AGENDA
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
January 27, 2003 – 3:00 P.M.
Mayor’s Pre-Council Chamber – Mobile Government Plaza
205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER - Chair
   1. Roll Call
   2. Approval of Minutes
   3. Approval of Mid-Month Requests Approved by Staff
   4. Approval of Agenda

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS

   1. 315 North Joachim Street: Willie Martin
      Replace rotten siding as necessary to match the original in profile and
dimension.

      APPROVED 1/3/03 jss

   2. 253 Dexter Street: Michael Duff
      Replace rotten wood as necessary with new to match existing in profile
and dimension on siding and trim. Repaint to match existing color
scheme.

      APPROVED 1/6/03 weh

   3. 1400-1404 Church Street: Banks Properties, LLC.
      Paint building the following colors:
      Painted brick first floor – SW Bunglehouse Gray 2845
      Shingled second floor – SW Roycroft Bronze Green 2646
      Trim – SW Roycroft Vellum 2833
      Concrete foundation and step caps – SW Roycroft Bronze Green 2846

      APPROVED 1/6/03 weh

   4. 400 Government Street: Kiker Roofing Company
      Re-roof building to match existing roofing material in color, profile and
dimension.

      APPROVED 1/6/03 weh
5. Holiday Inn Express/ Ben Meisler for MWH Investments
   Replace existing rotten wood privacy fence around dumpster with new 8’ high solid wood fence painted to match building. Replace rusted metal doors with new metal doors matching existing in profile and dimension, and painted to match building body. Replace rotten wood privacy fence around power transformer with new 6’ high solid wood fencing painted to match building.

   **APPROVED** 1/06/03  weh

6. 109 Gilbert Street:  Blackard Roofing Company
   Re-roof building with new materials to match existing in color and profile.

   **APPROVED** 1/8/03 weh

7. 12 Semmes Avenue:  Cynthia L. Nelms
   Replace front walkway to match existing in profile and dimension. Replace back siding as necessary with new materials to match existing in profile and dimension and repaint to match existing color scheme.

   **APPROVED** 1/9/03 asc

8. 301 Government Street:  AT&T Wireless
   Replace existing tower mounted amplifier with new equipment not to exceed existing equipment size.

   **APPROVED** 1/13/03 weh

9. 700 St. Michael Street:  Singleton Construction Company
   Re-roof with 3-tab fiberglass shingles.

   **APPROVED** 1/14/03 weh

10. 313 George Street:  Diversified Roofing
    Re-roof house with 5 v-crimp metal roofing.

    **APPROVED** 1/14/03  weh

11. 551 Church Street:  Robert Eddington/Nodar Construction
    Repair rotten wood as necessary with new matching dimension and profile to include: front steps, porch railing, and stair rail.

    **APPROVED** 1/15/03 asc
C. **OLD BUSINESS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Number</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Nature of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>030-02/03-CA</td>
<td>960 Church Street</td>
<td>Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund</td>
<td>Request change in setback from previously-approved 10’ to new 5’ front setback.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. **NEW BUSINESS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Number</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Nature of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>026-02/03-CA</td>
<td>118 Ryan Avenue</td>
<td>Dr. Dan McCall, Owner/Bill Baff Landscape, Contractor</td>
<td>Construct 18” high brick retaining wall, installed on a reinforced concrete footing inside front property line, as per submitted plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>028-02/03-CA</td>
<td>121 Macy Place</td>
<td>J. W. Raybon</td>
<td>Construct bedroom addition, measuring 12’ x 13’, as per submitted plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>029-02/03-CA</td>
<td>511 Eslava Street</td>
<td>Albert Hartley</td>
<td>Construct covered patio off south side of garage as per submitted plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construct pergola as per submitted plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>031-02/03-CA</td>
<td>1750 Dauphin Street</td>
<td>Felix and Carolyn Vereen</td>
<td>Replace chain link fence gate with iron gates as per submitted photograph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Replace chain link fence with wooden privacy fence to match existing as per submitted design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>027-02/03-CA</td>
<td>56 St. Francis Place</td>
<td>TAG/The Architects’ Group, architects/Ron Blount, RSA, Owner</td>
<td>Demolish existing structure. Incorporate reassembled cast iron façade as a false front on new 8 story parking garage.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. **OTHER BUSINESS**

1. Discussion of Policies and Procedures
2. Discussion of Commission Procedures and Guidelines

F. **ADJOURNMENT**
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – STAFF COMMENTS

026-02/03 – CA

118 Ryan Avenue

Applicant: Dr. Dan McCall, Owner/Bill Baff Landscape, Contractor

Received: 1/06/03

Submission Date + 45 Days: 2/21/03

Meeting Date(s):
1) 1/27/03
2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Ashland Place Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Residential
Additional Permits Required: 
Nature of Project: Construct 18” high brick retaining wall, installed on a reinforced concrete footing inside front property line, as per submitted plans.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Design Review Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sections</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Description of Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fences, Walls and Gates</td>
<td>Construct 18” high brick retaining wall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on information contained in the Application, in Staff’s judgement:

A. The Guidelines state that “fences should compliment the building and not detract from it.”
   1. The proposed brick retaining wall will match the brick of the foundation of the main residence.

B. The Guidelines require “…design, scale and placement…be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District.”
   1. The lots along Ryan Avenue are elevated from the sidewalk ranging from 6” to 2’.
   2. A number of residences adjacent to this location have retaining walls constructed of brick, stone or a combination of the two.
   3. A number of residences utilize landscaping elements such as fig ivy, sod and liriope to retain the soil.
   4. The following addresses along Ryan Avenue feature retaining walls as part of the front yard landscaping:
      108 Ryan Avenue – brick retaining wall
      110 Ryan Avenue – stone retaining wall
      114 Ryan Avenue – stone retaining wall
      116 Ryan Avenue – brick retaining wall

Staff suggests that the Review Board approve the application as submitted.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – STAFF COMMENTS

0027-02/03 – CA 56 St. Francis Street
Applicant: TAG/The Architects’ Group, architect/Ron Blount, Project Director, RSA, Owner
Received: 1/17/03 Meeting Date(s):
Submission Date + 45 Days: 1/27/03 1) 1/27/03 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4: General Business
Additional Permits Required: (1) Demolition
Nature of Project: Request to alter plans previously granted Concept Approval. Alteration involves change from retaining first 13’ of historic structure to demolition of existing structure and incorporation of reassembled cast iron and masonry façade as a false front on new 8 story parking garage.

History of the Project:

17 January 2002, Devereaux Bemis, Anne Crutcher, Buffy Donlon, and Ed Hooker (MHDC representative and ARB staff) met with Markham Smith, Dan Koch, Scott Taricco, and Libby Patrick (the architects for the RSA/Battlehouse Project to discuss a list of concerns of the MHDC. In order of importance, the future of the Coley Building was ranked number one.

28 June 2002 – In a follow-up letter from Smith Dalia Architects, Dan Koch addressed this concern with the following response: “… Coley Building on St. Francis Street: We are proposing retaining the Coley Building façade by integrating it into the street level retail space along St. Francis Street. The building will serve as a lobby for the parking deck and rooftop hotel fitness center and will help redefine and respectfully inform the new streetscape”

8 July 2002 – A meeting was held on site, attended by Devereaux Bemis, Anne Crutcher, Markham Smith, Dan Koch, and Gene Montezinos, at the Coley Building; the following comments were provided by MHDC staff:

- Keep as much of the roof as possible
- Step back parking lot building above Coley Building
- Maintain 2nd floor historic fabric to the first floor interior column bay, including doors and frames, window frames, 2 historic fireplaces in rooms facing St. Francis Street, and interior walls.
- Look at keeping 2nd floor line as is with steps down to 2nd level parking deck (Headroom at elevator lobby landing may be a problem.)
- Would like to see dormer windows recreated as a mansard roof.

8 July 2002 – Architects Markham Smith, Bob Kock and Gene Montezinos appeared before the ARB specifically requesting Concept Approval on plans for the exterior restoration of the Battlehouse. As a courtesy, preliminary plans for the tower and parking garage were discussed at this time. The Board granted Concept Approval for the exterior restoration plans, with the following understood: “… The Coley Building will remain and will be incorporated into the elevator lobby of the parking garage. It’s mansard roof will be restored and the garage will be stepped back to the south ridge line…” The motion was made by Buffy Donlon, and seconded by Douglas Kearley. David Barr with TAG Architects recused himself from voting on the application.

23 July 2002 – Correspondence from Markham Smith of Smith Dalia Architects regarding clarification to meeting minutes. This letter stated the following with regard to the Coley Building: “… Only the first structural bay of the Coley Building is proposed to be retained, not the entire building…”

24 July 2002 – ARB staff Ed Hooker responded to correspondence requesting clarification of the term “structural bay.”
13 August 2002 – Correspondence from Markham Smith of Smith Dalia Architects clarifying “structural bay”: “…Currently we plan on retaining all St. Francis Street frontage of the Coley Building up to the first structural bay (free-standing columns), which is approximately 13’-0” from exterior wall to centerline of column structure. The entire building to the north of the first column line will be demolished. We intend on utilizing the ground floor of the Coley Building for the entrance lobby to the new elevator and stair core of the parking deck.” A site plan was attached.

27 August 2002 – Correspondence to Markham Smith of Smith Dalia Architects from Devereaux Bemis requesting an explanation of why the Coley Building cannot be retained intact as indicated on the site plan.

3 September 2002 – Correspondence from Markham Smith of Smith Dalia Architects – explanation of why the entire building cannot be retained: “…We are saving the first structural bay primarily to retain the St. Francis Street façade and part of the mansard roof; both require restoration and restructuring…” The letter further states “…We intend to instruct the contractor on how to protect and shore up the structure of the Coley Building during demolition and new construction work for the parking deck.”

4 December, 2002 – ARB approved demolition plans for the wing of the Battlehouse, and general restoration of the exterior of the Battlehouse.

13 January, 2003 – TAG, The Architects’ Group acting on behalf of Ronald J. Blount and the RSA, made application to demolish the Coley Building and reconstruct the cast iron and masonry façade of the Coley Building on the front of the parking garage. The attachment to the application cites the following reasons for this change in plans:

A. Reason for wholesale demolition request:
   1. instability of the existing structure
   2. construction activities at the new garage producing ground vibrations and/or instability at the existing foundations

B. Problems with retaining a portion of the building after removal of cast iron façade:
   1. cast iron is a combination of decorative and structural elements
   2. safe method of shoring up embedded attachments without damaging the surrounding brick has not been found
   3. removal of rear portions of the building will result in structural instability

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES, CITY ORDINANCE and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sections</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Description of Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1, LDSCD</td>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>Demolish existing historic structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10, Mobile City Code</td>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on information contained in the Application, in Staff’s judgement:

Sub-Section 10 of Article IV, Section 44 of Mobile City Code requires the Board to consider the following:

“The Board shall not grant Certificates of Appropriateness for the demolition or relocation of any property within a historic district unless the Board finds that the removal or relocation of such building will not be detrimental to the historic or architectural character of the district. In making this determination, the Board shall consider:”
A. The historic or architectural significance of the structure;
1. The Coley Building is the only antebellum commercial structure remaining along St. Francis Street between Water and Royal Streets.
2. The Coley Building is only one of a few remaining cast iron storefronts in the LDSCHD.
3. The Coley Building is the best example of a commercial structure reflecting the Second Empire design from the 1870s, characterized by the mansard roof, cast iron storefront, and decorative cornice.

B. The importance of the structure to the integrity of the Historic District, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;
1. The Coley Building is a contributing structure within the LDSCD
2. The Coley Building was added to the National Register of Historic Places for its “unusual blend of architectural styles…” and is considered noteworthy for how its “…stylistic mix has resulted in a unique commercial building in which the elements blend interestingly but still retain their clearly distinctive origins.”
3. The plan to combine the Coley Building with the parking garage, as originally proposed, allowed the retention of the first 13’ of the Coley Building. This would allow the profile of the structure, with its mansard roof, to maintain the historic streetscape.

C. The difficulty or impossibility of reproducing the structure because of its design, texture, material, detail or unique location;
1. The solid masonry structure, along with the unique blend of cast iron structural and decorative elements, would make the replication of this structure cost-prohibitive.
2. The purpose of the demolition of the Coley Building is to construct a multi-story parking structure at this location. The construction of the new parking facility would not allow for the reconstruction of the Coley Building in its current form on the original site.

D. Whether the structure is one of the last remaining examples of its kind in the neighborhood, the county, or the region or is a good example of its type, or is part of an ensemble of historic buildings creating a neighborhood;
1. The Coley Building is the last remaining late-Federal commercial structure in the block between Water and Royal Streets.
2. The Coley Building, with its current Second Empire mansard roof and cast iron storefront, is the best remaining structure of this style in Mobile.

E. Whether there are definite plans for reuse of the property if the proposed demolition is carried out, and what effect such plans will have on the architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological, social, aesthetic, or environmental character of the surrounding area.
1. There are plans to place a multi-story parking garage on this site, connected by a bridge to the new RSA tower.
2. The proposed plans call for the reconstructed Coley Building facade to be applied to the lower part of the proposed parking garage.

Secretary of the Interior’s Standards – Item 3
“Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.”

Staff recommends denial of the application as submitted.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – STAFF COMMENTS

Applicant: J.W. Raybon
Received: 1/21/03
Submission Date + 45 Days: 3/07/03
Meeting Date (s): 1) 1/27/03 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way Historic District
Classification: Non- Contributing (New Construction)
Zoning: R-1; Single Family Residential
Additional Permits Required: (4) Building; Plumbing; Electrical; HVAC
Nature of Project: Construct bedroom addition measuring 12’ x 13’ as per submitted plans.
History of the Project: The ODWRB approved this infill construction in July 1999. Staff worked with the applicants to ensure the new construction was compatible with adjacent historic residences. The result was a compatible contemporary bungalow with arts and crafts detailing.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Design Review Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sections</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Description of Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Piers, Foundation and Foundation Infill</td>
<td>Construct rear addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Exterior Materials and Finishes</td>
<td>Construct rear addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Construct rear addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Roofs</td>
<td>Construct rear addition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on information contained in the Application, in Staff’s judgement:

1. The addition is located at the rear of the residence and will not be visible from the street.
2. The continuous stucco foundation will match that of the main residence
3. The exterior hardiplank siding will match that of the main residence, and will be painted to match the existing color scheme.
4. Existing wood window will be removed and reused in the addition.
5. All corner board, window trim, soffit and fascia will match that of the main house.
6. The pitch of the gable roof is compatible with the existing roof of the main house. The fiberglass asphalt shingles will match existing.

Staff suggests that the Review Board approve the application as submitted.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – STAFF COMMENTS

029-02/03 – CA 511 Eslava Street
Applicant: Albert Hartley, Owner
Received: 1/14/03
Submission Date + 45 Days: 3/04/03 1) 1/27/03 2) 3)

Meeting Date(s):

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East Historic District
Classification: Non-Contributing (New Construction)
Zoning: R-1; Single Family Residential
Additional Permits Required: (2) Building; Electrical
Nature of Project: Construct covered patio off south side of garage. Deck to be constructed at grade, measuring 22’ x 16’-7” constructed of 2x6 treated lumber. Columns to match those existing on carport. Gable roof to tie into existing hip of garage roof, with 1x6 lap siding in exposed gable end. Roofing material to match existing. Construct a 20’ x 7’ – 8” x 10’ high pergola as per submitted plan. Pergola to be constructed of 8x8 posts with 2x12 cornice, with notched 2x10s. Ends of 2x10s to be moulded as per drawing.

History of the Project: The ODWRB approved this infill construction in July 1999. Staff worked with the applicants to ensure the new construction was compatible with adjacent historic residences. The result was a compatible contemporary bungalow with arts and crafts detailing.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Design Review Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sections</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Description of Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Accessory Structures</td>
<td>Construct covered deck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Accessory Structures</td>
<td>Construct wood pergola</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on information contained in the Application, in Staff’s judgement:

1. The addition is located at the rear of the residence; the roof structure and a portion of the cornice will be visible from the street.
   a. the yard is concealed from public view by a high masonry wall.
2. The design will be compatible with the existing garage structure and will compliment the design and scale of the main residence and garage.
   a. the columns will match those of the carport
   b. the roof will be a continuation of the carport roof
3. The pergola will be located at the rear of the residence; the top of the pergola will be visible from Cedar Street.
   a. the materials of the pergola will match the materials used on the rear porch of the main structure and the carport.

Staff suggests that the Review Board approve the application as submitted.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – STAFF COMMENTS

030-02/03 – CA  960 Church Street
Applicant: Oakleigh Venture Revolving Fund
Received: 1/21/03
Submission Date + 45 Days: 3/04/03
Meeting Date(s): 1) 1/27/03  2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden Historic District
Classification: Non-Contributing (New Construction)
Zoning: R-1: One Family Residential
Additional Permits Required: (4) Building, Electrical, Plumbing, HVAC
Nature of Project: Request change in previously-approved setback from 10’ to 5’.
History of Project: The ARB approved this application with a site plan reflecting a 10’ setback. The applicant currently has a variance request before the Board of Adjustment to allow the residence be constructed 5’ from the sidewalk.
History of Site: According to City Records, and Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps to 1956, this property was always part of a parcel that ran from Government Street through to Church Street. A large 2 ½ story masonry residence faced Government Street. Later the property was used by the Mobile Gospel Tabernacle. Wendy’s Restaurant dates from the late 1970s, and the rear of the lot has always been used for parking.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

New Residential and Commercial Construction in Mobile’s Historic Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sections</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Description of Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Placement and Orientation</td>
<td>Request to alter setback</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on information contained in the Application, in Staff’s judgement:

A. The Guidelines for New Residential Construction require that setbacks approximate the established setbacks of existing structures.

B. Setbacks in this area of the Oakleigh Garden Historic District range from 0’ to 19’.

1. The property immediately adjacent to the lot in question to the west is the parking garage for the St. Charles Apartments (building faces Government.) The solid masonry wall is set back 4’ from the sidewalk.

2. The property immediately adjacent to the lot in question to the east is a one story bungalow, with setback of 19’.

3. The second house to the east of the lot, a one story bungalow, has a setback of 12’.

4. Properties across the street range from 0’ to 19’.

5. The property at the southeast corner of Marine and Church has a setback of 5’, with steps directly on the sidewalk facing Church Street.

6. The property at the southwest corner of Charles and Church as a setback of 5’, with steps directly on the sidewalk facing Church Street.
C. Based on Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps, the residences previously located on the north side of Church Street between Marine and South Broad Street were located in close proximity to the sidewalk. Additionally, the structure previously on the northwest corner of Church and Marine Streets faced Marine Street but had a side setback of 0’ on Church Street.

D. The house type, a Carolina Single House, historically had an average setback of 0’-5’. No such house type exists in the Oakleigh Garden Historic District, but those extant in the DeTonti Square Historic District have an average setback of 14’.

E. From all information provided, it appears that the earlier houses in this area of the Oakleigh Garden Historic District (pre-1930) were closer to the sidewalk than houses constructed after 1930.

Staff recommends approval of the request as submitted.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – STAFF COMMENTS

031-02/03 – CA 1750 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Felix and Carolyn Vereen
Received: 1/13/03  Meeting Date (s):
Submission Date + 45 Days:  3/02  1)  1/27/03  2)  3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1: Single Family Residential
Additional Permits Required: (1) Fence
Nature of Project: Replace chain link fence gate with iron gates as per submitted photograph
Replace chain link fence with wooden privacy fence to match existing as per submitted design

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Design Review Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sections</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Description of Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fences, Walls and Gates</td>
<td>Replace chain link gate with iron gates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fences, Walls and Gates</td>
<td>Replace chain link fence with wood privacy fence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STAFF COMMENTS

Based on information contained in the Application, in Staff’s judgement:

A. The current chain link gate is highly visible from public view.
   1. Chain link is not currently an allowed fencing material in historic districts

B. The replacement iron gate will be highly visible from public view.
   1. Iron is an allowable material for fencing in historic districts.

C. The current chain link fencing is highly visible from public view.

D. The proposed 6’ wood privacy fence will be highly visible from public view.
   1. The proposed 6’ wood privacy fence is an allowed material in historic districts.
   2. The proposed 6’ wood privacy fence will match that already present on the property.
   3. The chamfer of the slats of the wood privacy fence match the roof pitch of the main house.

E. The proposed 6’ wood privacy fence will run a distance of 3’ north of the proposed iron gates, then over a space of 4’ step down to a 5’ wood privacy fence. The 5’ fence will run to the north property line.

Staff suggests that the Review Board approve the application as submitted.