

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
September 4, 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: Robert Allen, David Barr, Nick Holmes III, Thomas Karwinski, Harris Oswalt, Craig Roberts, and Steve Stone.
Members Absent: Kim Harden, Carolyn Hasser, Bradford Ladd, Jim Wagoner, and Janetta Whitt-Mitchell.
Staff Members Present: Devereaux Bemis, Cart Blackwell, and John Lawler.
2. Mr. Karwinski moved to holdover the approval of the minutes of the August 21, 2013 meeting. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.
3. Mr. Stone 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: Richard Gudmundson**
 - a. Property Address: 14 South Catherine Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/14/13
 - c. Project: Install a period appropriate glazed and paneled door in the place of a later replacement door.
2. **Applicant: Zach Bolden**
 - a. Property Address: 263 Marine Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/14/13
 - c. Project: Install a six foot tall wooden privacy fence. The fence will not extend beyond the front plane of the house. Install a three foot wooden fence matching that on the adjacent property to the north. Said fence will enclose the front portion of the lawn.
3. **Applicant: Alan Jones**
 - a. Property Address: 263 North Joachim Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/14/13
 - c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repaint per the existing color scheme.
4. **Applicant: Hargrove and Associates**
 - a. Property Address: 20-26 South Royal Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/16/13
 - a. Project: Install an 11' 6" x 3' 33" aluminum wall sign on the building's façade.
2. **Applicant: Society of 1868**
 - a. Property Address: 254 Saint Anthony Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/16/13
 - c. Project: Repaint the front door Paris Green.
3. **Applicant: Timothy Hight**
 - a. Property Address: 266 Stocking Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/19/13
 - c. Project: Repaint the house. The body of the house will be painted to match the color of the property's garage apartment (gray). The trim will be white.

4. **Applicant: Thomas Figures**
 - a. Property Address: 212 South Lawrence Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/15/13
 - c. Project: Replace rotten boards, replace shutter as existing and repaint to match.
5. **Applicant: Ricky Anderson**
 - a. Property Address: 200 Tuttle Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/19/13
 - c. Project: Shift existing six foot privacy fence from middle of lot to Tuttle Avenue at a 25 foot setback, erect six foot privacy fence down Church Street, with a drive through gate at Tuttle Avenue entrance.
6. **Applicant: Hagan Fence**
 - a. Property Address: 1509 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/19/13
 - c. Project: Erect an 8 foot high wooden privacy fence across rear of property, bordering Church Street, and tying into existing 8 foot fence to east.
7. **Applicant: Popeye's**
 - a. Property Address: 1966 Government Street (out of district signage)
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/22/13
 - c. Project: Construct a non-illuminated monument sign. The aforementioned sign will measure 4' in height and 8' in length. Said sign will rest atop an aluminum base measuring 1' high. The composite board sign face will feature the name of the fast food franchise.
8. **Applicant: Sign Pro for Senior Bowl**
 - a. Property Address: 151 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/22/13
 - c. Project: Install a hanging sign. The sign will be suspended from the underside of the building's balcony. The double-faced sign will feature the name of the occupying tenant and the tenant's sponsor. The sign will be suspended at such a height as to meet code requirements.
9. **Applicant: Shane Taylor**
 - a. Property Address: 308 Congress Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/22/13
 - c. Project: Renew a sign permit issued on 28 August 2006. The 3' x 3' aluminum sign will feature the name of the occupying tenant.
10. **Applicant: Jim Walker**
 - a. Property Address: 661 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/26/13
 - c. Project: Replace doors to match the existing in appearance and material. Repaint the work to match.
11. **Applicant: Jim Walker**
 - a. Property Address: 602 Church Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/26/13
 - c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repaint to match the existing. Repair the roof to match the existing. Pressure wash the fence.
12. **Applicant: Antonio Petite**
 - a. Property Address: 259 South Georgia Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/26/13
 - c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork when and where necessary to match the existing. Repaint per the existing color scheme. Level the garage. Repair woodwork to match. Repaint per the existing.

13. Applicant: Rennie Brabner

- a. Property Address: 303 North Conception Street
- b. Date of Approval: 8/26/13
- c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork to match the existing in profile, dimension, and material. Repair windows when and where necessary. Repaint per the existing color scheme.

14. Applicant: Joseph Patterson with JPS Construction

- a. Property Address: 204 South Dearborn Street
- b. Date of Approval: 8/26/13
- c. Project: Install interior lot privacy fencing. The six foot high wooden fencing would not extend beyond the front plane of the house. Repaint the house per the submitted Sherwin Williams color scheme. The body will be Web Gray. The trim will be Extra White.

15. Applicant: Sign Pro for Senior Bowl

- a. Property Address: 151 Dauphin Street
- b. Date of Approval: 8/26/13
- c. Project: Install a hanging sign. The sign will be suspended from the underside of the building's balcony. The double-faced sign will feature the name of the occupying tenant and the tenant's sponsor. The sign will be suspended at such a height as to meet code requirements.

16. Applicant: Wrico Signs

- a. Property Address: 5 North Conception Street/200 Dauphin Street
- b. Date of Approval: 8/15/13
- c. Project: Install an aluminum wall sign. The 7.49 square foot sign will feature the name of the occupying tenant.

17. Applicant: M.A. Publishing

- a. Property Address: 467 Dauphin Street
- b. Date of Approval: 8/26/13
- c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork to match the existing. Remove plywood boarding. Repaint a door. Stain a storefront.

B. APPLICATIONS

1. 2013-67-CA: 104 South Georgia Avenue

- a. Applicant: Peyton Harvill with PH Company for Joel Bullard, III
- b. Project: Fencing – Install interior lot fencing.

DENIED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

2. 2013-68-CA: 22 (also listed as 18) South Royal Street

- a. Applicant: Ben Cummings with Cummings Architecture for Kress Investments
- b. Project: Reconstruct a ground floor storefront and construct a balcony.

APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

3. 2013-69-CA: 358-360 Dauphin Streets

- a. Applicant: Phillip Owens with Coastal Architects for Lightship Partners
- b. Project: Work to the Rear Elevations/Inner lots of Dauphin Street facing buildings – Relocate a staircase, construct a new staircase construct an elevator shaft, and tiered decks.

APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

- 1. Discussion

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2013-67-CA: 104 South Georgia Avenue
Applicant: Peyton Harvill with PH Company for Joel Bullard, III
Received: 8/12/13
Meeting: 9/4/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Fencing – Install interior lot fencing.

BUILDING HISTORY

This Aesthetics Movement inspired Queen Anne house dates from 1903. The large dwelling features a two-tiered wrap-around gallery.

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 was last reviewed on September 14, 1994. At that time, the Old Dauphin Way Review Board approved the reconstruction of the front porch and steps.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. Fences “should complement the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement, and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District. The height of solid fencing is ordinarily restricted to six feet, however, if a commercial or multi-family unit adjoins the subject property, an eight foot fence may be considered. The finished side of the fence should face toward public view.”
- C. **Scope of Work (per submitted site plan):**
 - 1. Install interior lot fencing.
 - a. Existing wooden and chain link fencing will be removed.
 - b. An 8’ tall wooden privacy fence will be constructed on the location of existing fencing (behind the front plane of the house and extending along the lot line).
 - c. A vehicular gate will access to and from the rear lot.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of a wooden privacy fence on rear property lines. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state that fencing should complement the building and not detract from it. The Design Guidelines go on to state that unless located adjacent to multi-family or commercial housing, the height of solid fencing is restricted to six feet in height. This application calls for

the construction of a privacy fence measuring 8' in height. Neither multi-family, nor commercial property abuts the subject property.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Joel Bullard, III was present to discuss the application

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt welcomed the applicant. He asked Mr. Bullard if he had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make.

Mr. Bullard thanked the Board for their time. He informed the Board that he and his family had acquired the house about a month ago. Mr. Bullard drew the Board's attention to the size of the yard and the vacant lot behind the house (a lot facing Ann Street). He stated that the existing fencing measures 6' in height. Mr. Bullard noted that the fencing varies in composition and condition. He told the Board that he would like to install an 8' fence on the location of the existing fencing for reasons of privacy and appearance. Mr. Bullard said that he lived on North Reed Street and that a previous owner had installed an 8' fence on that property. Citing the Staff Report, Mr. Bullard stated that he did not believe that location, height, and design of the proposed fence would impair the house or the district. He explained that he was appearing before the Board on the chance that they would consider his request. Mr. Bullard said that he and his family like their new home and want to make it attractive. He thanked the Board for their time and consideration.

Mr. Karwinski stated that he understood Mr. Bullard's reasons for wanting an 8' fence. He noted that while a 6' fence is proportional to ranch house, it is not necessarily in scale with a multi-story dwelling set atop a raised foundation. Mr. Karwinski then referenced the Guidelines. He suggested to Mr. Bullard that landscaping, possibly Lugustroms, would allow for privacy after they had time to grow and if they were property shaped.

Mr. Stone asked for precedent regarding the approval of 8' high fencing on rear lots. Mr. Roberts stated that 8' fencing is approved on properties designated or located adjacent to multi-family or commercial properties.

Mr. Holmes acknowledged the size of the rear lot and the location of the fencing.

Mr. Roberts said that 8' high fencing has been installed along alleys. Mr. Holmes referenced several 8' fences in other districts.

Mr. Roberts reiterated Mr. Karwinski's and Mr. Holmes' observations regarding the location of the fencing and the size of the rear lot. He cited the Guidelines and precedent.

Mr. Bullard stated that he understood the Board's reasoning. He asked if an 8' fence could be approved if it was made of a material other than wood. The Board responded by saying that the height restriction remained regardless of the material.

Mr. Roberts reiterated Mr. Karwinski's recommendation regarding the use of landscaping.

No further Board discussion ensued.

Mr. Oswalt asked if there was anyone in 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. 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. Roberts moved that, based upon the facts as approved by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued.

The received a second and passed. Mr. Karwinski voted in opposition.

DENIED.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2013-68-CA: 22 (also called 18) South Royal Street
Applicant: Ben Cummings with Cummings Architecture for Kress Investments, LLC
Received: 8/17/13
Meeting: 9/4/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Reconstruct a ground floor storefront and construct a balcony.

BUILDING HISTORY

Mobile's downtown Kress complex features four street frontages. Constructed over four decades, the four facades illustrate the development of architectural branding and corporate identity. The Royal Street and Dauphin Street facades date from 1913. Both of these elevations were constructed according to the designs of Kress architect Seymour Burrell. They were remodeled in 1928 according to plans by E. J. T. Hoffman, another architect of the Kress five and dime empire. The Saint Emanuel and Conti Street facades date from 1941 and 1950. They were designed by Edward F. Sibbert, the most well known of the Kress designers. For reasons of its size and architects, Mobile's Kress compound ranks among the most significant early commercial ensembles in the Deep South.

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 portion of the old Kress complex last appeared before the Architectural Review Board June 5, 2013. At that time, the applicants withdrew an application calling for the remodeling of the building's ground floor storefront. This application calls for reconstruction of the storefront and the construction of a balcony.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic District, the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation state, and the Lower Dauphin Street Commercial District Design Guidelines, in pertinent part:
 - 1. "New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterized a property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment."
 - 2. "New additions and adjacent 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. With regard to balconies “should there be no documentation that a balcony or gallery existed, a balcony gallery may be appropriate to the age and character of the building may be added.”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):

1. Repair deteriorated masonry when and where necessary.
2. Gently clean the building’s historic signage.
3. Reconstruct the ground floor storefront.
 - a. Reconstruct the northernmost portion of the bulkhead to match that located within the southern portion.
 - b. Install an insulated glass aluminum storefront system within the windows.
4. Construct a balcony.
 - a. Construct painted steel balcony.
 - b. The five-bay balcony will be supported by paired posts.
 - c. The balcony’s three central bays will be advance beyond the two outer bays.
 - d. Convert the upper story’s two central windows into doors.
 - e. The aforementioned doors will be paired and paneled wooden French doors.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application calls for the reconstruction of a storefront and the construction of a balcony.

The northern portion of the ground floor storefront has been removed. The bulkhead of the aforementioned area will be reconstructed to match the existing. As documented by physical and photographic evidence, the recessed entrance will be replicated. A contemporary aluminum storefront will be installed above the existing and replicated bulkheads. Similar aluminum storefronts have been approved throughout the Lower Dauphin Commercial District.

With regard to the proposed balcony, the Lower Dauphin Commercial District Design Guidelines state that when there is no evidence for a balcony or gallery, one appropriate to the age and character of the building may be added (See B-3). The Board has approved balconies on buildings that did not feature galleries on a number of occasions (200 Dauphin Street, 20-26 South Royal Street, 70 South Royal Street, and 206 Dauphin Street for example). The Secretary of the Interior Standards state that new additions and alterations should be differentiated from the old, yet compatible with the new (See B-1). In accord with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards, the simplicity of the contemporary design allows the character defining features of the façade to remain unaltered. The detailing of the railings borrows motifs from the building. The proportions and scale respect those of the building. The balcony will be in line with balcony of the adjacent building to the south so it would redirect pedestrian traffic and will engage the building at portion of the façade that has already been altered.

In order to access the balcony, the two inner windows are proposed for conversion to doors. The Board has approved similar alterations on a number of occasions (20-26 South Royal Street and 66 South Royal Street for example).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Ben Cummings and Jeb Shell were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt welcomed the applicant and the applicant's representative. He asked Mr. Cummings and Mr. Shell if they had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make.

Mr. Cummings said that he had read and agreed with the Staff Report. He said that based on their research, Royal Street was once lined with two and three tiered balconies. He stated that while neither the Kress, nor the adjacent Neisner's building ever featured balconies were a traditional feature of building on Royal Street.

A discussion ensued as to the recessed paired posts for the north and south ends of the proposed balcony. Mr. Karwinski voiced concerns regarding the placement of the posts in question. He said they invaded the public space. Mr. Karwinski added that they might pose fire-related concerns.

Mr. Karwinski then addressed the proposed storefront units. He said that the applicant had the opportunity to right earlier alterations which cause the storefronts to become misaligned with transoms located above them. He acknowledged that buildings change over time, but that by aligning the fenestration in a vertical manner, the appearance of the building would improve.

Mr. Cummings said that the applicants wanted to keep to keep the storefront as it was.

Mr. Holmes asked for clarifications as to the height of the balcony's railings. Mr. Cummings thanked Mr. Shell. He stated the railings would measure 3'6" in height, not 3' in height as specified in the plans. Mr. Stone recommended removing the posts in questions and cantilevering that those portions of the balcony. After some further discussion, Mr. Cummings and Mr. Shell agreed to amend the application to reflect Mr. Stone's suggestion.

Mr. Shell addressed the Board. He said that Hargrove and Associates, the owner the building, had invested eleven million dollars in their complex. Mr. Shell went on to say that this project would allow for another two million dollars to be used in improving Mobile's downtown. Mr. Roberts and Mr. Holmes thanked Mr. Shell for all Hargrove and Associates has done for downtown Mobile.

No further Board discussion ensued.

Mr. Oswalt asked if there was anyone in 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. 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, amending facts to note that outermost paired post would not be installed.

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 approved. Mr. Karwinski voted in opposition.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 9/14/14

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2013-69-CA: 358-362 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Phillip Owens with Coastal Architects for Lightship Partners
Received: 8/19/13
Meeting: 9/4/13

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin
Classification: Contributing and Contributing
Zoning: B-4
Project: Work to the Rear Elevations/Inner lots of Dauphin Street facing buildings – Relocate a staircase, construct a new staircase, construct an elevator shaft, and tiered decks.

BUILDING HISTORY

358 Dauphin Street was completed in 1853. The three-story brick is one of the finest extant mid 19th Century commercial buildings surviving in Mobile. The lower story served as store while the upper stories afforded residential quarters. A surviving ancillary building (formerly kitchen/domestic wing) survives to the rear of the building. 360 Dauphin Street dates from 1919. The two upper stories of 360 Dauphin Street were lost in a fire. 362 Dauphin Street survives as only the remains of single story façade.

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. 358 Dauphin Street last appeared before the Architectural Review Board in 1983. At that time, the Board approved the reconstruction of the building’s ground floor storefront. 360 Dauphin Street. 360-362 Dauphin Street last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on May 8, 2006. At that time, the Board denied an application calling for the removal of the 360’s third floor façade. With this the submission, the applicants propose construction of residential space within the second and third floors of 358 Dauphin Street and the construction of tiered decks, a flight of stairs (as well as the relocation of stairs), and an elevator shaft.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation state, and the Lower Dauphin Commercial District Guidelines, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterized a property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.”

2. "New additions and adjacent 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. With regard to rear elevations, "retain original character and materials when possible."
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
1. Relocate a staircase.
 - a. The existing steel staircase located behind the shell of 360-362 Dauphin Street will be relocated so as to access the dependency of 358 Dauphin Street (through its West wall). The stair will be reconfigured to adapt to the new location.
 - b. A paneled wooden door will allow for ingress and egress from the uppermost landing.
 2. Construct a new staircase.
 - a. The new steel staircase will afford access to and from the residential units being outfitted within 358 Dauphin Street.
 - b. A new door will be installed.
 3. Construct tiered decks.
 - a. The tiered decks will extend to the south of the new staircase.
 - b. Like the stairs, the galleries will feature picketed steel railings.
 - c. The decking will be constructed of steel reinforced concrete.
 - d. The steel stairs and posts will be painted black.
 - e. The railings of the deck and the stairs will match those of the existing stairs (those proposed for relocation and reassembly).
 - f. A standing seam metal roof will surmount the third story deck.
 4. Construct an elevator shaft.
 - a. The Elevator will rise through the northeast corner of the new gallery construction.
 5. An existing second floor opening will allow access to and from the second floor deck.
 6. Install a paneled wooden door accessing the third floor deck.
 7. Mark Parking Spaces.
 8. Install interior lot fencing. Said fencing will be aluminum in composition and 8' in height.

CLARIFICATIONS/REQUESTS

1. How will the party wall (between 358-360 Dauphin Street) be treated?
2. What is the slope of the new roof.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the relocation of a staircase, construction of a new staircase, construction of an elevator shaft, and the construction of tiered decks. The work will not be visible from the Dauphin Street (addresses of the subject buildings), but will be visible from Franklin Street, the side street running located to the west of the buildings.

While the ground floor of 360 Dauphin Street has been rebuilt and has continued to serve a commercial role, the upper stories were not reconstructed until after a fire. The party walls remain, but the rear wall is no longer extant.

The existing steel staircase located behind 360 Dauphin Street is proposed for relocation just north of its existing location. Once reconfigured to adapt to the new location, the stair would allow access to and from the second floor of the ancillary building located behind 358 Dauphin Street. A doorway would need to be installed.

The proposed metal stair and elevator shaft would be located within the proposed triple tiered decks. The decks would allow access to and from residential spaces located on the second and third floors of 358 Dauphin Street.

Though the alterations are fairly substantial they are going in areas with minimal historic fabric. The additions will only be visible from a side street and are obviously contemporary providing the differentiation required by the Park Service.

The parking area is rather informal and the new plan provides efficiency. However the area is rather bare so staff recommends the installation of landscaping.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Pending the clarifications listed above, 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 Owens 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. Owens if he had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make.

Mr. Owens explained the how the owner intended to develop the property.

Mr. Karwinski agreed with the Staff Report as per the installation of landscaping.

A discussion of parking requirements ensued.

A discussion of code related concerns regarding fenestration ensued.

Mr. Oswalt asked if there was anyone in 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. 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, but that a landscaping plan would be required for the parking area.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 9/14/14