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

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Steve Stone, called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. Paige Largue, Historic Development staff, called the roll as follows.
   Members Present: Steve Stone, David Barr, Catarina Echols, Craig Roberts, and Joseph Rodrigues.
   Staff Members Present: Paige Largue, Bridget Daniel, Christine Dawson, Marion McElroy, and Flo Kessler.
2. Mr. Roberts moved to approve the minutes from the November 6th meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Rodrigues and approved unanimously.

B. MID-MONTH APPROVALS

1. Applications will be ready for review on December 4th agenda.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2019-50-CA: 961 Savannah Street
   a. Applicant: Mr. Douglas B. Kearley of DBK, Inc. on behalf of Crescent Construction and Development
   b. Project: Rehabilitation and renovation related: Repair in kind. Alter existing duplex to create a single-family residence by altering an existing rear space.
   APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
   a. Applicant: Mr. Michael Ulrich
   HELD OVER FOR FURTHER DESIGN REVIEW. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
3. 2019-52-CA: 365 McDonald Avenue
   a. Applicant: Mr. Garland Braswell, Jr.
   b. Project: After the fact approval: Retain single vehicular metal carport.
   DENIED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Next meeting is December 4, 2019.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2019-50-CA: 961 Savannah Street
Applicant: Mr. Douglas B. Kearley of DBK, Inc. on behalf of Crescent Construction and Development
Received: 10/16/2019
Meeting: 11/20/2019

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Rehabilitation and renovation related: Repair in kind. Alter existing duplex to create a single-family residence by altering an existing rear space.

BUILDING HISTORY

This Victorian period shotgun house is seen on the 1904 Sanborn map. The offset gable wing was constructed at later date, circa 1945.

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 previously appeared before the ARB. The proposed scope of work includes repair in-kind work; filling in between two rear sections, and alteration of fenestration.

B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
   1. “Deteriorated architectural features shall be repaired rather than replaced, wherever possible. In the event replacement is necessary, the new material shall match the material being replaced in physical character and durability. Composition, design, texture, and other physical qualities should appear similar to the original.”
   2. “Maintain significant historic façades in their original form.”
   3. “Repair deteriorated building materials by patching, piecing-in, consolidating or otherwise reinforcing the material.”
   4. “Maintain the relationship of solids to voids of an exterior wall as established by the historic building.”
   5. “Maintain the original pitch.”
   6. “Preserve decorative elements, including crests and chimneys.”
   7. “Use new roof materials that convey a scale and texture similar to those used traditionally.”
   8. “Use cement tiles when replacing clay tile roofs on larger buildings if clay is not available.”
   9. “Retain historic details and ornamentation intact.”
10. “Preserve historic window features, including the frame, sash, muntins, mullions, glazing, sills, heads, jambs, moldings, operation, and groupings of windows.”
11. “Preserve the original roof form of a historic residential structure”
12. “Avoid a new roofing system that permanently damages or alters an existing roof.”
13. “Design an addition so there is the least possible loss of historic fabric and so the character-defining features of the historic building are not destroyed, damaged or obscured.”
14. “Design an addition so that the overall characteristics of the site (site topography, character-defining site features, trees, and significant district vistas and public views) are retained.”
15. “Design an addition to be compatible with the character of the property, neighborhood, and environment.”
16. “The new work shall be differentiated form 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.”
17. “Place an addition so that it is subordinate in scale to the historic structure.”
18. “Wherever possible, construct an addition in such a manner that, if the addition were to be removed, the essential form and integrity of the historic structure would be unimpaired.”
19. “Design doors or windows to or onto an addition so to be compatible with the existing structure.”
20. “Design an addition to be compatible with the color, material, and/or character of the property, neighborhood, and environment.”
21. “Design the building components (roof, foundations, doors, and windows) of the addition to be compatible with the historic architecture.”
22. “Maintain the relationship of solids and voids (windows and doors) in an exterior wall as established by the historic building.”
23. “Differentiate an addition from a historic structure using changes in material, color and/or wall plan. Alternative materials, such as cement fiberboard, are allowed when the addition is properly differentiated from the original structure.”
24. “Place an addition so that so that it is subordinate to the historic residential structure.”
25. “Place a vertical addition in the rear so that it is not visible from the street.”
26. “As per camelback additions, those “substantially setback from the street” can be “appropriate.”
27. “Design a roof of an addition to be compatible with the existing historic building.”
28. “Design a roof shape, pitch, material, and level of complexity to be similar to those of the existing historic building.”
29. “Incorporate overhanging exposed rafters, soffits, cornices, fascias, frieze board, moldings, or other elements into an addition that are generally similar to those of the historic building.”
30. “Use exterior materials and finishes that are comparable to those of the original historic residential structure in profile, dimension and composition. Modern building materials will be evaluated for appropriateness or compatibility with the original historic structure on an individual basis, with the objective of ensuring the materials are similar in their profile, dimension, and composition to those of the original historic structure.”
31. “Where possible, locate a dormer or skylight on a new addition in an inconspicuous location.”
C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):

1. Perform general repairs to match the existing in-kind.
   a. Repair historic turned columnar posts.
   b. Repair existing door and transom.
   c. Repair existing foundation piers.
   d. Repair deteriorated wood elements such as windows, cornice, soffit, and fascia.
   e. Repair existing concrete steps and cheek walls.
   f. Remove abandoned electrical and mechanical equipment.
   g. All repair work will be to match existing in dimension, profile and material.
   h. Install new architectural shingles.
2. Alter existing elevations.
   a. North (façade) elevation: The North (façade) elevation will have new tongue-and-groove porch floors, turned posts to match existing, and the installation of framed lattice between piers.
   b. East (side) elevation
      1. The East (side) elevation will have an existing window found on in a central location on the elevation removed. Siding will be feathered in to match existing.
      2. An existing window on the elevation will be relocated further north.
      3. The recessed portion, located at the southernmost part of the elevation, will have a door and window removed. Siding will be feathered in.
      4. A series of cascading steps will access the new rear entrance at the southern portion of the advanced section of the East elevation.
   c. South (rear) elevation: The South (rear) elevation will have a door removed. A salvaged multi-light door will be installed in its place.
   d. West (side) elevation
      1. An existing aluminum window will be replaced with a six-over-six wooden window to match those found on the house.
      2. The southernmost window will be removed, and siding will be feathered in.
      3. Construct a rear addition extending between the existing duplex rear additions.
         a. The addition will connect advanced and recessed planes off the rear elevation.
         b. The addition façade will become flush with the eastern portion of the elevation. This will create two rear façade plans instead of three.
         c. The existing roof will extend over the addition.
         d. A relocated window will be installed west adjacent to the multi-lite door.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The application calls for the infill between rear additions onto a contributing residence. Minor in-kind repair and replacement work also informs the scope of work. Fenestration changes located towards the rear portion of secondary elevations are also proposed.

The proposed repair and replacement work will match existing materials in dimension, profile and configuration (See B-1). Where items are not repaired to match, they will be replaced to match or replaced with salvaged components.

In accord with the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts, the proposed addition is so designed that the overall characteristics of the property are retained (See B-3). By virtue of being located between existing rear additions, the addition is subordinate to the public view (See B-6). While the majority of work will be located towards the rear portion of the building, rooflines between existing rear additions will be altered (See B-8).
Details of the addition such as eaves, soffits, and other components will match the existing (See B-18 and B-19). The roof pitch of the addition blends with the existing house (See B-28). These elements, as well as roofing materials, afford compatibility with the existing house. Foundation treatments, ceiling heights, wall treatment, fenestration, and eave treatments are compatible with the existing features (See B 9 -10 & 17-19).

Fenestration changes on the existing house called for by the proposed addition are located on secondary elevations and on the rear elevation. Alterations to secondary elevations are located towards the rear of the original house and on later additions. Windows would be repurposed and relocated. The proposed fenestration pattern reflects existing solid-to-void relationships. With regard to the addition, the light configurations are responsive to those found on the historic portions of the building (See B-22).

Building components employed for the new addition are compatible with those found on the existing house (See B-19 and 20). The proposed new addition will employ wood siding, salvaged or wooden windows, eave details, and other elements that are well-matched with the residence materials as it exists.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on (B1-20), Staff does not believe the application would impair the residence or historic district and recommends approval of the application in full.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Kearley, the owner’s representative, was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Roberts stated that the existing windows and doors of the house are not as shown on the submitted plans. He inquired about the design of the front door. Mr. Kearley stated that if no design changes were proposed for an element, he left the item unarticulated in the submitted drawings. Therefore, the windows and doors shown as “blank” would appear as they do now.

Mr. Stone inquired about the second set of steps on the front elevation and the addition of a window on the wing. Mr. Kearley stated that the second set of steps would be removed, and the railing would be added back to the porch once the necessary repairs were completed, with the addition of a wood door on the wing. He also stated all windows would be six-over-six.

There was no further Board discussion at that time.

Mr. Stone opened the application to public comment. With no one speaking in either favor of or opposition to the application, Mr. Stone closed the period of public comment.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Roberts moved that, based on the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, as written.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Rodrigues and was approved unanimously.
DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Roberts moved that, with the application amended to show porch railings on the front elevation and staff approval of the new doors and windows, and based on the facts approved by the Board, the changes proposed by the application do not impair the integrity of the property or neighborhood and a Certificate of Appropriateness be granted.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Rodrigues and was approved unanimously.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

Applicant: Mr. Michael Ulrich
Received: 10/25/2019
Meeting: 11/20/2019

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non- Contributing (Vacant)
Zoning: R-1

BUILDING HISTORY

A residential building once stood on this lot.

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 in May 2017. At that time, the Board granted approval for the construction of a residence. The project never came to fruition. The application up for review calls for approval of a two-story residence.

B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
   1. “Maintain alignment of front setbacks.”
   2. “Maintain the rhythm of buildings and side yards.”
   3. “Design the massing of new construction to appear similar to that of historic buildings in the district.”
   4. “Design the scale of new construction to appear similar to that of historic buildings in the district.”
   5. “Design piers, a foundation, and foundation infill to be compatible with those of nearby historic properties.
   6. “Size foundations and floor heights to appear similar to those of nearby historic buildings.”
   7. “Use building height in front that is compatible with adjacent contributing properties.”
   8. “Design building elements on exterior buildings walls to be compatible with those on nearby historic buildings. These elements often include but are not limited to: balconies, chimneys, and dormers.”
   9. “Use exterior building materials and finishes that complement the character of the surrounding district.”
   10. “Locate and size a window to create a solid-to-void ratio similar to the ratios seen on nearby historic windows.”
   11. “Use traditional window casement and trim similar to those seen in nearby historic buildings.”
12. “Place and size a special feature, including a transom, sidelight or decorative framing element, to complement those seen in nearby historic buildings.
13. “Match the scale of a porch to the main building and reflect the scale of porches of nearby historic buildings.”
14. “When using artificial materials, use a blind or shutter unit that has a thickness, weight and design similar to wood.”
15. “Design a roof on new construction to be compatible with those on adjacent historic buildings.”

C. Scope of Work:

1. Construct a single-family residence.
   a. The house will be setback so as to negotiate the setback of the neighboring houses including 73 S. Ann Street.
   b. The raised foundation is unclear.
   c. The aforementioned foundation will be skirted by brick-faced slab.
   d. The walls will be clad with fiber-cement siding.
   e. The ceiling heights will be 12’0” on the first floor and 10’0” on the second floor.
   f. The windows will be aluminum clad wood in construction and multi-light (typically four-over-four) in configuration.
   g. Doors will be composed of aluminum clad, metal or wood.
   h. The dominant roof will be hipped in construction.
   i. Architectural shingles will sheath the roof.
   j. West Elevation (Facade)
      1) The West Elevation will feature open (porch) spaces.
      2) A three-bay porch will inform the facade.
      3) The porch will be 26’0” in width and 6’0” in depth.
      4) A flight of wooden composite steps will access the southernmost bay of the porch.
      5) Boxed columnar posts will define the bays of the porch.
      6) Fenestration will be as follows in a southerly to northerly direction on the first floor: double door with transom; four-over-four window, four-over-four window.
      7) Fenestration will be as follows in a southerly to northerly direction on the second floor: double door; four-over-four window, opening with blind shutter.
   k. South (right side) Elevation
      1) A porch will define the westernmost portion of the South elevation.
      2) The South Elevation’s fenestration (in a westerly to easterly direction) will be as follows on the first floor: four-over-four window; blind shutter; four-over-four window; four-over-four window; and double vehicular garage entrance.
      3) The garage door will be paneled.
      4) The South Elevation’s fenestration on the second floor will be a series of five (5) four-over-four windows.
   l. East (Rear) Elevation
      1) The rear elevation will not feature any fenestration.
   m. North (side) Elevation
      1) A porch will inform the westernmost portion of the elevation.
      2) The North Elevation’s fenestration (in a westerly to easterly direction) will be as follows on the first floor: four-over-four; four-over-four; double door accessed by stairs, smaller four-over-four. No fenestration will be on the eastern portion of the elevation wall.

2. Conduct site improvements.
   a. Install concrete driveway to access garage on southern portion of lot.
STAFF ANALYSIS

The subject property, 69 S. Ann Street, is located within the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The application under review involves construction of single-family residence on an inner lot. Several items are taken into account for new construction residences including placement, mass, scale, and building components.

With regard to placement, two components are taken into account – setback from the street and distance between buildings. The Design Review Guidelines for New Residential Construction in Mobile’s Historic Districts state that new buildings should be responsive to and maintain the alignment of traditional façade lines (See B-1), as well as the rhythm of side & rear setbacks (See B-2). The property under review, an inner block situation, is located adjacent to/in the vicinity of contributing buildings. In accord with Design Guidelines, the setbacks reflect the historical character of the contributing aspects of the built landscape. The proposed placement negotiates the placement of the buildings located within 150’ of the building, including properties at 65 S. Ann Street and 73 S. Ann Street. The side setbacks are traditional in dimension. The façade directly engages the street in its orientation. The drive would be respectful of traditional placement patterns.

The Design Review Guidelines state that mass - the relationship of the parts of the larger whole comprising a building - for new construction should be in keeping with arrangement and proportion of surrounding historic residences (B-3). The proposed house adopts a traditional block-like massing. A dominant hipped roof anchors the building. The West (façade) elevation’s recessed porch is located on the front façade. The outward massing of the building, a block with a front porch surmounted by a hipped roof, is similar to massing found in the neighborhood. The scale and massing of the proposed house respond to historical porch-fronted residences (See B-13). The height of the foundation seems to mimic traditional foundation heights (See B-5). While a raised slab in construction, the foundation would feature brick facing. The massing of the structure, one informed by 12’ ceilings below a 10’ second story height, is compatible with the architectural context of the contributing landscape which it is situated (See B-7).

Scale refers to a building’s size in relationship to other buildings. The Design Review Guidelines for New Residential Construction state that new construction should be in scale with nearby historic buildings (See B-4). The adjacent residence at 71 S. Ann Street is one and a half stories in height. As you continue South along Ann Street, several two-story houses are found along the same block face. As mentioned in the preceding paragraph addressing massing, the height of the ceilings and pitch of the roof combine to form a whole that would be compatible with surrounding architectural landscape.

With regard to building components, the Design Review Guidelines call for responsiveness to traditional design patterns. As mentioned in the portion of the narrative articulating massing, the typology evoked has precedent in the immediate and surrounding landscape (See B-8). The double doors used for the West (front) façade second story and the North (side) elevation are close, if not matching, the width of the proposed front entrance. Patterns in Old Dauphin Way, particularly Ann Street, show secondary entrances and second story gallery access did not have wide openings. Going further into building components, the building employs sash window types (sash) and wall treatment (siding) that inform the surrounding architectural and historical context (See B-11). The proposed window spacing mimics a traditional solid-to-void ratio along the West and East elevations and the western portion of the South elevation (See B-10). The solid-to-void ratio could be further improved by installing blind shutters on the rear elevation and installing a smaller blind shutter on the first floor of the South (side) elevation’s eastern portion.

In accord with the Design Guidelines for New Construction, the building materials, while of the present day, blend with those employed in the past and in immediate surroundings (See B 9 & 14). Hardieboard siding and aluminum clad windows are approved for new construction within Mobile’s Historic Districts. Staff would request more clarifications on the material of entrance doors.
CLARIFICATIONS
1. What is the foundation height?
2. Please provide an image or specification of brick.
3. Please confirms the materials of the doors. If wood, will they be painted or stained?
4. Will you be constructing a sidewalk leading to the front entrance from the right of way? If so, please provide details.
5. Please confirm the size of the proposed siding.
6. Please an image or drawing detailing the front porch columns and balustrade.
7. Please provide paint colors to staff.

SUGGESTIONS:
1. Install a smaller blind shutter on the eastern portion of the North elevation.
2. Minimize the width of the second story door accessing the gallery and the side elevation door to better blend in with the proportions of similar doors and access found in the district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-1 through 5, B1-10, and B1-13 through 15), Staff does not believe the scale, massing, placement, materials, and solid-to-void ratio would impair the architectural or the historical character of the surrounding district.

Based on B (1-8), Staff is concerned the large second story door on both the West (façade) second story and North (side) first story is not in keeping with similar elements in the district.

Staff recommends approval of the application regarding the elements permitted by the guidelines outlined above. Staff asks the applicant to provide clarification on other details, and for the applicant to consider minimizing the width of the secondary door entrances.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Ulrich, the property owner, was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Roberts noted that the staff comment regarding the porch details was an important one. He inquired about the door patterning, two panel versus four panel. Mr. Roberts also pointed out that the only shutters shown are on fake windows, which would lead one to ask what happened to the shutters on the real windows. Mr. Ulrich stated that the doors were to be of fiberglass, and he agreed to place shutters on the front windows but preferred not to place shutters on all of the windows due to the cost.

Mr. Roberts noted that the pair of doors on the north (left side) elevation would be exposed to the weather and suggested a shed-roofed covering. Mr. Ulrich agreed to add the feature.

Mr. Roberts stated that the wide fascia shown between the first and second floor porches on the west elevation was not in keeping with historic models. Mr. Stone suggested a Design Review meeting might help resolve the issues being brought up in the meeting.

Mr. Stone noted that an extra set of blind shutters was shown on the south elevation plan sheet. The applicant stated that the floorplan is wrong, and the elevation plan is correct. Mr. Stone further noted that
a window is shown at the toilet location on the first floor. The applicant stated he was aware of that, and the interior plan has been changed since these plans were drafted.

Mr. Stone recommended that the continuous brick foundation be broken up as it is too plain, as shown, for the neighborhood. He suggested a pier simulation to accomplish the effect.

No further discussion from the Board occurred at that time.

Mr. Stone opened the application to public comment. With no one speaking either in favor of or in opposition to the application, Mr. Stone closed the period of public comment.

**FINDING OF FACT**

The evidence was presented from the application and during the public testimony to the Board with the facts in the Staff report, as written.

No motion was made for approval, as the application was tabled for review by a Design Review Committee.

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Mr. Roberts moved that the application be tabled and discussed in a Design Review Committee meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Rodrigues and was unanimously approved.

Mr. Roberts and Mr. Stone volunteered to serve on the Design Review Committee.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2018-52-CA: 365 McDonald Avenue
Applicant: Mr. Garland Braswell, Jr.
Received: 11/12/2019
Meeting: 11/20/2019

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Leinkauf
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: After the fact approval: Retain one story metal ancillary building constructed without Certificate of Appropriateness.

BUILDING HISTORY

This one-story ranch residence was listed in a late 2000s district expansion of Leinkauf. The property was constructed in 1965.

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 not appeared before the Architectural Review Board, according to the MHDC vertical files. The proposed scope of work consists of retaining a one-story metal carport installed without permits.

B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
   1. “Design an accessory structure to be subordinate in scale to that of the primary structure.”
   2. “Locate a new accessory structure in line with other visible accessory structures in the district.”
   3. “These are traditionally located at the rear of a lot.”
   4. “Acceptable materials for accessory structures include…wood frame, cement fiber board, masonry, installations (Pre-made store-bought sheds, provided they are minimally visible from public areas.)”
   5. Unacceptable materials for accessory structures include”…metal…”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted site plan):
   1. After the fact approval:
      a. Retain a metal carport installed with a height below 20’0” and width less than 30’0”.
      b. The carport is located 6 feet behind the front façade plane of the residence and in front of a privacy fence.
STAFF ANALYSIS

When reviewing applications for new ancillary structures, the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts take into account scale, placement, and materials (See B-1 through B-4).

The ancillary building falls within neither the property’s nor the district’s periods of significance. The Design Review Guidelines state that an ancillary structure should be subordinate to the primary structure (see B-1). The one-story carport is one vehicular stall in width. The height of the structure is less than that of the main house. The guidelines further state accessory structures should be located in line with other accessory structures and explain this is typically on the rear of the lot (See B-2 and 3). The carport is located on the side of the lot, behind the front façade plane and in front of an existing privacy fence. Regarding accessory structures, the guidelines state approvable and unapproved materials for construction (See B-5). Metal is listed as an unapprovable material.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2, 3 and 5), Staff believes the accessory structure that is the subject of this application will impair either the architectural or the historical character of the district. Staff notes that while the size of the carport is permissible, the location of the structure and materials do not meet the Design Review Guidelines standards. Staff recommends denial.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Braswell, the property owner, was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Roberts asked the applicant whether, living in a historic district, he did not know he needed a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the carport. Mr. Braswell stated that he believed the contractor who erected the carport had obtained all necessary permits.

Ms. Suzanne Schwartz of 360 McDonald Avenue stated her opinion that the carport is “practically invisible”, and the camper it shelters is no longer noticeable. Ms. Schwartz stated that most people in the neighborhood appreciate that the camper is now back from the street and covered. She stated that the complainant, who lives next door to Mr. Braswell, has complained that their view is obstructed, but City ordinance does not provide for a “view.” She stated that the neighborhood on the whole supports the carport.

Mr. Roberts stated that the ARB must follow City ordinances, and if the ARB approves the carport, it would set a precedent, despite the support of Mr. Braswell’s neighbors.

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.

Mr. Barr seconded the motion, and it was unanimously approved.
DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the facts as approved by the Board, the accessory structure that is the subject of the application impairs either the architectural or the historical character of the district and a Certificate of Appropriateness shall not be granted.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Rodrigues and was denied unanimously.

Ms. Largue explained to the applicant his right to appeal the decision and the process and timeline for an appeal.