ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
February 20th 2019 – 3:00 P.M.
Multi-Purpose Room, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The acting Chair, Bob Allen, called the meeting to order at 3:02 p.m. Paige Largue, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
   
   **Members Present:** Jim Wagner, Bob Allen, Kim Harden, Nicholas Holmes III and Craig Roberts.
   
   **Members Absent:** Steve Stone, David Barr, Robert Brown, Catarina Echols and Carolyn Hasser.
   
   **Staff Members Present:** John Sledge, Bridget Daniel, Paige Largue, Flo Kessler and Marion McElroy.
   
2. Mr. Roberts moved to approve the minutes of the February 6th 2019 meeting. The motion received a second and was approved unanimously.
3. Mr. Roberts moved to approve the Mid-Months as written. Ms. Harden seconded the motion. The motion was approved with one in opposition, Mr. Allen.

B. MID-MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED.

1. **Applicant:** Federal National Mortgage
   
   a. **Property Address:** 1602 Dauphin Street
   
   b. **Date of Approval:** 1/22/2019
   
   c. **Project:** Reroof to match.

2. **Applicant:** Lee Hale
   
   a. **Property Address:** 501 Church Street
   
   b. **Date of Approval:** 1/24/2019
   
   c. **Project:** Repair/replace rotten wood to match, and possibly window, all to match original in profile, dimension and materials. Repaint to match.

3. **Applicant:** John Wink of Wink Management, LLC
   
   a. **Property Address:** 160 Davitt Street
   
   b. **Date of Approval:** 1/24/2019
   
   c. **Project:** Repair and replace deteriorated wood to match in dimension, profile and material. Reroof damaged portion with in-kind materials. Repaint to match. Repair outer brick columns on front porch to match.

4. **Applicant:** Caldwell Whistler
   
   a. **Property Address:** 8 S. Ann Street
   
   b. **Date of Approval:** 1/28/2019
   
   c. **Project:** Repair/replace rotten porch decking and rails, columns to match existing in material, profile and dimension.

5. **Applicant:** Ethel Burns
   
   a. **Property Address:** 364 Gordon Street
   
   b. **Date of Approval:** 1/28/2019
   
   c. **Project:** Repaint exterior existing color, and reroof asphalt shingles weatherwood.

6. **Applicant:** BJE Properties
   
   a. **Property Address:** 4 N. Cedar Street
   
   b. **Date of Approval:** 1/28/2019
   
   c. **Project:** Erect metal fence around parking lot, six feet with gate.
7. **Applicant:** Angela Farmer  
   a. Property Address: 17 S. Hallett Street  
   b. Date of Approval: 1/30/2019  
   c. Project: Construct 3’ wooden picket fence in front yard with two pedestrian gates.

8. **Applicant:** Vicky Brutkiewicz  
   a. Property Address: 56 S. Conception Street  
   b. Date of Approval: 1/31/2019  
   c. Project: Remove roof tiles, place two layers underlayment, replace slate.

9. **Applicant:** Kelly Baker  
   a. Property Address: 254 State Street  
   b. Date of Approval: 1/31/2019  
   c. Project: Reconstruct metal fence behind front plane of house.

10. **Applicant:** Melanie Bunting on behalf of D&D Properties  
    a. Property Address: 9 McPhillips Avenue  
    b. Date of Approval: 1/31/2019  
    c. Project: Repair deteriorated wood in dimension, profile, and material. Repair stucco and repaint. Paint scheme will be as follows: Body- SW 7077 Original White; Trim - SW 7660 Earl Gray and SW 7631 City Loft.

11. **Applicant:** Malcolm Steniner  
    a. Property Address: 1555 West Avenue  
    b. Date of Approval: 2/1/2019  
    c. Project: Reroof asphalt single.

12. **Applicant:** Michael Killam  
    a. Property Address: 105 Houston Street  
    b. Date of Approval: 2/1/2019  
    c. Project: Remove old driveway, pour new driveway.

13. **Applicant:** John Stimpson on behalf of Stimrad Investments  
    a. Property Address: 961 Elmira Street  
    b. Date of Approval: 1/31/2019  
    c. Project: Repair/replace rotten wood to match existing in dimension, profile and detail, repaint, reroof, new HVAC. Repair windows as per existing in dimension and profile.

14. **Applicant:** Yves Gorat and Melanie Strommel  
    a. Property Address: 1055 New St. Francis Street  
    b. Date of Approval: 2/5/2019  
    c. Project: Repair and replace deteriorated wood to match in dimension, profile and material. Repaint to match.

15. **Applicant:** Rodney Englund  
    a. Property Address: 1066 Old Shell Road  
    b. Date of Approval: 2/5/2019  
    c. Project: Repair/replace rotten siding to match original in materials, dimensions, and profile; replace window sills as per existing in materials, dimension, and profile, reside non-historic infilled carport with masonite and battens, smooth side out to match house color.

16. **Applicant:** Ellen Marler  
    a. Property Address: 17 Common Street  
    b. Date of Approval: 2/5/2019  
    c. Project: Enclose property by adding to existing privacy fence to match existing.
17. Applicant:  Paul Bridges  
a. Property Address:  156 St. Anthony Street  
b. Date of Approval:  2/7/2019  
c. Project:  Repair/replace roof; repair/replace wooden eaves to match existing in materials, dimension and profile; repair metal brackets to match; repaint to match; repair exterior rotten wood on rear galleries to match. Repaint to match. Add railings back stairs.

C. APPLICATIONS  
1. 2019-08-CA:  113 Monroe Street  
a. Applicant:  Mr. Nicholas Holmes III of Holmes and Holmes Architects on behalf of Ft. Conde Restoration Venture, LLC  
b. Project:  Rehabilitation Related and Fenestration Related.  
   APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.  
2. 2019-09-CA:  200 St. Emanuel Street  
a. Applicant:  Mr. Nicholas Holmes III of Holmes and Holmes Architects on behalf of Ft. Conde Restoration Venture, LLC  
b. Project:  Rehabilitation Related.  
   APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.  

D. OTHER BUSINESS  
1. Ms. Largue stated the next meeting will be March 6th, Ash Wednesday.  
2. Mr. Stone asked the process of following up on previous approvals. Ms. Largue stated it is difficult because there is little ways to enforce at this time, and the office is short staffed. Mr. Stone suggested inquiring into the use of building inspectors to assist in the process. Ms. Largue stated it had been mentioned before to the Build Mobile Department.
APPLICABLE FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2019-08-CA: 113 Monroe Street
Applicant: Mr. Nicholas Holmes III of Holmes and Holmes Architects on behalf of Ft. Conde Restoration Venture, LLC
Received: 1/29/2019
Meeting: 2/22/2019

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: T5.1
Project: Rehabilitation Related and Fenestration Related:

BUILDING HISTORY

The Olensky Building is a two story stucco building constructed circa 1930 as a duplex. Open stoops on the East (front) and North (side) facades afforded access into the building. The ornamental balconies were built in 1976.

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. According to the MHDC vertical files, this property has not appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The proposed scope of work includes repair and replacing with in kind materials, and the alteration of secondary fenestration.

B. The Design Review Guidelines state in pertinent part:
1. “Preferred sequence of improvements: Preserve, Repair, Reconstruct; Replace; Comparable Alteration.”
2. “For most historic resources, the front façade is the most important to preserve intact.”
3. “Maintain significant historic façades in their original form.”
4. “Repair deteriorated building materials by patching, piecing-in, consolidating or otherwise reinforcing the material.”
5. “Replace only the amount of material required. If a few boards are damaged beyond repair, for example, then only they should be replaced, rather than the entire wall.”
6. “Replace exterior finishes to match original in profile, dimension and materials.”
7. “Preserve masonry features that define the overall historic character, such as walls, cornices, pediments, steps and foundations.”
8. “The utilization of period color and paint schemes that reflect the historic character of the property is encouraged.”
9. “Maintain the original pitch.”
10. “Preserve decorative elements, including crests and chimneys.”
11. “Use new roof materials that convey a scale and texture similar to those used traditionally.”
12. “Original doors and openings, including their dimensions, should be retained along with any moldings, transoms or sidelights.”
13. “Maintain the original position and proportions of a historically significant door.”
14. “Materials that are the same as the original, or that appear similar in texture and finish to the original are acceptable. These often include: wood panel; wood panel with glass lights; leaded glass with lead cames; and metal with a painted finish.”
15. “Retain and treat exterior stylistic features and examples of skilled craftsmanship with sensitivity.”
16. “Repair historic details and ornamentation that are deteriorated.”
17. “Patch, piece-in, splice, consolidate or otherwise upgrade deteriorated features using recognized preservation methods.”
18. “When replacing historic details, match the original in profile, dimension, and material.”
19. “A substitute material may be considered if it appears similar in character and finish to the original. A measured drawing may be required in these instances to recreate missing historic details from photographs.”
20. “Where historic (wooden or metal) windows are intact and in repairable condition, retain and repair them to match the existing as per location, light configuration, detail and material.”
21. “Preserve historic window features, including the frame, sash, muntins, Mullions, glazing, sills, heads, jambs, moldings, operation, and groupings of windows.”
22. “Repair, rather than replace, frames and sashes, wherever possible.”
23. “In instances where there is a request to replace a building’s windows, the new windows shall match the existing as per location, framing, and light configuration.”
24. “Minimize the visual impacts of communications equipment and mechanical equipment.”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted site plan):

1. Rehabilitate a former duplex.

A. Conduct in-kind repairs and replacements.
   i. Repair foundation masonry to match.
   ii. Repair stucco to match.
   iii. Repair or replace wood elements such as fenestration trim and fascia to match existing in dimension profile, and dimension.
   iv. Repair and replace windows to match in dimension, configuration and material.
   v. Repair ornamental metal work.
   vi. Repair chimney and install new flashing.
   vii. Reroof with architectural shingles in color TBD.
   viii. Repaint in color TBD.

B. West (façade) Elevation
   i. Remove existing roof framing.
   ii. Reframe roof to match original pitch.
   iii. Remove second floor gallery framing and roof.
   iv. Construct second floor gallery with ornamental columns and details to match existing.
   v. Repair chimney and install new flashing.
   vi. Reroof with architectural shingles in color TBD.
   vii. Repaint in color TBD.

C. South (side) Elevation
   i. Remove top sashes from paired window located on the first story of the easternmost portion.
   ii. Install louvered vents in the aforementioned location.
   iii. Remove existing electric and plumbing elements.
D. East (rear) Elevation
   i. Remove existing roof frame.
   ii. Reframe roof to match original pitch
   iii. Infill existing door and paired windows on first story of southernmost portion of elevation with stucco.
   iv. Install set of six-paneled wooden, aluminum clad, or metal doors in location paired windows were infilled.
   v. Install two louvered vents on the central portion of the first story.

E. North (side) Elevation
   i. Install ornamental iron balcony on existing gallery roof.
   ii. Install new handrail at front façade steps.
   iii. Reframe roof to match original pitch
   iv. Infill existing door and paired windows on first story of southernmost portion of elevation with stucco.
   v. Install set of six-paneled wooden, aluminum clad, or metal doors in location paired windows were infilled.
   vi. Install two louvered vents on the central portion of the first story.

F. Conduct additional site repairs and improvements.
   i. Construct 12’0” by 10’0” patio screened with landscaping at southwest corner of building.
   ii. Install wooden lattice fence, 6 feet in height, around mechanical equipment located at the southeast corner of building.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the rehabilitation, alteration of fenestration, addition of galleries, and site improvements for buildings located at 4-10 St. Emanuel Street. A similar version of the application was approved in February 19, 2014 for 10 St. Emanuel Street. Said approval also included the construction of new storefront and addition of balconies. The application up for review involves both properties.

With regard to the conservation and restoration of historic fabric, this project will address repair work. In accord with the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts, an overall policy of repair by patching and consolidation will be employed when and where possible (See B-3). Repairs and replacements would match as per profile, dimension and material (See B-4). Repairs would be consistent and reflective of the building (See B 3 & 4.).

This application calls for the alteration of fenestration. With regard to the windows in specific replacements will match the existing components (and in one instance whole) as per location, light configuration, detail, and material for historic materials (See B-11). 10 St. Emanuel does not possess any windows on the front façade. Photographic evidence provided guidance as to the light pattern of the proposed windows (B-11). In keeping with the Guidelines the proposed materials of aluminum clad and wood in a two-over-two light pattern is similar to the original (see B-10). 4-6 St. Emanuel has evidence of fenestration change in 1930 when six-over-three windows were removed and replaced by six-over-six windows. In 2007, a Certificate of Appropriateness was issued to repair or replace windows. The Design Review Guidelines state where historic windows are intact they should be repaired, rather than replaced (See B-8). Where windows are not in repairable condition replacements may be employed to match in dimension, profile, and material. However, aluminum clad or double paned wood can be considered if it appears similar to the original in texture, profile, dimension, finish and configuration. Based on photographic evidence and Certificate of Appropriateness issued, the amounts of historic windows intact are unknown (SeeB-9 and B-10). A recent site visit made showed evidence of minimal original sashes.
Regarding storefront, the design should be appropriate to the building (See B-7). The new storefront would be located in the same plane as historic examples (See B-19). Said composition of new storefront would be complementary to historic patterns and not remove any historic fabric. While composition responds to the historic nature of the building, modern materials of aluminum clad are available for use. Window openings will be altered to doors on the front elevation but in such a manner that the solid-to-void ratio remains (see B-12 and B-13).

In keeping the Design Review Guidelines, the addition of galleries is based off of earlier Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps (See B-22). The design for 10 St. Emanuel calls for a more decorative iron railing, while its neighboring property at 4-6 St. Emanuel calls for contemporary cable rail systems. While it is encouraged to employ galleries that reflect the historic nature of the building, modern galleries are considered (See B-23). Examples of modern umbrages include 20 Conception Street and 225 Dauphin Street.

Lamp posts and trees will be removed. Said lamp posts will be returned to the City of Mobile. LED strip lighting will be applied under existing architectural features (See B-27). A set of LED lamps will be installed over the second story gallery on both buildings. While the LED strip lighting is minimally obtrusive, the proposed lamps will be installed on façade and therefore more noticeable and not in keeping architecturally (See B-26).

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-12) Staff does not believe this application would impair either architectural or the historical character of the building or the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval in full.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Ms. Leigh Rice, representative, was present for the discussion.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Allen welcomed Ms. Rice and asked if she had any clarifications, comments or questions. Ms. Rice responded Ms. Largue addressed the application in full.

Mr. Roberts inquired as to the design of the front façade doors. He noted they did not look original, but were being repaired and replaced. Ms. Largue noted it met the Guidelines and the National Park Service has been extremely particular about work being performed on tax credit project such as this property.

Ms. Largue confirmed the lattice identified to hide equipment would be wood.

No further discussion from the Board ensued.

Mr. Roberts opened the application to public comment. With no one to speak either for or against the application, Mr. Allen 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 by Ms. Harden and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the facts as approved by the Board, a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued.

The motion received a second by Mr. Wagoner and was approved unanimously.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS EXPIRATION DATE: February 20, 2020
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2019-09-CA: 200 St. Emanuel Street
Application: Mr. Nicholas Holmes III of Holmes and Holmes Architects on behalf of Ft. Conde Restoration Venture, LLC
Received: 1/29/2019
Meeting: 2/22/2019

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: T5.1
Project: New Construction

BUILDING HISTORY

The Olensky Building is a two story stucco building constructed circa 1930 as a duplex. Open stoops on the East (front) and North (side) facades afforded access into the building. The ornamental balconies were built in 1976.

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. According to the MHDC vertical files, this property has not appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The proposed scope of work includes repair and replacing with in kind materials, and the alteration of secondary fenestration.

B. The Design Review Guidelines state in pertinent part:
   1. “Preferred sequence of improvements: Preserve, Repair, Reconstruct; Replace; Comparable Alteration.”
   2. “For most historic resources, the front façade is the most important to preserve intact.”
   3. “Maintain significant historic façades in their original form.”
   4. “Repair deteriorated building materials by patching, piecing-in, consolidating or otherwise reinforcing the material.”
   5. “Replace only the amount of material required. If a few boards are damaged beyond repair, for example, then only they should be replaced, rather than the entire wall.”
   6. “Replace exterior finishes to match original in profile, dimension and materials.”
   7. “Preserve masonry features that define the overall historic character, such as walls, cornices, pediments, steps and foundations.”
   8. “The utilization of period color and paint schemes that reflect the historic character of the property is encouraged.”
   9. “Maintain the original pitch.”
   10. “Preserve decorative elements, including crests and chimneys.”
   11. “Use new roof materials that convey a scale and texture similar to those used traditionally.”
12. “Original doors and openings, including their dimensions, should be retained along with any moldings, transoms or sidelights.”
13. “Maintain the original position and proportions of a historically significant door.”
14. “Materials that are the same as the original, or that appear similar in texture and finish to the original are acceptable. These often include: wood panel; wood panel with glass lights; leaded glass with lead cames; and metal with a painted finish.”
15. “Retain and treat exterior stylistic features and examples of skilled craftsmanship with sensitivity.”
16. “Repair historic details and ornamentation that are deteriorated.”
17. “Patch, piece-in, splice, consolidate or otherwise upgrade deteriorated features using recognized preservation methods.”
18. “When replacing historic details, match the original in profile, dimension, and material.”
19. “A substitute material may be considered if it appears similar in character and finish to the original. A measured drawing may be required in these instances to recreate missing historic details from photographs.”
20. “Where historic (wooden or metal) windows are intact and in repairable condition, retain and repair them to match the existing as per location, light configuration, detail and material.”
21. “Preserve historic window features, including the frame, sash, muntins, mullions, glazing, sills, heads, jambs, moldings, operation, and groupings of windows.”
22. “Repair, rather than replace, frames and sashes, wherever possible.”
23. “In instances where there is a request to replace a building’s windows, the new windows shall match the existing as per location, framing, and light configuration.”
24. “Minimize the visual impacts of communications equipment and mechanical equipment.”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted site plan):
   1. Rehabilitate a former duplex.
      A. Conduct in-kind repairs and replacements.
         i. Repair foundation masonry to match.
         ii. Repair stucco to match.
         iii. Repair or replace wood elements such as fenestration trim and fascia to match existing in dimension profile, and dimension.
         iv. Repair and replace windows to match in dimension, configuration and material.
         v. Repair ornamental metal work.
         vi. Repair chimney and install new flashing.
         vii. Reroof with architectural shingles in color TBD.
         viii. Repaint in color TBD.
      B. West (façade) Elevation
         i. Remove existing roof framing.
         ii. Reframe roof to match original pitch.
         iii. Remove second floor gallery framing and roof.
         iv. Construct second floor gallery with ornamental columns and details to match existing.
         v. Repair chimney and install new flashing.
         vi. Reroof with architectural shingles in color TBD.
         vii. Repaint in color TBD.
      C. South (side) Elevation
         i. Remove top sashes from paired window located on the first story of the easternmost portion.
         ii. Install louvered vents in the aforementioned location.
         iii. Remove existing electric and plumbing elements.
D. East (rear) Elevation
   i. Remove existing roof framing.
   ii. Reframe roof to match original pitch
   iii. Infill existing door and paired windows on first story of southernmost portion of elevation with stucco.
   iv. Install set of six-paneled wooden, aluminum clad, or metal doors in location paired windows were infilled.
   v. Install two louvered vents on the central portion of the first story.

E. North (side) Elevation
   i. Install ornamental iron balcony on existing gallery roof.
   ii. Install new handrail at front façade steps.
   iii. Reframe roof to match original pitch
   iv. Infill existing door and paired windows on first story of southernmost portion of elevation with stucco.
   v. Install set of six-paneled wooden, aluminum clad, or metal doors in location paired windows were infilled.
   vi. Install two louvered vents on the central portion of the first story.

F. Conduct additional site repairs and improvements.
   i. Construct 12’0” by 10’0” patio screened with landscaping at southwest corner of building.
   ii. Install wooden lattice fence, 6 feet in height, around mechanical equipment located at the southeast corner of building.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the rehabilitation, alteration of fenestration, addition of galleries, and site improvements for buildings located at 4-10 St. Emanuel Street. A similar version of the application was approved in February 19, 2014 for 10 St. Emanuel Street. Said approval also included the construction of new storefront and addition of balconies. The application up for review involves both properties.

With regard to the conservation and restoration of historic fabric, this project will address repair work. In accord with the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts, an overall policy of repair by patching and consolidation will be employed where and where possible (See B-3). Repairs and replacements would match as per profile, dimension and material (See B-4). Repairs would be consistent and reflective of the building (See B 3 & 4.).

This application calls for the alteration of fenestration. With regard to the windows in specific replacements will match the existing components (and in one instance whole) as per location, light configuration, detail, and material for historic materials (See B-11). 10 St. Emanuel does not possess any windows on the front façade. Photographic evidence provided guidance as to the light pattern of the proposed windows (B-11). In keeping with the Guidelines the proposed materials of aluminum clad and wood in a two-over-two light pattern is similar to the original (see B-10). 4-6 St. Emanuel has evidence of fenestration change in 1930 when six-over-three windows were removed and replaced by six-over-six windows. In 2007, a Certificate of Appropriateness was issued to repair or replace windows. The Design Review Guidelines state where historic windows are intact they should be repaired, rather than replaced (See B-8). Where windows are not in repairable condition replacements may be employed to match in dimension, profile, and material. However, aluminum clad or double paneled wood can be considered if it appears similar to the original in texture, profile, dimension, finish and configuration. Based on
photographic evidence and Certificate of Appropriateness issued, the amounts of historic windows intact are unknown (See B-9 and B-10). A recent site visit made showed evidence of minimal original sashes.

Regarding storefront, the design should be appropriate to the building (See B-7). The new storefront would be located in the same plane as historic examples (See B-19). Said composition of new storefront would be complementary to historic patterns and not remove any historic fabric. While composition responds to the historic nature of the building, modern materials of aluminum clad are available for use. Window openings will be altered to doors on the front elevation but in such a manner that the solid-to-void ratio remains (see B-12 and B-13).

In keeping the Design Review Guidelines, the addition of galleries is based off of earlier Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps (See B-22). The design for 10 St. Emanuel calls for a more decorative iron railing, while its neighboring property at 4-6 St. Emanuel calls for contemporary cable rail systems. While it is encouraged to employ galleries that reflect the historic nature of the building, modern galleries are considered (See B-23). Examples of modern umbrages include 20 Conception Street and 225 Dauphin Street.

Lamp posts and trees will be removed. Said lamp posts will be returned to the City of Mobile. LED strip lighting will be applied under existing architectural features (See B-27). A set of LED lamps will be installed over the second story gallery on both buildings. While the LED strip lighting is minimally obtrusive, the proposed lamps will be installed on façade and therefore more noticeable and not in keeping architecturally (See B-26).

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-12) Staff does not believe this application would impair either architectural or the historical character of the building or the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval in full.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Ms. Leigh Rice, representative, was present for the discussion.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Allen welcomed Ms. Rice and asked if she had any clarifications, comments or questions. Ms. Rice responded Ms. Largue addressed the application in full.

Mr. Roberts asked if the Park Service would approve the alteration of windows for a tax credit project. Ms. Rice explained since the existing lintels are in place, it provides evidence for the larger windows and therefore would be acceptable.

Ms. Largue confirmed for Ms. Harden the addition indicated in the drawings would be brought before the Board at a later date. She noted the Board was only reviewing the rehabilitation of the existing building.

Ms. Harden inquired as to the extension of the platform to the gallery. Ms. Rice explained the reason for its supports and location. Mr. Allen expressed concern for the interruption of the sidewalk. Ms. Harden suggested the applicant contact Right of Way department for the extension of columns in the sidewalk.
Mr. Roberts asked if landscaping was reviewed by the Board. Ms. Largue explained landscaping and some lighting components have been addressed by the Board on previous applications. She clarified the application before the Board has no landscaping changes proposed.

No further discussion from the Board ensued.

Mr. Allen opened the application to public comment. With no one to speak either for or against the application, Mr. Allen 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 by Mr. Allen and was unanimously approved.

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the facts as approved by the Board, a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued.

The motion received a second by Ms. Harden and was approved unanimously.

**CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS EXPIRATION DATE: February 20, 2020**