

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
October 15, 2015 – 3:00 P.M.
Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, James Wagoner, called the meeting to order at 3:00. Cart Blackwell, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
Members Present: David Barr, Robert Brown, Catarina Echols, Kim Harden, Nick Holmes II, Craig Roberts, and Steve Stone.
Members Absent: Robert Allen Carolyn Hasser, Bradford Ladd, and Harris Oswalt
Staff Members Present: Cartledge W. Blackwell and Melissa Mutert.
2. Mr. Stone moved to approve the minutes for the September 16, 2015 meeting. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.
3. Mr. Stone moved to approve midmonth COA's granted by Staff. The motion received a second and was unanimously approval. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED.

1. **Applicant: Laura Clarke**
 - a. Property Address: 10 South Catherine Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/21/15
 - c. Project: Repair and when necessary replaced deteriorated woodwork (siding, foundation screening, etc...) to match the existing as per design, profile, dimension, and material. Repaint the house to match the existing color scheme.
2. **Applicant: Frank Reusser**
 - a. Property Address: 8 South Lafayette Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/14/15
 - c. Project: Reroof the house with 25 year shingle (charcoal in color).
3. **Applicant: Dave Thurman**
 - a. Property Address: 61 South Ann Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/15/15
 - c. Project: Reroof with 30 year architectural shingles (black in color).
4. **Applicant: Pete Vallas**
 - a. Property Address: 63 Fearnway
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/21/15
 - c. Project: Construct a dormer off a rear elevation. Said dormer will not be visible from the public view
5. **Applicant: John C. Bell**
 - a. Property Address: 122 Ryan Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/21/15
 - c. Project: Remove a paved drive. Install crushed gravel surfacing atop the same location.
6. **Applicant: Mike Henderson**
 - a. Property Address: 154 Marine Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/15/15
 - c. Project: Reroof the house with asphalt shingles.
7. **Applicant: Wendell Quimby**
 - a. Property Address: 162 South Monterey Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/14/15

- c. Project: Reroof the house with asphalt shingles.
- 8. Applicant: Olympus Building & Roofing**
- a. Property Address: 505 Church Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/15/15
 - c. Project: Reroof sections of asphalt roofing with asphalt roofing.

- 9. Applicant:** Nord-Sud Shipping Inc. and/or Family Land & Properties
- Property Address: 605 Saint Francis Street
 - Date of Approval: 9/14/15
 - Project: Reroof the building to match existing.
- 10. Applicant:** **Spring Hill Landscape, LLC**
- Property Address: 1651 Dauphin Street
 - Date of Approval: 9/14/15
 - Project: Demolish a collapsed shed. Construct a new garden shed on the site per submitted site plan and elevations. The 8' x 8' structure is an adaptation of the MHDC stock plan altered so to reflect design features from the main house.
- 11. Applicant:** **Blacard Roofing Company**
- Property Address: 1662 Government Street
 - Date of Approval: 9/10/15
 - Project: Reroof the house (porch portion for the most part) with asphalt shingles.
- 12. Applicant:** **Christy D. Reid**
- Property Address: 1569 Dauphin Street
 - Date of Approval: 9/22/15
 - Project: Install interior lot fencing per the submitted plan. All the fencing will be located behind the front façade line and enclose the rear portion of the lot. A six foot tall aluminum picketed design will extend to either side of the house to the lot lines. Said fence will extend along the western side of the lot where it transition into a wooden privacy fence along southern (rear) lot line. Install gravel paving in the driveways. Reinstate a curb (as per ROW requirements).
- 13. Applicant:** **Caldwell Whistler**
- Property Address: 8 South Ann Street
 - Date of Approval: 9/24/15
 - Project: Install aluminum interior lot fencing to either side of the house. Said fencing will be behind façade line of the body of the house. The fencing will tie into fencing on adjoin fencing. Install a four foot tall section of metal fencing along a portion of the North lot line.
- 14. Applicant:** **Caldwell Whistler**
- Property Address: 10 South Ann Street
 - Date of Approval: 9/24/15
 - Project: Install an aluminum gate. The gate is so located at to afford the use of either an inward to outward swing.
- 15. Applicant:** **Caldwell Whistler**
- Property Address: 12 South Ann Street
 - Date of Approval: 9/24/15
 - Project: Install aluminum interior lot fencing to either side of the house. Said fencing will be behind façade line of the body of the house. The fencing will tie into fencing on adjoin fencing. Install a four foot section of metal fencing along a portion of the North lot line. Construct wooden privacy fence to the north south side of the house.
- 16. Applicant:** **Mike Henderson**
- Property Address: 1408 Old Shell Road
 - Date of Approval: 9/23/15
 - Project: Reroof with 30 year architectural shingle, charcoal color.

- 17. Applicant: Debra Baumhauer**
- a. Property Address: 960 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/24/15
 - c. Project: Construct a pergola behind an existing walled enclosure within the property's side lot.
- 18. Applicant: Kelly Marsh**
- a. Property Address: 1756 Hunter Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/25/15
 - c. Project: Erect a five foot tall wood tall privacy fence in back yard with one gate at driveway; and three foot wooden fence in front yard.
- 19. Applicant: Kelly & Fred Bauer**
- a. Property Address: 1408 Old Shell Rd.
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/28/15
 - c. Project: Remove porch infill. Repaint as per the follow: body of house light sage; trim crisp linen; porch ceiling desert seedling; and door teaberry blossom.
- 20. Applicant: Esther deWolde**
- a. Property Address: 257 Rapier Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/28/15
 - c. Project: Change the color of the porch floor. The color will be Conti Street Grey-Green.
- 21. Applicant: Freedom Roofing**
- a. Property Address: 63 South Julia Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/29/15
 - c. Project: Reroof the building with asphalt shingles.
- 22. Applicant: Freedom Roofing**
- a. Property Address: 120 Espejo Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/29/15
 - c. Project: Reroof the building with asphalt shingles.
- 23. Applicant: Sharyn Bohannon**
- a. Property Address: 201 South Georgia Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/29/15
 - c. Project: Remove a later door. Install a custom-made Arts & Crafts glazed and paneled door appropriate to the style and period of the subject bungalow. Construct a stoop to access the door of a side entrance. The stoop will feature a wooden railing. Construct a pergola/arbor in the rear lot.
- 24. Applicant: Sprint**
- a. Property Address: 101 & 103 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/29/15
 - c. Reissue a CoA calling for the installation of cellular antennae.
- 25. Applicant: Nod-Sud Shipping Inc./Family Land Properties**
- a. Property Address: 605 Saint Francis Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/30/15
 - c. Project: Replace rotten wood to match original in profile and dimension, and repaint to match existing.
- 26. Applicant: Riley Coleman**
- a. Property Address: 1302 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/30/15
 - c. Project: Reroof building the flat roof, not visible from the street.

- 27. Applicant: Sondra Dempsey**
a. Property Address: 261 North Jackson Street
b. Date of Approval: 9/30/15
c. Project: Reroof the house with asphalt shingles.
- 28. Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley**
a. Property Address: 8 North Dearborn Street
b. Date of Approval: 10/1/15
c. Project: Construct a brick wall enclosing the side yard. Said wall will be eight feet in height and will be punctuated by vehicular gate. The gate will be made of iron. Install brick and concrete paving within the resulting enclosure. Construct a handicap access ramp within the same.
- 29. Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley**
a. Property Address: 210 Dauphin Street
b. Date of Approval: 10/1/15
c. Project: Reissue a CoA calling for the construction of a cast iron gallery. Said gallery meets the CRC requirements.
- 30. Applicant: Ed Adams**
a. Property Address: 110 South Dearborn Street
b. Date of Approval: 10/3/15
c. Project: Repaint house as per existing, replace any necessary to match original and repaint to match
- 31. Applicant: Riley Coleman**
a. Property Address: 1302 Dauphin Street
b. Date of Approval: 9/30/15
c. Project: Reroof building with flat roof, not visible from the street.
- 32. Applicant: Virginia D. Wilson**
a. Property Address: 1600 Monterey Place
b. Date of Approval: 10/6/15
c. Project: Repaint house body per existing, change trim from blue to green.
- 33. Project: Applicant: William & Susan Case**
a. Property Address: 1214 Selma Street
b. Date of Approval: 10/6/15
c. Project: Replace/replace/install interior lot privacy fencing. Touch up the paint per the existing color scheme. Repair any deteriorated wood to match the existing as per profile dimension and material.
- 34. Applicant: Wayne Morgan**
a. Property Address: 1311 Brown Street
b. Date of Approval: 10/6/15
c. Project: Repaint house as per existing color scheme.
- 35. Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley for Christopher & Sarah Watkins**
a. Property Address: 1604 Dauphin Street
b. Date of Approval: 10/12/15
c. Project: Construct an ancillary building per submitted plans. The building will be located behind the main residence and minimally visible from the public view. Install six foot tall interior lot privacy fencing behind the front plan of the house. Install paving in the parking areas and for a patio. Construct a lychgate at one of the entrances to rear lot.
- 36. Applicant: Wayne Morgan**
a. Property Address: 1311 Brown Street
b. Date of Approval: 10/10/15
Project: Repaint the house per the existing color scheme.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2015-33-CA: 360 Dauphin Street

- a. Applicant: Phillip Owen with Coastal Architects
- b. Project: Fenestration and Railings – Install windows & doors in the fenestrated bays of a former shell of a building and replace railings.

APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

2. 2015-38-CA: 1659 Government Street

- a. Applicant: Angelica Ramudio for Delta Properties Investments
- b. Project: Painting – Paint a building and ancillary building.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

3. 2015-39-CA: 1252 Government Street

- a. Applicant: Timothy J. Spafford with Architecture & Design, Inc., for Michael Spina
- b. Project: Commercial Renovation – Remodel a non-contributing commercial building.

APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

- 1. Discussion

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2015-33-CA: 360 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Phillip Owen with Coastal Architects
Received: 8/24/15 – first submitted; heldover on 9/16/15
Meeting: 10/21/15

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: T5-1
Project: Fenestration and Railings – Install windows & doors in fenestrated bays of a former shell of a building and replace railings.

BUILDING HISTORY

360 Dauphin Street dates from 1919. This three-story brick building was one of the first buildings constructed on Dauphin Street after World War I. The structure took the place of two 19th-Century brick buildings. The facade bears a strong resemblance with regard to material and articulation to 457 Dauphin Street and 259 St. Francis Street, both designs of Mobile architect C.L. Hutchisson, Sr.

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 September 16, 2015. The application was heldover for reason of lack of representation. Prior to the aforementioned holdover, the application most recently reviewed on September 4, 2013. At that time, the Board approved new construction off the rear elevation of the long burned out building’s shell. The interior volume of the upper-stories is nearing the final stages of being reclaimed for residential use. The application up for review calls for the installation windows & doors within the façade’s fenestrated bays and the installation of new balcony railings.

- B. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
1. “Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.”
 2. “The size and placement of new windows for additions and alterations should be compatible with the general character of a building.”
 3. With regard to galleries, “particular attention should be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, etc...”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted site plan):**
1. Remove replacement door and window units from a former burned out shell of a building.
 2. Install new door and window units.
 - a. The door bays will be tripartite in construction and appearance.
 - b. Double French doors with flanking sidelights will constitute the configuration.
 - c. Said doors will and sidelights will be constructed of and framed in wood.
 - d. The window bays will receive pairs of one-over-one windows. Said windows will be aluminum clad wood in construction.
 3. Remove existing railings.
 4. Install new railings.
 - a. The new railings will be of the same design as the earlier railings.
 - b. Said new railings will be taller so to meet code related requirements.
 5. Install gooseneck lamps.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the removal of later fenestration, the installation new fenestration, and other alterations to the façade of a commercial building. The building burned in the 1980s. While the ground floor and basement were rehabilitated, the two upper stories were not recreated. Over the past year, the interior volume of those upper stories has been reclaimed. The project has reached a point where street-facing fenestration needs to be addressed (rear elevation already reviewed, approved, permitted, and constructed).

When the building burned, the fenestration was lost. Non-operable framed and dressed installations were constructed within the openings. The Design Review Guidelines state that the size and placement of new windows and doors for alterations should be compatible with the general character of a building (See B-2.). All of the units are sized to fit the reveals. The proposed windows are not only responsive to the character of the building, but also take inspiration from the original fenestration. In accord with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards, the new windows are informed by physical, pictorial, and documentary evidence (See B-1.). As evidenced by photographs located within the property’s MHDC vertical file, the types and configurations of both fenestrations are observed.

With regard to the railings, the Design Review Guidelines state that particular attention should be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, etc. (See B-3.). The railings are not original to the building, as is evidenced by older photographs. The proposed railings would match the existing in design, but would taller so to meet code-related height requirements.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-3), Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the building. Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Phillip Owen was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Wagoner welcomed the applicant's representative. He asked Mr. Owen if he had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make. Mr. Owen said not the present juncture.

Mr. Wagoner asked his fellow Board members if any of them had questions which to ask the applicant's representative.

Mr. Stone asked for clarification regarding the proposed doors. Comparison was made between the doors documented in older photographs in the property file and the proposed fenestrated bays. Mr. Stone noted that the widths of the proposed doors were wider than the original doors. He added that widths in the proposed plan did not match those in the elevation. Mr. Owen stated that the width of the doors be same as rendered in the elevation drawing.

Mr. Blackwell and Mr. Holmes pointed out that the existing units are not original. Mr. Blackwell pointed out that the use of filler around the units would not be used for the proposed units would constructed so have casings tailored to the bays.

Ms. Harden said that while the tripartite nature of the door bays would be maintained evidence shows a different proportional sequence than that proposed. She said that since the doors were not being used to egress, they would not have to be as wide as proposed. Ms. Harden asked for clarification regarding the railings. Mr. Owen addressed Ms. Harden's query. Mr. Owen was asked if he was amenable to changing the width of the doors from six to five feet and expanding the sidelights. Mr. Owen expressed his amenability to the aforementioned changes.

Mr. Holmes offered advice as per the permitting and impact resistance.

No further Board discussion ensued.

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

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Stone 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 that the width of the door units would be changed from six to five feet (and the consequent enlarging of the width of the transoms).

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Stone 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: 10/21/16

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2012-38-CA: 1659 Government Street
Applicant: Angelica Zamudio for Delta Properties Investments
Received: 10/2/15
Meeting: 10/21/15

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Leinkauf
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-2
Project: Paint a house.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to materials located within this property's MHDC file, the property's main building is listed as contributing structure in the Leinkauf Historic District. The duplex adopts the forms and features of a 20th Century Picturesque variety.

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. On October 2, 2015, a 311 notification was received on the property. Work - painting the brick building and garage - was being done without the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness. Staff visited the site. The new owner applicant promptly responded and halted the work. The applicant proposes completing the painting of the main building and ancillary building.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. "The exterior of a building helps define its style, quality, and historic period."
 - 2. "Painting of unpainted brick is also inappropriate in most cases."
 - 3. "Period color schemes are encouraged."
- C. **Scope of Work (per submitted site plan):**
 - 1. Continue painting a brick dwelling and an ancillary building.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application is the result of a 311 call. The same day that the 311 notification was received, Staff visited the site and the applicant responded. The unauthorized work took the form of painting walls of previously unpainted brick residence. The applicant stopped the work, but would like to complete the painting pending the Board's approval.

The Design Review Guidelines state that the exterior of a building helps to determine its style, quality, and period (See B-1.). The Guidelines go to state that the painting of unpainted brick is generally inappropriate (See B-2.). Staff consulted colleagues in Savannah and Charleston. Savannah's Architectural Review Board and Charleston's Board of Architectural Review follow the same policy. Painting of historical significant buildings constructed out of handmade brick and major architect designed buildings is deemed inappropriate. The subject building, a contributing structure on account of its age, is neither constructed of a brick that would be damaged by painting nor is it designed by an architect. The overall character of the building would remain the same.

Additionally, the Board has approved painting of two unpainted brick dwellings in recent years. Those two approvals are as follows: 1400 Dauphin Street (18 September 2013) and 1650 Dauphin Street (18 March 2015). In accord with the Design Review Guidelines of Mobile's Historic Districts, a period color scheme has been selected (See B-3.). 2301 Ashland Place Avenue a contemporaneous dwelling has always featured a comparable color scheme, as has 265 Park Terrace. Both dwellings are of these same 20th Century Picturesque stylistic expression.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-3), Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the building or the historic district. Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Angelica Zamudio was present to discuss the application

BOARD DISCUSSION

The board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Wagoner welcomed the applicant and thanked her for prompt action.

Mr. Holmes provided two more examples of houses of same style and period which have always been painted. He cited a second example on Ashland Place Avenue, as well as a house on Woodlands Avenue.

Ms Harden asked for clarification as to the texture of the brick.

No further Board discussion ensued.

Mr. Wagoner 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. Stone 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. Holmes 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.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/21/16

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2012-39-CA: 1252 Government Street
Applicant: Timothy Spafford with Architecture & Design, Inc., for Michael Spina
Received: 9/14/15
Meeting: 10/21/15

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden District
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-
Project: Commercial Renovation – Remodel a non-contributing commercial building.

BUILDING HISTORY

This non-contributing commercial building dates from the latter half of the 20th Century.

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 July 8, 1989. At that time, the Board approved the construction of a rear addition. With this application, a new owner proposes the remodeling of the building.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “New work shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.”
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. Remove porch infill from the front of the building.
 - 2. Remove a stepped fascia.
 - 3. Reconfigure the area in question so to serve as an outdoor dining area and entry.
 - a. Expose existing steel posts and roof framing.
 - b. Install wooden planter boxes in advance of the porch bays.
 - c. Install aluminum picketed railings between the posts.
 - d. Install three banquette seating groupings between two door bays (See the below.).
 - e. Install wooden board and batten siding.
 - f. Install additional fenestration on the façade.
 - i. Install a wooden glazed and paneled door in the existing door bay.
 - ii. Install a second door at the opposite end of the façade. Said door will match the aforementioned door.

- iii. Install five one-over-one aluminum clad or wooden windows between the two doors.
- g. Repair/replacing interior lot fencing palings to match the existing.
- h. Stripe the existing parking.
- i. Paint the building per the submitted color scheme.
- j. Repair and when necessary replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application concerns the renovation of a non-contributing commercial building. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic District do not have regulations specifically addressing applications of the subject variety. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation state that new work shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment (See B-1.). The location of the work impacting the non-contributing building is an infilled porch space. Said infill would be removed and the original façade line reinstated. Posts and roof structure would be (re)exposed. Railings and plantings would be installed to define and enclose the open area enclosure, a space that would function as an entrance and outdoor dining area. Banquette seating would be installed. The fenestration sequence, a bank of sash windows with flanked by doors, would replicate the existing bay sequence of the façade, albeit with more context appropriate designs and materials. Board and batten siding matching the existing would be employed.

Repairs to fencing, repair/replacement of woodwork, and the restriping of parking represent in kind interventions.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Michael Spina was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Wagoner welcomed the applicant. He asked Mr. Spina if he had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make.

Mr. Stone asked if there were any proposed changes proposed for the East Elevation. Mr. Spina said that other than painting and the addition of a side door, no further changes were proposed.

Ms. Harden asked for clarification as per the materials doors and windows. She noted that the Staff Report specified wood or aluminum clad wood windows, but the plans specified another material. Mr. Spina and Mr. Blackwell clarified that the units for both the door and window bays would as stated in the Staff Report.

Mr. Holmes recommended the use of aluminum clad for reasons of code.

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

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Stone 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 that the doors would also be wood or aluminum clad wood in composition.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Holmes 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.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/21/16