

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD Minutes
October 2, 2013 – 3:00 P.M.
Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Harris Oswalt, called the meeting to order at 3:00. Cart Blackwell, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:

Members Present: David Barr, Kim Harden, Carolyn Hasser, Nick Holmes III, Thomas Karwinski, Harris Oswalt, Craig Roberts, and Steve Stone

Members Absent: Bradford Ladd, Jim Wagoner, and Janetta Whitt-Mitchell.

Staff Members Present: Cart Blackwell, and John Lawler.

2. Mr. Karwinski moved to approve the minutes of the 2009 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: Anne Hall

- a. Property Address: 11 McPhillips
- b. Date of Approval: 9/10/13
- c. Project: Repaint the house. The body will be Government Street Olive and the trim will be off white.

2. Applicant: Susan Rhondes

- a. Property Address: 22 South Ann Street
- b. Date of Approval: 9/10/13
- c. Project: Construct a six foot high interior lot privacy fence per drawings in file.

3. Applicant: John Wells

- a. Property Address: 261 Tuttle Street
- b. Date of Approval: 9/12/13
- c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork to match the existing and repaint to match the existing.

4. Applicant: Jesse Mangham

- a. Property Address: 1407 Brown Street
- b. Date of Approval: 9/12/13
- c. Project: Construct outbuilding per plans in file. Hardiplank walls, hip roof, two wood doors. Five foot setback.

5. Applicant: Jerry Brown Roofing

- a. Property Address: 59 South Georgia Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 9/13/13
- c. Project: Reroof with asphalt shingles, black in color.

6. Applicant: Lee Franks

- a. Property Address: 955 Elmira Street
- b. Date of Approval: 9/13/13
- c. Project: Replace fire-damaged siding. The new siding will match that being removed in composition, profile, and dimension. The work will be repainted to match the existing.

7. Applicant: Big Moore Roofing

- a. Property Address: 1755 Conti Street
- b. Date of Approval: 9/16/13
- c. Project: Reroof to match the existing.

- 8. Applicant: Mary Sturdivant**
 - a. Property Address: 161 South Warren Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/16/13
 - c. Project: Repaint per the existing, repair any rotten wood, repair/replace windows as necessary, reinstall wooden shutters.
- 9. Applicant: Bob and Sherrilyn Allen**
 - a. Property Address: 959 Augusta Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/17/13
 - c. Project: Remove a metal security door. Install a wooden and glass storm door whose divisions and construction match the main door.
- 10. Applicant: Pentecostal Church of God**
 - a. Property Address: 306 North Joachim Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/17/13
 - c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile dimension and material. Repaint to match the existing color scheme.
- 11. Applicant: Pentecostal Church of God**
 - a. Property Address: 308 North Joachim Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/17/13
 - c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile dimension and material. Repaint to match the existing color scheme.
- 12. Applicant: Louis Felis**
 - a. Property Address: 954 Palmetto Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/20/13
 - c. Project: Remove a later window from the side elevation. Install a period appropriate wooden with trim to match the historic windows.
- 13. Applicant: Stephen Hand**
 - a. Property Address: 200 South Dearborn Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/20/13
 - c. Project: Repair foundations (using appropriate mortar) if necessary. Replace deteriorated siding to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material as required. Repair and/or replace windows sashes to match the existing in profile, dimension, material, and construction if necessary. Repair and replace any deteriorated woodwork or detailing to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repaint per the existing color scheme.
- 14. Applicant: Taylor Atchison**
 - a. Property Address: 1400 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/18/13
 - c. Project: Paint a house and garage per the submitted color scheme as authorized by the Board.
- 15. Applicant: RCLA**
 - a. Property Address: 101 Michael Donald Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/20/13
 - c. Project: Install a three foot high picket fence around the lot.
- 16. Applicant: Dr. Ray Hester**
 - a. Property Address: 955 Augusta Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/23/13
 - c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repaint the house Sherwin Williams Peacock Plume. Extend the rear deck.

17. Applicant: Karlos Finley

- a. Property Address: 501 Monroe Street
- b. Date of Approval: 9/23/13
- c. Project: Install an ancillary structure per submitted plans. The prefabricated installation meets setback and lot coverage requirements.

18. Applicant: McGill Toolen Catholic High School

- a. Property Address: 1501 Old Shell Road
- b. Date of Approval: 9/19/13
- c. Project: Install recycling receptacles within the courtyards and behind the building.

19. Applicant: Harris and Drue Oswalt

- a. Property Address: 301 West Street
- b. Date of Approval: 9/4/13
- c. Project: Repaint the house per the existing color scheme. Repair any deteriorated woodwork (when and where necessary) to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2013-CA-72: 255 State Street

- a. Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley with Douglas Burtu Kearley Architect for Kelly Baker
- b. Project: Construct a rear addition.

APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

2. 2013-CA-73: 222 Dauphin Street

- a. Applicant: David Naman
- b. Project: Construct a balcony and remodel a storefront.

TABLED FOR LACK OF INFORMATION. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

3. 2013-CA-74: 1567 Fearnway

- a. Applicant: Steve Stone with Dakin Street for Sarah and Chad Jones
- b. Project: Restoration and Renovation

APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Form-Based Code

Elizabeth Sanders, Fred Rendfrey, Laura Clarke, Richard Olsen, Bert Hoffman, and Keri Coumanis were present to discuss the form based code proposal for the Downtown Loop. Ms. Sanders spoke of the proposed plan and the benefits it could provide. Ms. Clarke stated that (as far as the Architectural Review Board was concerned) the same procedures would be applied. Mr. Roberts inquired as to how potential expansions of the affected historic districts would be impacted. Ms. Sanders, Ms. Clarke, and Mr. Blackwell addressed Mr. Roberts' concerns. Mr. Holmes voiced concern over the use related restrictions that would impact DeTonti Square. Mr. Karwinski recommended that Urban Development consider establishing a position for a city architect work in the subject areas. Ms. Clarke explained that adoption of the new code would not entail the creation of additional posts within the City.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2013-72-CA: 255 State Street
Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley with Douglas Burtu Kearley Architect for Kelly Baker
Received: 9/18/13
Meeting: 10/2/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: DeTonti Square
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Construct a rear addition.

BUILDING HISTORY

This house is comprised of the 1856 rear service wing of the Martha Crawford House, a traditional Mobile side hall house that was lost in a fire, and a 1945 front block located atop the site of the aforementioned main residence. The 1945 portion of the dwelling was designed by architect Harry Inge Johnstone.

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 October 19, 1987. At that time, the Board approved the enclosure of the rear service wing’s side galleries. With the application, the owner/applicant proposes the construction of a rear addition.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Rehabilitation and 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 the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.”
 - 2. “New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
 - 1. Construct a rear addition.
 - a. Constructed behind the old service wing portion of the building, the “Old Mobile” brick faced addition will be located in the southwest corner of the lot.
 - b. The addition will be single-story in form and in plane with the service wing’s eastern wall.

- c. The addition's East Elevation will feature three glazed and paneled antique doors. The doors will be surmounted by splayed flat arches and a cornice-like beltcourse that will provide transition from the wall field to a capped parapet.
- d. The addition will be surmounted by a hipped roof. Asphalt roofing shingles will be employed.
- e. The addition's south-facing doors will open onto a wooden deck fronted by an existing brick wall.
- f. The addition's western wall will feature an outer wall constructed of stucco-faced concrete block.
- g. The addition's existing south-facing wall will be heightened. "Old Mobile" bricks will be employed.
- h. Enclose the southeast corner of the service wing's previously infilled gallery. The existing posts will remain in place.
- i. The aforementioned infill will employ wooden siding that will match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. The wall bay will feature a relocated six-over-six wooden window.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of a rear addition. Located behind the main dwelling, the addition will not be visible from the public view. Both Staff and the applicant's representative have contacted the office of Urban Development regarding setback and lot coverage requirements. Surrounding property owners do not object to the new construction.

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards state that additions should be differentiated from, yet compatible with the existing historic fabric (See B-1). The brick addition (except for the west-facing wall which will be stuccoed so as to complement the building located on the adjacent property) will be single story in height and shed roof in form. The single story form will serve to visually demarcate the transition from the 1840s portion of the building from the proposed new construction. The use of historic "Old Mobile" brick, French doors, and a brick cornice will allow for compatibility with the 1940s portion of the existing complex.

With the exception of the small open section of the 1840s lower gallery, the old service wings galleries were enclosed at an earlier date (See the above.). The small section of infill would be faced with wooden siding matching that employed elsewhere on the building. A relocated six-over-six wooden window will be employed. The infilled porches square section posts will remain in place so to allow the proposed enclosure to "read" as a later alteration.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2), Staff does not believe this application impairs either the architectural or the historical character of the building. Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Douglas B. Kearley was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt welcomed the applicant's representative. He asked Mr. Kearley if he had any clarifications to address, comments to

make, or questions to ask. Mr. Kearley answered no with regard to the application, but he elaborated on the history of the house. Mr. Oswalt asked his fellow Board members if they had any questions to ask Mr. Kearley. Mr. Karwinski asked if the east-facing doors would be decorative or operable. Mr. Kearley answered that the doors would be operable. He noted that the doors depicted in the presentation had been acquired by the owner after the drawings had been submitted. Mr. Oswalt asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. Upon hearing no response, Mr. Oswalt closed the period of public comment.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Karwinski moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, amending facts to note the doors installed on the west elevation would match those pictured in the PowerPoint presentation.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Karwinski moved that, based upon the facts as amended by the Board, the construction of the gallery 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: 10/2/14

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2013-73-CA: 222 Dauphin Street
Applicant: David Naman
Received: 9/3/13
Meeting: 10/2/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Construct a balcony and remodel a ground floor storefront.

BUILDING HISTORY

Erected in 1879, 222 Dauphin is one of the three units comprising the Demouy Row, one of Mobile's finest extant examples of Italianate commercial architecture of the Postbellum period.

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 owner/applicant proposes the construction of a cast iron balcony and the remodeling of the ground floor storefront.
- 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 the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment."
 - 2. "New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired."
 - 3. "Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence."
 - 4. "Changes that create a false sense of historic sense of historic development such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall be not be undertaken."
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
 - 1. Construct a cast iron gallery.
 - a. The gallery will be supported by four cast iron posts matching those employed on the two other units which comprise the complex.
 - b. The gallery will be 6' 2" in depth and extend between the unit's pilasters.

- c. The gallery will feature an Italianate style railing. The sections of railing will be extended between newel-like posts vertically aligned with the posts supporting the gallery.
- d. The decking will match that employed on the adjacent unit's gallery.
- 2. Remove the 1950s recessed entrance.
- 3. Reconfigure the ground floor storefront.
 - a. The ground floor storefront will be comprised of two parts.
 - b. All of the storefront vertical and horizontal members will be made of wood.
 - c. The western portion of the storefront will feature a glazed wooden door surmounted by a transom.
 - d. The eastern portion of the storefront will feature a recessed bay featuring a double door flanked by glazed bays.
 - e. All of the storefront's easternmost fenestrated bays will be surmounted by transoms.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of a gallery and the alteration of a ground floor storefront.

As the building's upper-story door bay indicates, early 20th-Century photographs depict, and Sanborn Maps depict, this building once featured a cast iron gallery. Cantilevered in form, the balcony was later replaced by a projecting marquee (See B-3). The proposed gallery would feature the same four bay elevation and 6' 2" depth as the galleries fronting the buildings two western units. The balcony to the east is of the same projection. Traditional railings like that proposed have been approved on reconstructed balconies located across the Lower Dauphin Commercial District. The structure and posts of the balcony serve allow this historically informed intervention to read as a sympathetic addition to traditional commercial context (See B-1 and 4).

The ground floor storefront dates from the 1950s. While a testament with regard to changing technologies, marketing practices, and design aesthetics, recessed entrance is not an exemplar of Modern design. Better examples survive and have been preserved elsewhere on Dauphin Street (223 Dauphin Street for instance). The proposed store front accommodates access to the ground floor and upper story units, a common feature of many 19th-Century commercial buildings. A similar solution can be seen at remodeled storefront located at 3 South Royal Street. Wooden ground floor storefronts have been approved across the Lower Dauphin Commercial District.

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

No one was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Blackwell stated that if there were no major objections to the application, he would answer questions regarding the application. Mr. Karwinski asked Mr. Blackwell if the applicant was amenable to the suggestion which he had emailed on Monday. Mr. Blackwell responded by informing Mr. Karwinski that he had notified the applicant of his suggestion, the alignment of the transom of the second story's proposed door with the muntins of the flanking windows, but that he had not heard back from the him (as

to their amenable to the suggestion). A discussion ensued as to the swing of the doors. Mr. Blackwell note that since the double door was recessed, it could either swing inward or outward and still meet code related requirements. Mr. Karwinski and Mr. Roberts pointed out that the same might not prove true for the single door. Mr. Roberts asked for clarification as to the plan. A discussion ensued as to the type of door proposed for the upper story. Mr. Karwinski questioned the framing and treatment of the ground floor storefront. The Board determined that while the application does not appear to impair the building, clarifications needed to be addressed prior to approving the project.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Holmes 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. Karwinski moved that, based upon the facts as approved by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building, but that the application be tabled for lack of information.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2013-74-CA: 1567 Fearnway
Applicant: Steve Stone with Dakin Street for Sarah and Chad Jones
Received: 9/16/13
Meeting: 10/2/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Restoration and Renovation

BUILDING HISTORY

Oral tradition and documentary evidence prove this wood-framed dwelling to be the oldest house located on Fearnway. One of the oldest suburban developments in Mobile, the lands comprising Fearnway were purchased, platted, developed, promoted, and named in honor of real estate mogul George Fearn. Other Fearn projects include the following: Ashland Place, Florence Place, Monterey Place, North Monterey Street (the northernmost block), Bayshore, and Country Club Estates.

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 new owner applicants propose the restoration and renovation of the vacant dwelling.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “The exterior of a building helps define its style. Replacement of exterior finishes, when required, must match the original in profile, dimension and material.”
 - 2. An accessory structure is any construction other than the main building on the property. The appropriateness of accessory structures shall be measured by the guidelines applicable for new construction. The structure should complement the design and scale of the main building.”
 - 3. The type, size and dividing lights of windows and their location and configuration (rhythm) on the building help to establish the historic character of a building. Original window openings should be retained as well as original window sashes and glazing. Where windows cannot be repaired, new windows must be compatible to the existing. The size and placement of new windows for additions or alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.”
 - 4. “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture. Historic porches should be maintained and repaired to reflect their period. Particular attention

should be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns and decorative details.”

5. “The form and shape of the porch and its roof should maintain their historic appearance. The materials should blend with the style of the building.”
6. “The balustrade of the stairs should match the design and materials of the porch.”
7. “A roof is one of the most dominant features of a building. Original or historic roof forms, as well as the original pitch of the roof should be maintained. Materials should be appropriate to the form and pitch and color.”

C. Scope of Work in general and then broken down into elevation and/or location (per submitted plans):

1. Remove later asphalt siding.
2. Expose, repair, and when necessary replace deteriorated wooden siding to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material.
3. Reroof the house with asphalt shingles.
4. North Elevation (Façade)
 - a. Remove the existing concrete steps.
 - b. Construct a flight of wooden steps. The steps will be splayed in configuration.
 - c. The wooden steps will feature wooden railings and terminating newel posts.
 - d. Remove and salvage the later iron railings and porch supports.
 - e. Construct square section paneled wooden porch posts. The posts will be four in number and located on the location of the existing iron supports.
 - f. Construct a wooden picketed railing that will extend between the porch bays.
 - g. Reconvert a later door bay back into a window bay. A salvaged wooden window will be employed. Said windows will match the other windows on the façade.
 - h. Remove the existing shed roofed dormer.
 - i. Reconstruct a hipped roof dormer.
 - j. The aforementioned dormer will feature wooden siding matching that employed on the body of the house. The dormer will feature two two-over-two aluminum clad wooden windows. The roofing shingles will match those proposed for the body of the house.
5. West Elevation
 - a. Remove two shorter windows from the rear portion of the West Elevation.
 - b. Install a single two-over-two aluminum clad window in area of the aforementioned windows.
6. East Elevation
 - a. Remove three shorter windows and relocate one two-over-two window.
 - b. Install two two-light aluminum clad wooden transom windows.
 - c. Remove the shed roof dormer.
 - d. Reconstruct the aforementioned using aluminum clad wooden windows instead of jalousie windows.
7. Demolish the garage/lean to sequence located off the main house’s shed roof rear addition.
8. South Elevation
 - a. Remove later jalousie windows and a secondary door.
 - b. Replace the aforementioned windows with two-over-two windows.
 - c. Remove and relocate a two-over-two window.
 - d. Replace a later rear door with a new wooden door with flanking multi-light lights.

- e. Remove later concrete steps.
 - f. A pyramidal sequence of steps rising to a stoop will be constructed as a means of access to the rear entrance.
 - g. Remove the rear dormer.
 - h. Construct a hipped roof dormer featuring four six light windows.
9. Construct a new carport.
- a. The carport will measure 24' 3" by 28' 10" in plan.
 - b. A gable-roofed breezeway supported by square section piers will connect the main house to the new carport.
 - c. A concrete drive will access the double vehicle carport.
 - d. The hipped roof carport will feature a storage unit that will extend the length of the East Elevation. The storage area will be accessed by two pairs of double doors.
 - e. Four square section wooden piers will support the porch's western portions (those used for parking).
10. Reclaim the existing brick patio.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the restoration and renovation of a contributing dwelling. The house experienced many unsympathetic alterations over the course of the latter half of the 20th Century. The original front porch supports and railings were removed, the façade's fenestration was altered and removed, dormers were added, and asphalt siding was installed.

The proposed removal of the later asphalt siding and the repair and/or in kind replacement of the original wooden siding is in accord with Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts (See B-1)

In keeping with the Design Review Guidelines, the proposed changes the porch and street-facing fenestration which would allow the façade to better reflect its period and past. Porch posts and railings (based on those documented in an early photograph) would be constructed, as well as new wooden steps featuring railings matching those proposed for the porch (See B 4-6). The later iron supports and railings would be salvaged and repurposed by the owners. Existing wooden windows on the façade would be removed when and where necessary. Two-over-two wooden windows would be installed. A later door would be reconverted back into a window.

The main roof will remain unaltered which is in keeping with the Design Review Guidelines (See B-7). Later and altered dormers will be reconstructed with roof forms designed to complement the main room and stylistic period. Windows more in keeping with the period will be installed on the façade and East Elevation. The reconstructed dormers will not rise above the main roof.

With regard to the windows, the Design Guidelines state that type, size and dividing lights of windows and their location and configuration (rhythm) on the building help to establish the historic character of a building. Original window openings should be retained as well as original window sashes and glazing. The façade's windows (North Elevation) will remain in place. A later door will be replaced with a relocated wooden window. The new front dormer will utilize wooden windows. The new side and rear dormers will employ aluminum clad wooden windows. The Board allows aluminum clad windows on additions and new construction. The window designs will be in keeping with the style and period of the house. The existing side dormer features aluminum windows. The rear dormer, while an original feature to the house, is not visible from the public view. The Rear (South) Elevation's later aluminum windows will be replaced with aluminum clad wooden windows matching the design of those employed elsewhere on the dwelling. The window proposed for relocation from the Rear Elevation will be employed

elsewhere on the building. As per the replacement of first-floor side elevation wooden windows with aluminum clad wooden windows, the Board has required that windows be replaced in kind. While the proposed windows would match the originals in design, their construction would change. In previous discussions regarding the replacement of wooden windows, the condition of windows has been discussed. Staff requests further clarification regarding the condition of the windows.

The rambling rear/carport addition is piecemeal in nature and construction and extends from the body of the house. When evaluating partial demolitions, the following criteria are taken into account: the architectural significance of structure; the degree of deterioration; the effect the demolition will have on the streetscape, and the nature of any proposed redevelopment. The existing carport is not of the same architectural integrity as the principle dwelling. Of poor construction, the subject area is not visible from the public view. In keeping with the Design Review Guidelines, the proposed new carport would complement the design of the main house.

CLARIFICATIONS

1. Provide clarification of the condition of the windows located on the East and West Elevations.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-7), Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the building or the district. With the exception of the replacement of the East and West Elevations'' windows, which are subject to clarification and discussion, Staff recommends approval of the whole of the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Sarah Jones was present to discuss the application. Mr. Stone recused himself from the discussion and exited the room.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt welcomed the applicant's representative. He asked Ms. Jones if she had any clarifications to address, comments to make, or questions to ask. After describing the variety and condition of the windows, Ms. Jones explained that only the aluminum windows would be replaced. She stated that the later windows would be removed for reason of consistency and appearance.

Mr. Karwinski said that he had several questions to ask. He asked for clarification regarding the dormers (questioning the roof of the side dormer and noting that the notes on the drawings were inconsistent). Ms. Jones explained that the front and rear dormers would feature hipped roofs and the rear side dormer would feature a shed roof. Mr. Karwinski asked for clarification regarding the façade's shutters. Ms. Jones stated that existing wooden shutters would be retained and that new shutters of the same type and design would be employed on either side of the proposed reconverted window. Mr. Karwinski noted that the existing shutters are faux and that non operable shutters are not ordinarily allowed. Mr. Karwinski stated that the expanses located between the house's brick foundation piers are of a masonry composition. He noted they were not rendered correctly in the drawings. Mr. Karwinski asked how the aforementioned areas would be treated. Ms. Jones stated that the subject areas would be painted. Mr. Karwinski asked Ms. Jones if she had given any thought to removing the concreted porch substructure and rebuilding a wooden porch (decking). Ms. Jones answered yes but stated that for reasons of expense, condition, and scope, the existing concrete substructure would remain. She said that it would be painted to complement the house.

Mr. Karwinski question the front door treatment. Ms. Jones explained that only the door would change. The transom would be retained. Mr. Oswalt asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. Upon hearing no response, Mr. Oswalt closed the period of public comment.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Karwinski moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, amending facts to note that front door would be replaced, the transom surmounting the aforementioned door would remain intact and the foundation expanses would not be altered structurally, only painted.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/2/14