical or architectural significance.

Caroline Avenue is a five block thoroughfare located between Government and Dauphin Streets. Some blocks were heavily built up and remain relatively intact. Others functioned as rear lots to larger properties fronting Dauphin Street. Vacant lots resulting from demolitions coupled with lots featuring unsympathetic infill are also found along this architectural varied streetscape.

1010 Caroline Avenues is one of a row of five shotguns houses dating from circa 1910. All survive intact. This property is the most altered in form. The block located immediately to the south the subject block (opposite) contains several shotguns that are interspersed between empty lots and later unsympathetic infill. The close proximity of the neighboring dwellings along with the inner location of the dwelling would lessen the impact of the proposed demolition on this section of street.

This building is an extreme example of demolition by neglect that results from several decades deferred maintenance. Once a three room deep residence, the now two room deep structure is boarded up and unoccupied. Termite damage is extensive. The roof is missing in places. The resulting water intrusion has caused the floor to collapse. Plyboard extends across the now exposed interior walls of the rear portion of the building. After being open to the elements for almost a decade, both the historic and the later fabric are largely unsalvageable. The building poses a fire and safety hazard to the neighboring structures.

If granted demolition approval, the applicants would level the lot, plant grass, and install landscaping. A three foot wooden picket fence would extend between 1008 and 1012 Caroline Street. The landscaping plans calls for planting of varying height to be located along the eastern and western sides of the adjoining houses. The landscaping would provide as sense of transition between the built and natural landscapes.

Based on the building's lack of architectural significance, the relatively negligible effect of the demolition on the streetscape, and the building's advanced state of decay, Staff recommends approval of the demolition of the structure.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1), Staff believes this demolition application will impair the architectural and historical integrity of the building, but recommends approval of the demolition due to the building's advanced state of decay and lack of architectural significance.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Corrina Murray was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Ms. Baker asked if the Board was reviewing the post demolition plan or the whole application. Mr. Ladd explained that while the application had been tabled to review the submitted post demolition landscape plan, the Board would still revisit the whole of the application.

Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant. He asked Ms. Murray if she had any comments to make or questions to ask with regards to the Staff Report. Alluding to the site/landscaping plan, Ms. Murray stated that she intended to construct a fence across the front of the lot, install a patio behind 1012 Caroline Avenue, and landscape the lot.

Mr. Karwinski asked Ms. Murray if she had received his alternative plan for the lot. Ms. Murray acknowledged receipt of the plan. She thanked Mr. Karwinski, but said that she preferred to construct a fence. Ms. Murray told Mr. Karwinski that his design was elegant all the same. Mr. Ladd explained to the Board that Mr. Karwinski had suggested the use of wood frame element that would intimate the outline of the house. Mr. Karwinski pointed out that the use of this device would maintain, to some degree, the rhythm of the streetscape. Ms. Murray thanked Mr. Karwinski a second time. She said that she was unsure as to whether she could construct his suggested design.

Ms. Whitt-Mitchell informed her fellow Board members of her familiarity with the Caroline Avenue. She stated that she was in favor of the demolition of the dilapidated dwelling.

A discussion of post demolition maintenance ensued. Ms. Murray explained that she would pay a landscaping concern to maintain the lot. Mr. Karwinski asked Ms. Murray about the location and design of the fence. Ms. Murray and Mr. Blackwell addressed Mr. Karwinski's concerns.

Mr. Ladd asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. Upon hearing no response, Mr. Ladd closed the period of public comment. No further discussion took place among the Board.

FINDING OF FACT

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

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Oswalt moved that, based upon the facts 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: 3/16/12