

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES

March 2, 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, Kim Harden, Bill James, Thomas Karwinski, Bradford Ladd, Harris Oswalt, Craig Roberts, and Jim Wagoner.
Members Absent: Carlos Gant, Janetta Whitt-Mitchell, and Barja Wilson.
Staff Members Present: Cart Blackwell, Keri Coumanis, and John Lawler.
2. Mr. Karwinski moved to approve the minutes of the February 16, 2011 meeting. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.
3. 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: Shirla Lunsford-Gatson**
 - a. Property Address: 56 North Georgia Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/7/11
 - c. Project: Repair and replace rotten woodwork to match the existing. Replace windows to match the existing. Touch up the paint to match the existing color scheme.
2. **Applicant: Amelia Cade Bacon**
 - a. Property Address: 71 South Ann Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/8/11
 - c. Project: Remove metal shed in backyard.
3. **Applicant: David Koen**
 - a. Property Address: 151 South Dearborn Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/9/11
 - c. Project: Repair and replace rotten woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repoint brickwork. Paint house to match the existing color scheme.
4. **Applicant: David Koen**
 - a. Property Address: 962 Palmetto Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/9/11
 - c. Project: Undertake repair work to the main house and garage apartment. The work will include the following – repair rotten wood as necessary with new wood to match the existing in profile and dimension. Repair windows to match the existing. Paint exterior to match the existing color scheme.
5. **Applicant: Shenevie Johnson**
 - a. Property Address: 301 Breamwood Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/10/11
 - c. Project: Extend the existing interior lot six foot privacy fence along the remainder of the rear lot line. Repair and replace boarding on the existing boarding were necessary..
6. **Applicant: Wrico Signs for Able Body Labor**
 - a. Property Address: 1702 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/7/11
 - c. Project: Remove the existing sign. Install a 3' x 10' aluminum sign featuring the name of the establishment.

7. **Applicant: Jeremy Cox**
 - a. Property Address: 208 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/10/11
 - c. Project: Install two directional and one advertising signs on the back of the building for the period of Mardi Gras. The signs will be removed during the days when parades are not held. The signs will be removed no later than the Friday after Mardi Gras.
8. **Applicant: Thelma Juzang**
 - a. Property Address: 8 South Conception Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/11/11
 - c. Project: Place plywood over front windows and door to protect building during Mardi Gras; Applicant will paint plywood at a later date if they decide to keep it permanently.
9. **Applicant: William Johnston**
 - a. Property Address: 1223 Selma Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/11/11
 - c. Project: Remove the cracked exiting concrete front walkway. Install a new walkway between the foot of the steps and the inner edge of the sidewalk. The walkway will be laid with old bricks and will be located within the existing curbing.
10. **Applicant: Sharman Egan**
 - a. Property Address: 1130 Montauk Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/15/11
 - c. Project: Repaint the house per the Sherwin Williams color scheme. The body of the house will be Roycroft Rose. The trim will be Classic White Buff. The accent will be Deepest Mauve.
11. **Applicant: Dr. Coleman Oswald/Thomas Roofing**
 - a. Property Address: 201 Lanier Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/15/11
 - c. Project: Tear off old hard shingle roof over garage and install synthetic slate roof to match resident (roof approved at earlier date for main residence).
12. **Applicant: Amelia Cade Bacon**
 - a. Property Address: 71 South Ann Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/14/11
 - c. Project: This COA amends that of October 12, 2010: change shutter color from dark green to dark tan to better match other colors.
13. **Applicant: Anita Crigler**
 - a. Property Address: 350 Charles Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/17/11
 - c. Project: Repair wood fence to match, replace rotten siding and repaint to match, re-sod yard.
14. **Applicant: John Reynolds**
 - a. Property Address: 61 South Conception Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/14/11
 - c. Project: Erect metal pipe and chain fence around lot, 36 inches high.
15. **Applicant: Pete's Foundation**
 - a. Property Address: 109 Chatham Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/17/11
 - c. Project: Level and repair the façade's concrete steps and antipodia.

- 16. Applicant: Tuan Titlestad with Bay Town Builders**
- a. Property Address: 1553 Fearnway
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/17/11
 - c. Project: Repair and replace stucco, woodwork, and brickwork on the rear guest house to match the existing.

- 17. Applicant: Robert Mullen**
- a. Property Address: 918-920 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/17/11
 - c. Project: Replace the existing aluminum storefront windows. The replacement units will feature a bronze treatment.

- 18. Applicant: Andy Scott with Identity Signs**
- a. Property Address: 211 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 2/17/11
 - c. Project: Install three applied window signs onto the façade's first story storefront windows. Two 3' x 1' signs featuring the name of the establishment will be located either side of the entrance. A single 28" x 35" sign will be located next to on the entrance.

C. APPLICATIONS

- 1. 2011-16-CA: 112 Lanier Avenue**
- a. Applicant: Charles Weems for Richard and Barbara Janecky
 - b. Project: New Construction – Construct a rear addition and reconstruct an existing garage.

APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

- 2. 2011- 17-CA: 1010 Caroline Avenue**
- a. Applicant: Joshua and Corrina Murray
 - b. Project: Demolition Request – Demolish a shotgun house.

TABLED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Alternative Decking Treatments

Mr. Blackwell distributed to the Board samples of a composite tongue-and-groove decking treatment. A discussion ensued as to the product's use on new construction, non-contributing buildings, and contributing buildings in Mobile's historic districts. The Board decided to holdover full review until the manufacturer and distributor's representative was present to address the product.

2. Amendments to Midmonth Approvals

Two proposed amendments to the Staff Midmonth Approval List were discussed. Mr. Blackwell initiated the discussion by reminding the Board of the two proposed amendments, the first involving the approval of metal roofs (such as 5-V Crimp and similar roofing options) and the second involving the installation of temporary telecommunications devices. Board discussion ensued on both proposed amendments. The Board moved to approve Staff review of mobile telecommunications devices. It was noted that Staff would coordinate with other City Departments regarding their installation and placement. The moved to reconsider the staff review of the metal roofs upon further consideration and examination of the various metal roofing alternatives.

3. Guidelines

Mr. Blackwell informed the Board that Mr. Bemis would apprise them of the state of the Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts at the next meeting.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2011-6-CA: 112 Lanier Avenue
Applicant: Charles Weems for Richard and Barbara Janecky
Received: 1/14/11
Meeting: 3/2/11

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Ashland Place
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: New Construction – Construct a rear addition and reconstruct an existing garage.

BUILDING HISTORY

This two-story residence was constructed in 1937 according to the designs of Mobile architect C. L. Hutchisson, Jr. The house is one of several contemporary Hutchisson designs featuring complex brick patterns and colorings.

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 5, 2011. At that time the Board tabled a proposal calling for a rear addition for reason of lack of information. A Design Review Committee was held on January 12, 2011. Based on the feedback provided by Board members at January 5th meeting and the January 12th Design Review Committee meeting, the applicant’s representative returns to the Board with a revised design entailing the construction of a rear addition and the reconstruction of an existing garage.
- B. The 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 shall 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 and 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 would be unimpaired.”
- C. **Scope of Work (per submitted site plan):**
 - 1. Construct a rear addition and reconstruct an existing garage.
 - a. The proposed addition will connect the main house to the existing garage. The garage will be reconstructed.
 - b. The addition and reconstruction will feature a synthetic stuccoed wall treatment.
 - c. The walls of the addition will feature a continuous beltcourse. The beltcourse of the reconstructed garage will be lower than that of the body of the addition.

- d. The addition will feature wooden windows of varying size and type.
- e. The addition's roof type, pitch, eave detailing, and sheathing will match those of the main house.
- f. The addition's roof structure will be comprised of gables and sheds set perpendicular to the body of the main house.
- g. The West Elevation will be setback behind existing landscaping.
- h. The West Elevation will feature a single diamond-paned casement window set before a sequence of telescoping side bays.
- i. The massing of the North Elevation will be comprised of a shed skirted lower gabled eastern block, a taller center gabled block with projecting gable, and a shed roofed western bay.
- j. The North Elevation's eastern block will feature two blind windows featuring stuccoed casings.
- k. The North Elevation's taller center block will feature a single transom window, as well as a bank of four single light windows in the projecting gable.
- l. The North Elevation's western shed will feature a single transom window.
- m. The East or Rear Elevation will feature two sixteen panel metal garage doors.
- n. The East Elevation's two gables will feature louvered vents and siding expanses to match those found on the body of the house.
- o. Open (a recessed porch off the South Elevation) and enclosed (slightly recessed bay off the North Elevation) shed roofs will skirt the East Elevation.
- p. The South Elevation will be comprised of two gabled roof expanses.
- q. The South Elevation's lower eastern block will feature a glazed and paneled door flanked by two-six-over-one windows.
- r. The South Elevation's taller western block will feature a two bay shed roofed porch.
- s. The South Elevation's shed roofed porch will rest on a brick foundation and will be supported by projecting brick pedestals. Three un-fluted columns will surmount the pedestals.
- t. A single flight of east facing brick steps will access the porch.
- u. Two pairs of twelve light French doors with surmounting transoms will allow ingress and egress to the porch.
- v. The western or end wall of the porch will not feature fenestration.
- w. A small shed bay with a single multi light diamond paned window will be located to the west of the porch off the body of the house.
- x. A small octagonal window will be located to the east of the porch.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of a rear addition. The proposed inner lot rear addition and garage reconstruction will be minimally visible from the public view. The body of the main house and the existing landscaping will obscure the proposed addition. The addition will in effect connect the house to the garage. The garage, which will maintain its existing footprint, will be reconstructed on its existing location.

In accord with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation, the proposed addition and alterations will be differentiated from yet compatible with the massing, form, and materials of the main house. The use of a stuccoed wall treatment will be complementary to, albeit distinguishable from the brick walls of the main house thereby allowing the addition to "read" as sympathetic alteration to the property's existing built context. The roof forms and pitch will be based upon those of the main house. The roof sheathing and varying window types will match those found on the main house. The addition meets the setback requirements for Mobile's historic districts.

As per the reconstruction of the garage, the existing single story wooden ancillary structure is not of the same architectural caliber and construction as the main house. The reconstructed garage will become a rear wing of the main house though it will continue to function as a garage. It will feature a stuccoed wall treatment matching that of the addition. The fenestration type will match that of the body of the house. The South Elevation's existing fenestration patterns will be replicated. While the roof pitch will be altered so to better complement the rear gables of the main house and the addition, it will maintain the overall gable with side shed form. The roof will be lower in height than that of the rear addition thereby indicating a transition in mass and use. Given that the proposed garage reconstruction will maintain the existing building footprint, retain the existing roof form, and match the wall treatment of the addition, Staff does not believe that the addition (or the reconstruction) will impair the architectural or the historical integrity of the building or the district

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2), Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the historical character of the historic district. Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Charles Weems was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant's representative. He asked Mr. Weems if he had any comments to make or questions to ask with regard to the Staff Report. Mr. Weems answered no, but stated if the Board had any questions pertaining to the revised plans, he was here to address them. Mr. Ladd reminded his fellow Board members that a Design Review Committee, which he, Bill James, and Kim Harden took part, addressed the concerns the Board had identified during their January 12, 2011 review of the initial application.

Mr. Roberts addressed Mr. Weems saying he had comments and questions relating the addition's window selection and stucco treatment. He told Mr. Weems that the addition featured a mixture of window types. Mr. Roberts said that he thought the single light windows proposed for the East Elevation were not in keeping with those used elsewhere on the design or the main house. Mr. Weems explained that single light windows were being proposed at the applicant's request. Mr. Ladd and Ms. Baker reminded Mr. Roberts of the property's last appearance before the Board. At that time, it was suggested that additional fenestration be added to the east elevation. Mr. James noted the presence of an existing window of the same design as the proposed on the main house's east elevation. He also pointed out that the east elevation was located in close proximity to the lot line. The location, in addition to existing fencing and vegetation, would obscure views of the whole of the elevation. Mr. Roberts interjected saying that what was approved today would be in place for years to come. Mr. James told his fellow board members about the proceedings of the Design Review Committee. He stated that the increased amount and coordinated interior-exterior sequence of windows had been one of many positive results of the meeting.

Mr. Roberts then addressed his second point of concern, the proposed stucco treatment. He told the Mr. Weems that the proposed synthetic stucco was not appropriate for use on additions in the historic districts. Mr. Weems said that the two layer stucco treatment consisted of an inner layer of true stucco and outer coating of elastomeric finish. Speaking to his fellow board members and the applicant, Mr. Roberts stated that he was simply voicing his concerns regarding treatment of what was otherwise a good design. A discussion of stucco treatments ensued. Mr. Robert explained that the traditional three coat stucco method resulted in a finish and a feel more appropriate for buildings in historic districts. He said that the

proposed treatment is endemic to condominiums and suburban developments. Ms. Coumanis stated that elastomeric finishes were the proper approach for walls surfaces in historic districts. Mr. James and Ms. Harden further nuanced the discussion of elastomeric and acrylic-finished stucco treatments.

Mr. Karwinski stated that he had one question to ask and one comment to make. He asked Mr. Weems why the owner was not present to answer questions regarding the application. He stated that the owner should attend in order to address the Board's concerns. Mr. Ladd spoke on behalf the applicant. Mr. James said that it was not required that an owner attend the meetings. Speaking to the applicant's representative and his fellow Board members, Mr. Karwinski said that he had compared the previous and present submissions and found no improvement in the latter. Mr. Karwinski stated that the overall design was a poor one.

Mr. Baker said that the applicants and their representative had met with a Design Review Committee. Suggestions and alteration had been made that reflected concerns voiced at the board meeting and realized during the on site inspection. Mr. Roberts said that Design Review Committees can at times fail to address all the issues pertaining to a given proposal. Mr. Ladd stated that the Design Review Committee reminded his fellow Board members of the concerns that the Board raised during the course of the January 12th meeting, namely the roofing configuration, porch enclosure, and fenestration treatment. Mr. Roberts noted that in times past proposals have had to go through as many as three Design Review Committee meetings before receiving approval. 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.

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 fact as written.

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 impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued on the condition that the addition feature a traditional stucco treatment.

The motion received a second and was approved. Mr. Karwinski and Mr. Roberts voted in opposition.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 3/2/12

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED REOCORD

2011-17-CA: 1010 Caroline Avenue
Applicant: Joshua and Corrina Murray
Received: 2/11/11
Meeting: 3/2/11

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 last 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.
- 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

- 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:

1. Demolish a shotgun house.
2. Level the lot.
3. Plant grass and install landscaping.

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. This property and the three properties to the east share the use of an open rear yards. The owners of these neighboring properties would be allowed to use of the lot.

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

Mr. Blackwell reiterated that MHDC staff members Devereaux Bemis and Keri Coumanis were not involved in the review of this application. The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant. He asked Ms. Murray if she had any comments to make or question to ask with regard to the application.

Ms. Murray stated that she and her husband own both this property along with one of the adjoining shotguns. She said that they lived in the other house, a building which they restored. She told the Board that when she and her husband acquired 1110 Old Shell Road, it was already in advanced state of decay. The restoration of the building is beyond their skills and budget. Ms. Murray explained to the Board that the house had been put on the market, but it failed to sell.

Mr. Roberts asked Ms. Murray about her familial relation to Mr. Bemis. Ms. Murray answered that Mr. Bemis was her uncle. Mr. Wagoner asked Ms. Murray if she still owned the neighboring shotgun. Ms. Murray answered yes. Mr. Wagoner pointed out that she had vested interest in the area. Ms. Murray concurred.

Mr. Karwinski asked Ms. Murray if she and her husband intended to maintain the property if demolition approval was issued. She answered yes. Mr. Karwinski asked Ms. Murray if they had considered subdividing and selling half the site thereby allowing two properties the option of off street parking. Ms. Murray said that she and her husband had not considered that option. She told the Board that they primary objective was to remove the building as it posed a fire and safety hazard.

Mr. Oswalt stated that in previous demolition applications, Staff had recommended that salvageable materials be reused. He asked Staff if materials could be salvaged from this building. Addressing the Board and Ms. Murray, Mr. Blackwell answered yes, if the applicants were willing to agree. Ms. Murray said that any reusable fabric could be salvaged for later reuse.

Speaking to her fellow Board members, Staff, and the applicant, Ms. Baker pointed out that the application was not accompanied by plans for redevelopment of the lot. When queried as to why no plans were provided, Mr. Blackwell stated that since the size of this residential lot was so small he had not seen fit to ask for plans for redevelopment. He said that the applicant communicated in the application and to staff directly that the intention was to level the lot, plant grass, and install landscaping. Ms. Murray was asked to describe the landscaping. She told the Board that she had considered border plantings along the perimeter. Ms. Murray explained that she would coordinate with the neighboring property owner as per the height and selection. Said plantings would be surrounded by shrubs and mulch. A discussion as to whether a landscape plan should have been provided followed. Ms. Harden pointed out that previous demolition applications had at times been accompanied by redevelopment site plans.

Mr. Ladd asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak for or against the application. Upon hearing no response, he closed the period of public comment. Mr. Ladd then voiced his concerns regarding the landscape plan. He said that the Board had several options. They could approve the application without plans for redevelopment, approve the demolition with the condition of Staff approval of landscape plans, or holdover approval of the application until the submission of landscape plans. Mr. Karwinski moved to table the application for submission of landscape plans. The motion received unanimous approval from the Board.