

**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES**  
**November 7, 2012 – 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, Carlos Gant, Kim Harden, Carolyn Hasser, and Janetta Whitt-Mitchell.  
**Members Absent:** David Barr, Nick Holmes III, Thomas Karwinski, Bradford Ladd, Harris Oswalt, Craig Roberts, and Jim Wagoner.  
**Staff Members Present:** Devereaux Bemis and Cart Blackwell.
2. Mr. Oswalt moved to approve the minutes of the September 19, 2012 AND October 3, 2012 meetings. Mr. Karwinski moved to approve the minutes of the October 17, 2012 meetings. Both motions 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

**B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED**

1. **Applicant: David McConnell for Celie and Desi Tobias**
  - a. Property Address: 1556 Fearnway
  - b. Date of Approval: 10/11/12
  - c. Project: Reissue of a CoA issued on 15 June 2011. The CoA calls for the construction of a rear addition.
2. **Applicant: Modern Signs for Moe's Barbeque**
  - a. Property Address: 701 Spring Hill Avenue
  - b. Date of Approval: 10/9/12
  - c. Project: Install a double-faced aluminum sign. The sign will be located above the building's corner entrance. The manner of installation will not affect historic building materials. The aluminum sign will feature neon lighting. Measuring a total of 53.68 square feet, the name of the commercial establishment will comprise the sign design.
3. **Applicant: Vlad Moldoveanu with Mediterranean Sandwich Company**
  - a. Property Address: 274 Dauphin Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 10/10/12
  - c. Project: Replace current green awning covering with a blue awning and gold valence using the existing framework.
4. **Applicant: Terry Matthews with M & J Electric, Inc.**
  - a. Property Address: 152 Houston Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 10/9/12
  - c. Project: Repair and replace deteriorated woodwork and detailing to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material.
5. **Applicant: Murray Thames for George and Sallye Irvine**
  - a. Property Address: 1157 Church Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 10/11/12
  - c. Project: Repair, and when necessary replace, deteriorated woodwork and columns to match the existing.
6. **Applicant: Paul Howen**
  - a. Property Address: 1320 Dauphin Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 10/15/12

- c. Project: Paint the house per the submitted Sherwin Williams color scheme. The body will be Salisbury Green or Driftwood and the trim will be Classical White.
- 7. Applicant: Rebecca Taylor**
- a. Property Address: 1216 Selma Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 10/16/12
  - c. Project: Reroof the house with asphalt shingles.
- 8. Applicant: Ethel Harris**
- a. Property Address: 1105 Elmira Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 10/7/12
  - c. Project: Repair/replace handrail and column to match existing in profile, dimension and materials. Paint repairs and porch in the existing color scheme.
- 9. Applicant: Maria Matern**
- a. Property Address: 157 South Catherine Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 10/18/12
  - c. Project: Repair / replace rotten wood as needed to match existing in profile and dimension; repaint existing colors.
- 10. Applicant: Edward G. Adams**
- a. Property Address: 959 Dauphin Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 10/22/12
  - c. Project: Repaint the house per the existing color scheme. Repair any deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in material, profile, and dimension.
- 11. Applicant: Joe Villa**
- a. Property Address: 100 Beverly Court
  - b. Date of Approval: 10/23/12
  - c. Project: Install a storm door and a glazed and paneled garage door within the existing vehicular garage bays.
- 12. Applicant: Susan Linnon**
- a. Property Address: 1057 Savannah Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 10/26/12
  - c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork and siding to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repaint the house per the submitted color scheme: body, Bona Fide Beige; porch decking, windows, and lattice, Jasper; trim, Irish Cream; and Doors, Apple-A-Day.
- 13. Applicant: Sean O'Donnell**
- a. Property Address: 1502 Church Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 10/23/12
  - c. Project: Replace porch decking matching original, true dimensional 1 inch (5/4) tongue and groove decking. Repair the front railing to match the existing in profile, dimension and materials. Paint the house in the following BLP paint: Body: Government St. Olive; Trim: DeTonti Square Off White; Porch deck, ceiling & piers: Bellingrath Green; Windows & Door: Claiborne St. Red; and repair rear porch railing to match existing.
- 14. Applicant: Booth Construction/James Booth**
- a. Property Address: 504 Church Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 10/25/12
  - c. Project: Rebuild front porch to match the original. The unapproved changes will be removed and the rails and balusters will be repaired to match the remaining rail on the second floor. Replace rotten siding and porch decking as to match existing in profile, dimension and materials. Paint the house in the same colors and color scheme as existing.
- 15. Applicant: Brandy Bryars**
- a. Property Address: 308 South Broad Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 10/26/12

- c. Project: Install a six foot high interior lot wooden privacy fence. The fence will enclose the backyard and will not extend beyond the front plane of the house.

**16. Applicant: Bay Town Builders for Virginia Edington**

- a. Property Address: 1058 Old Shell Road
- b. Date of Approval: 10/29/12
- c. Project: Remove later concrete steps. Install wooden steps. Reinstall the stair railings (had been stored on the property). Repair and replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Replace and install lattice foundation screening to match the existing in pattern and composition. Install a three foot high wooden picket fence about the front and side yards.

**17. Applicant: Ross Holladay**

- a. Property Address: 609 Conti Street
- b. Date of Approval: 10/29/12
- c. Project: Install an 18” x 30” metal sign featuring plastic lettering. The sign will be located adjacent to property’s South Dearborn Street vehicular entrance.

**18. Applicant: Sign Pro for Ameriforce**

- a. Property Address: 452 Government Street
- b. Date of Approval: 10/29/12
- c. Project: Install an 2’ x 6’ aluminum sign on the building’s façade (the space just above the window zone. The name of the occupying tenant will comprise the window design.

**C. APPLICATIONS**

**1. 2012-62-CA: 300 McDonald Avenue**

- a. Applicant: Don Bowden with Bowden Architecture for Wanda Cochran and Arthur Madden
- b. Project: Demolition/Anicllary Construction/Rear Addition – Demolish a garage and a carport; Construct a new garage and storage building; and Construct a small rear addition.

**APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

**2. 2012-63-CA: 454 South Broad Street**

- a. Applicant: Angela H. Surgener for Pura Vida Ventures, LLC
- b. Project: Demolition – Demolish a residential building.

**TABLED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

**D. OTHER BUSINESS**

- 1. Iron Stair Railings – Review recommended examples as a follow up from October 3, 2012 Meeting.

The Board discussed railing designs and the approval process. Staff was instructed to alter the language of the Midmonth Approval List.

- 2. Finalize the revisions to the Midmonth Approval List.

Mr. Ladd agreed to sign the Midmonth Approval List after the aforementioned change regarding hand rails had been made.

- 3. Signage – Review a Board requested update on Charleston’s and Savannah’s sign regulations, namely lighting.

The Board reviewed and discussed signage concerns.

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

**2012-62-CA: 300 McDonald Avenue**  
**Applicant: Don Bowden with Bowden Architecture for Wanda Cochran and Arthur Madden**  
**Received: 10/22/12**  
**Meeting: 11/7/12**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Leinkauf  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Demolition/Ancillary Construction/Rear Addition – Demolish a garage and a carport; Construct a new garage and storage building; Remove and Install Fencing; and Construct a small rear addition.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This high end Arts & Crafts inspired “bungalow” dates from circa 1913. The house’s garage was constructed contemporaneously with the main dwelling. Said ancillary structure was remodeled in the 1940s.

**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 18, 2012. At that time, the Board approved the renovation of the garage. Structural examination of the building and investigation of the costs involved in a renovation caused the applicants to consider other alternatives to redeveloping the rear portion of the lot. With this application, the applicants propose: the demolition of the garage and the later carport; the construction of a new garage storage building; the removal and installation of fencing; and the construction of a rear addition.
- B-1 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:
    - The historic or architectural significance of the structure;

1. The principle building located on a property determines whether said property is classed as contributing and non-contributing. In most instances, surviving ancillary buildings located within Mobile's historic districts are non-contributing buildings. On account of its size and location, Staff believes this property's garage to be a contributing building. While the building has undergone alterations, the overall form remains intact. As a large scale and highly visible example of an early garage structure, the building contributes to the property's architectural and historical integrity.
- The importance of the structures to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;
    - On account of its engagement with the Church Street, this property's garage is a contributing component to the streetscape. It adds to the built density and augments the historic character of this section of Church Street.
  - The difficulty or the impossibility of reproducing the structure because of its design, texture, material, detail or unique location;
    - The building materials are capable of being reproduced.
  - 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;
    - Other garage structures of this period survive. The size and location of this example make it more significant than others.
  - 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.
    - If granted demolition approval, the applicants would redevelop the rear portion of the lot. The scope of work (outlined below) would entail the demolition of the garage, the construction a new garage, the installation of fencing, the construction of a storage building, as well as the construction of small rear addition.
  - The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
    - The applicants purchased this property in November of 2010 for \$190,000.
  - The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
    - The applicants initially proposed the remodeling of the garage. This they received approval for on January 18, 2012. Upon closer examination of the building's structure and the project's expense, the applicants reconsidered their options.
  - Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
    - The property has not been listed for sale.
  - 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;
    - NA.
  - Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
    - See submitted materials and scope of work.



- b. The storage building will measure 8' by 10' in plan.
  - c. The storage building will be constructed atop a brick-veneered foundation that will adapt to the topography of the site.
  - d. The walls will be faced with hardiboard siding. The lower portions of the siding will adopt a flared pitch similar to that employed on the main house.
  - e. Decorative rafter tails will match those found on the body of the house.
  - f. The asphalt shingles sheathing the storage building's North-South oriented gable roof will match those found on the main house.
  - g. The North Elevation will feature a wood or aluminum-clad wood simulated four-over-one window. The lattice gable vent located within the upper portion of the West Elevation's gable will match those employed on the main house.
  - h. The West Elevation will not feature fenestration. The brick dado and hardiboard siding will continue uninterrupted around the South Elevation.
  - i. The South Elevation will feature a wood or aluminum-clad wood simulated four-over-one window. The lattice gable vent located within the upper portion of the West Elevation's gable will match those employed on the main house.
  - j. The East Elevation will feature a multi simulated divided light wooden or clad wooden paneled and glazed door. An overhang will extend over the door.
6. Demolish a later rear stair entry.
  7. Construct a new flight of steps accessing the main house's principle Rear (West) entrance. The steps will feature a dog leg configuration. Simple square-shaped picket railings will be employed.
  8. Construct a small rear addition.
    - a. The addition will take the form of an oriel bay extending from the southern portion of the West Elevation's projecting rear ell.
    - b. Two existing windows located in the affected area of the West Elevation will be reused in the oriels West elevation.
    - c. The oriel's lattice vent, rafters, and brackets will match those employed elsewhere on the house.
  9. Install a brick walkway.
  10. Remove chain link and wooden privacy fencing.
  11. Install new 4' high picket fencing and gates.
  12. Construct a 6' high wooden privacy fence. The fence will feature horizontal boarding.
  13. Install landscaping.

## **CLARIFICATIONS/REQUESTS**

1. Provide a drawing of the proposed addition's North Elevation.
2. Provide a drawings of the proposed storage shed's West Elevation.
3. Provide a drawing of the proposed garage's East Elevation.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

This two part application involves the demolition of a garage and the consequent redevelopment of the rear portion of lot located at the southwest corner of McDonald Avenue and Church Street.

Demolition requests entail the review of the following: the architectural significance of the building; the condition of the building; the effect a demolition would have on the streetscape; and the nature of the proposed redevelopment. While most ancillary structures are considered non-contributing on account of their style and construction, Staff believes this building to be a contributing structure on account of its size and location. Of a larger scale and more prominently situated than many contemporary examples, this



early garage contributes to the built density, historic character, and architectural integrity of the property and the streetscape. Though deteriorated and costly, the building could be renovated.

With exception of the proposed rear addition, demolition approval of the garage affects the feasibility of the remainder of the application. The proposed storage shed would be located atop a portion of the site of the existing garage. Proposed fencing, hardscaping, and landscaping would also be impacted. The removal of the chain link and privacy fencing and its replacement with picket fencing and the removal of privacy fencing its replacement with picket fencing would improve the property. The proposed new single car garage could be constructed if the existing garage was retained, but it said retention and construction could exceed the built allotment for the lot.

The proposed rear addition is small in size and restricted to the rear portion of the house. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation and the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts (See B-2, 1-2 of the Staff Report ), state that additions and/or alterations should be differentiated from yet compatible with the existing historic fabric. Located in the end bay of an infilled porch, the 3' deep extension would be setback within the lot. The small addition would be surmounted by gable treatment matching that found on the body of the house. Two windows would be salvaged. Said windows feature a light pattern that is different from those found elsewhere on the house.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (B-1, 1-3), Staff believes the demolition of the garage would impair the architectural and the historic character of the property and the surrounding district. Staff does not recommend approval of that portion of the application.

Based on (B-2, 1-2), Staff does not believe that the proposed rear addition, the replacement of fencing (adapted to plan calling for the retention of the old garage building), and the construction of the new garage would impair the architectural or the historical character of the building or the district. Staff recommends approval of those portions of the application.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Don Bowden with Bowden Architecture 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. Bowden if he had any comments to make, questions to ask, or clarifications to address. Mr. Bowden answered no. He said that Mr. Blackwell had sufficiently addressed the applications three primary components, those being the construction of a small rear addition, the demolition of ancillary structures, and the construction of ancillary structures. Mr. Bowden then said that he was here to represent the applicant and answer any questions the Board might entertain.

Mr. Ladd asked his fellow Board members if they had any questions to ask or comments to make with regard to the application.

Mr. Roberts said that he appreciated the Staff Report, but did not see that the demolition of the garage would impair the property or the district. He complimented Mr. Bowden on the design and stated that it should be approved. Mr. Holmes encouraged him to make a motion to that end.

Mr. Wagoner asked for clarification regarding the windows proposed for salvage and reuse in the proposed rear addition. Mr. Bowden and Mr. Blackwell addressed his concerns.

Mr. Karwinski stated that he had several comments to make and questions to ask. First, he noted that both the plans and the Staff Report called for matching treatments. Roof pitches, Mr. Karwinski noted, were an exception. Mr. Bowden responded first by saying that mass had been a matter a concern in the design of all components comprising the application. He went on to say that the main house had a variety of roof pitches.

Mr. Karwinski asked Mr. Bowden for clarification regarding the North Elevation of the proposed garden shed. He asked if the siding would flare outward. Mr. Bowden answered yes. Upon being questioned if the brick coping would do likewise, he responded yes. Mr. Bowden told Mr. Karwinski that the drawings while finished were schematic for purposes of review.

Mr. Karwinski stated that he had checked the measures of the proposed garage's roof overhand. He said that according to his calculations, the overhang would extend over the property line. Mr. Bowden said that he was not of the same opinion. Mr. Karwinski reiterated the concern. Mr. Bowden said that the overhang would be addressed if need be.

Mr. Karwinski asked for clarification regarding the location of portions of the fencing. Mr. Bowden addressed Mr. Karwinski's query.

Mr. Karwinski said that he had concerns of over the measurements of the trellised expanse extending between the proposed garage and the house. He said that two different dimensions had been listed. Mr. Bowden reiterated that the designs were schematic to some extent.

Mr. Holmes interjected. He asked Mr. Karwinski if the aforementioned questions would affect the approval of the project. Mr. Karwinski responded by saying yes. Mr. Holmes stated he believed Mr. Karwinski was taking his concerns too far.

## **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 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: 11/7/13**

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

**2012-63-CA: 454 South Broad Street**  
**Applicant: Angela H. Surgener for Pura Vida Ventures, LLC**  
**Received: 10/1/12 – not submitted for review at the applicant’s request**  
**Meeting: 10/17/12**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Demolition – Demolish a residential building.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This Arts and Crafts influenced dwelling dates from circa 1923. Built as a multi-family dwelling, the house features two separate front doors both of which are flanked by advanced window ways.

**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. The application calls for the demolition of the contributing building. If approved, the applicants would level the lot and plant sod.
- 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:
    - The historic or architectural significance of the structure;
      - 2. This dwelling is a contributing building located within the Oakleigh Garden District. The gable surmounted, porch-fronted house is middle grade example of the popular Arts and Crafts informed “bungalow” typology.
    - The importance of the structures to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;

- This contributing building is one of three extant, south-facing residences located on this block of South Broad Street. The residential buildings on the adjacent blocks north and south of this block have been demolished.
- The difficulty or the impossibility of reproducing the structure because of its design, texture, material, detail or unique location;
  - The building materials are capable of being reproduced.
- 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;
  - Gable roofed “bungalows” are found across the United States. This example is unique in Mobile in that façade’s front porch features a pair of single doorways.
- 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.
  - If granted demolition approval, the applicants would demolish the house and level the lot.
- The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
  - The applicant went into a partnership with the other owner of Pura Vida in 2011. The other partner already owned the property.
- The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
  - The applicant was remodeling the property when an arsonist set it afire. It was intended for rental purposes. After receiving no offers on the property, the applicant and her business partner have proposed demolishing the house, leveling, the site, and planting grass.
- Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
  - The property was listed for sale. No suitable offers ensued.
- 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;
  - NA.
- Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
  - See submitted materials.
- 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.
  - Application submitted.
- 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 plan):

1. Demolish the house.
2. Level the lot.
3. Plant sod.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application involves the demolition of a contributing residential building. Demolition requests entail the review of the following: the architectural significance of the building; the condition of the building; the effect a demolition would have on the streetscape; and the nature of the proposed redevelopment.

This residential building is a contributing structure located within the Oakleigh Garden District. The building is an early multi-family dwelling. The simply executed residence exhibits an awareness of “Craftsman” inspired Arts and Crafts design currents.

Though damaged during a recent fire and looted by trespassers, the building is capable of being restored. That said, the cost of restoration exceeds the value of the property.

This building is one of two surviving contributing structures located on this block of South Broad Street. Non-contributing and/or commercial infill occupies the remainder of the Broad Street portion of the block. The building contributes to the built density, historic character, and architectural integrity of the streetscape and district.

If granted demolition approval, the applicants would demolish the building, level the lot, and plant sod on the site.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-3), Staff believes this application will impair the architectural and the historical character of the property and the surrounding district. Staff does not recommend approval of this application.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Cherri Paccatte was present to discuss the application.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicants. He asked Ms. Pacatte if she had any questions to ask, comments to make, or clarifications to address.

Mr. Ladd said that he understood that the property had been listed for sale. He asked Ms. Pacatte for clarification as to the listing price. Ms. Pacatte stated that the property had been listed for sale at \$15,000.

Mr. Holmes asked Ms. Pacatte the date upon which the house had caught fire. Ms. Pacatte told the Board that fire occurred on August 21, 2011. She said that while the cause has been undetermined, it is her belief that the water heater exploded.

Mr. Ladd asked Ms. Pacatte about the extent of the fire damage. Ms. Pacatte addressed Mr. Ladd’s query. Mr. Ladd explained to Ms. Pacatte that his and other questions were aimed at bringing about greater Board understanding so they could more properly address her application. He said that while the Board is ordinarily against any and all demolitions of a principle building occupying a property, each case is reviewed on a case by case basis. Location and damage are taken into account. Ms. Pacatte thanked Mr. Ladd. She distributed a spread sheet of repairs and estimates to the Board.

Ms. Pacatte told the Board that she had purchased the property with the intention of restoring the building. She said that the house was being renovated when the fire occurred. Ms. Pacatte said that while she believes Broad Street will one day improve, she stated that at present the situation was far from ideal. She spoke of the surrounding properties with regard to their condition and tenants.

Mr. Holmes again asked Ms. Pacatte as to the date of the fire. Ms. Pacatte said that the fire occurred on August 21, 2011. He asked her how long the property had been on the market. Ms. Pacatte responded by saying a little over a year. Mr. Holmes asked her if she had received any offers. Ms. Pacatte answered yes saying that she and her business partner had received one offer for the amount of \$12,500. She continued by saying that the offer, one from a neighboring property owner, had fallen through.

Ms. Pacatte spoke of instances of theft in the surrounding area and the travails of property owners.

Mr. Roberts asked Ms. Pacatte if she had investigated demolition related costs. Ms. Pacatte said that she had contacted a demolition contractor with regard to demolishing the house and salvaging materials.

A discussion of the demolition related concerns ensued. Mr. Roberts offered his observations and experiences. Mr. Ladd encouraged Ms. Pacatte to obtain referrals.

Mr. Holmes and Mr. Bemis entered into a discussion as to revolving funds and individual buyers who might be interested in the property. Mr. Wagoner entered into the discussion. It was the consensus that most potential buyers of properties of this sort had were preoccupied with other properties.

The application was tabled for the second meeting in January of 2012.