

Architectural Review Board Agenda

November 20, 2024 – 3:00 P.M.

ADMINISTRATIVE

The meeting was called to order by the acting Chair, Jennifer Roselius, at 3:02 pm.

1. Roll Call

Annie Allen, Historic Development staff, called the roll as follows:

Members Present: Karrie Maurin, Cameron Pfeiffer-Traylor, Jennifer Roselius, Stephen Howle, Stephen McNair, and Barja Wilson

Members Absent: Cartledge Blackwell, Abby Davis, and Catarina Echols

Staff Members Present: Annie Allen, Kimberly Branch-Thomas, Hannon Falls, Marion McElroy, Bruce McGowin, and Meredith Wilson

2. Approval of Minutes from October 2, 2024

Stephen McNair moved to approve the minutes from the October 2, 2024 meeting.

The motion was seconded by Stephen Howle and approved unanimously.

3. Approval of Minutes from November 6, 2024

Barja Wilson moved to approve the minutes from the November 6, 2024 meeting.

The motion was seconded by Stephen McNair and approved unanimously.

4. Approval of Mid-Month COAs granted by Staff

Cameron Pfeiffer-Traylor moved to approve the mid-month COAs granted by Staff.

Stephen McNair seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.

MID-MONTH APPROVALS - APPROVED

1.	Applicant:	Darrell McKinney
	Property Address:	155 Broad St
	Issue Date:	10/30/2024
	Project:	1. Replace rotten and damage siding where needed to match existing.
		2. Repair trim around windows to match existing.
		3. Repair windows were needed.
		4. Replace rotten and deteriorated front and rear porch decking where
		needed to match existing.
		5. Repaint exterior in approved colors.

2.	Applicant:	Fortified Exteriors LLC
	Property Address:	1809 Dauphin Street
	Issue Date:	10/30/2024
	Project:	Reroof in-kind with shingles. Color: Charcoal
3.	Applicant:	Fortified Exteriors LLC
	Property Address:	19 Macy Place
	Issue Date:	10/30/2024
	Project:	Remove existing shingles and reroof with architectural shingles.
	•	Color: Pewter Gray
4.	Applicant:	Tracy Hunter
	Parcel ID:	R022910380003193.000
	Issue Date:	10/31/2024
	Project:	The building will be placed on a foundation of brick piers. Framed wood lattice screening panels will be installed between the piers as infill. The existing metal roof will be replaced with an approved metal roof or dimensional shingles. In-kind repairs to front porch. Parge concrete foundation in stucco.
		In-kind repairs to all doors and transoms.
		Replace all windows with one-over-one aluminum clad windows to fit the existing openings.
		Paint exterior in approved color.
		Carry out landscaping and site improvements at receiving lot.
		Install a new 10'-0" wide concrete driveway.
		Install a new 4'-4" wide walkway connecting the existing sidewalk to the
		House.
-	Annellananta	Plant shrubs, small trees, flowers, and grass as needed.
5.	Applicant:	NewTech Environmental Solutions Inc.
	Property Address:	1004 New St Frances St
	Issue Date:	11/01/2024
	Project:	 Repair masonry piers in-kind Repair and replace lap siding where needed. Replacement siding will match existing in material, dimension, and profile. Repair existing windows in-kind to match existing. Reroof with shingles or standing seam metal - product and color to be
		approved by Staff prior to installation.
		6. Repair and stabilize the porch roof. Repair hipped portion of roof on south end of addition. Adjust roofline to continue gable roof shape for the roof to shed water correctly.7. Repaint exterior in color appropriate to the district.
6.	Applicant:	Go Pro Home Services LLC
	Property Address:	1058 Old Shell Road
	Issue Date:	11/04/2024
	Project:	 Repair and replace damaged masonry piers under front porch in-kind. Repair and repaint trim to match where needed. Repair front porch roof/ceiling in-kind where needed. Reroof the front
7	Applicante	porch in shingles. Color to match existing.
7.	Applicant:	Reyner Construction LLC

	Property Address: Issue Date: Project:	903 Palmetto Street 11/04/2024 1. Repair and replace missing siding on exterior where needed to match
		existing. 2. Repair and replace the trim around existing windows where needed.
		3. Repaint exterior to match existing.
8.	Applicant:	Lipford Construction Inc.
	Property Address:	1419 Monroe Street
	Issue Date:	11/04/2024
	Project:	 Remove and replace damaged front porch decking. Replacement to match existing.
		2. Paint the new deck to match existing.
9.	Applicant:	Home Solutions of Mobile, LLC
	Property Address:	219 Conti Street
	Issue Date:	10/15/2024
	Project:	 Apply sealant/caulk to door and windows as needed.
		Patch and fill cracks in stucco siding where needed. Repaint stucco to match existing.
		3. Replace the missing board with a low slope roof to match existing.
		4. Paint fascia boards to match existing color.
		5. Repair low slope roof in-kind where needed.
10.	Applicant:	Felder Services
	Property Address:	920 Conti Street
	Issue Date:	11/06/2024
	Project:	Replacing existing siding on north, east, and west elevations only (wood siding on south façade to remain). Replacement siding will be Hardie boarc to match existing in dimensions and profile.
11.	Applicant:	Mark and Suzanne Short
	Property Address:	55 N. Monterey Street
	Issue Date:	11/08/2024
	Project:	Install a 36' high wood picket fence to enclose front yard. A wood arched double gate will be installed along the east stretch of fence, crossing the existing sidewalk. Gate will measure 7' wide. The arch would rise to 54".
12.	Applicant:	Mark and Suzanne Short
	Property Address:	1602 Dauphin Street
	Issue Date:	11/08/2024
	Project:	1. Replace non-historic window on second floor of rear elevation with 5' wide by 1' high fixed single-light window, level with the existing matching window.
		2. Remove existing non-historic half-door on rear elevation and fill in with siding to match existing. Repaint area to match existing exterior color.

APPLICATIONS

1.	2024-66-CA	
	Address:	156 Everett Street
	Historic District:	Leinkauf

Applicant/Agent:	Spencer Ruggs/Kingdom Construction, LLC.
Project:	Demolish addition on west end of south elevation
APPROVED	- CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

OTHER BUSINESS

1. The next ARB meeting will be held on Wednesday, December 4, 2024.



Location: 156 Everett

Summary of Request: Demolish addition at west end of south elevation

Applicant (as applicable): Spencer Ruggs/Kingdom Construction, LLC.

Property Owner: Living Word Christian Center

Historic District: Leinkauf

Classification: Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The structure proposed for demolition is a later-added wing which is not original to the historic dwelling.
- The wing appears to be in a dilapidated state and has sustained significant termite damage.
- The applicant plans to clear debris and level the lot after demolition.

Report Contents:

Property and Application History	2
Scope of Work	2
Applicable Standards	2
Staff Analysis	2
Attachments	3

PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

Leinkauf Historic District was initially listed in the National Register in 1987 under Criteria A and C for significant architecture and community planning; the district was expanded in 2009. The neighborhood was settled in the early 20th century as a streetcar suburb adjacent to Government Street and surrounding Leinkauf School (1904). Housing forms and styles in the district reflect the range of styles and forms popular from 1900 through 1955.

The property at 156 Everett, constructed c. 1910, is a one-story frame hipped roof bungalow dwelling with a front porch spanning the three-bay façade. An offset rectangular wing projects off the west end of the south elevation. The house does not appear on the 1904 Sanborn Map but is represented on the subsequent 1925 overlay as a square form with no wings or projections. The same form appears on the 1956 overlay. Aerial photography reveals that the addition seems to have appeared on the property between 1967- 1980. The wing is connected to the dwelling's southwest corner yet cannot be accessed through the interior of the original house. It is possible the addition may have originally been a stand-alone structure which was moved to its current location.

This property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board (ARB).

SCOPE OF WORK

Demolish the non-original addition.

APPLICABLE STANDARDS (Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts)

- 1. 12.0 Demolition Guidelines
 - Consider the current significance of a structure previously determined to be historic.
 - Consider the condition of the structure in question. Demolition may be more appropriate when a building is deteriorated or in poor condition.
 - Consider whether the building is one of the last remaining positive examples of its kind in the neighborhood, county, or region.
 - Consider the impact that demolition will have on surrounding structures, including neighboring properties, properties on the same block or across the street or properties throughout the individual historic district.
 - Consider whether the building is part of an ensemble of historic buildings that create a neighborhood.
 - Consider the future utilization of the site.
 - If a development is proposed to replace a demolished historic structure, determine that the proposed replacement structure is consistent with the guidelines for new construction in historic districts.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The application under review seeks approval to demolish the non-original portion of the dwelling at 156 Everett Street. Regarding any proposed demolition, the *Guidelines* require that the following be considered: the architectural significance of the building, the condition of the structure, the impact the demolition will have on the streetscape, and the nature of future utilization of the site.

The c. 1910 dwelling at 156 Everett is a contributing resource to the Leinkauf Historic District. The wing proposed for demolition is a three-bay side gable structure with an entryway centered on the east elevation. As mentioned above, the wing is a later addition to the property which reads as a separate structure. Its form, design, and placement lend to the wing's appearance as an appendage to the house, and not an incorporated element of the original structure's architectural expression.

Per the *Guidelines*, "the condition of the structure in question" should be considered. "Demolition may be more appropriate when a building is deteriorated or in poor condition." According to the applicant, the subject addition is in a dilapidated and structurally unsound condition with significant termite damage. A site visit revealed rotten siding and openings in the gable ends, exposing the interior to the elements.

Whether the building in question is "one of the last remaining positive examples of its kind in the neighborhood, county or region" should be factored into any decision to allow or disallow demolition in a historic district. In this case, the elimination of the later-added wing would not alter or impair the historic form or architectural integrity of the original structure on the property. Likewise, its removal would not impact the surrounding structures or the historic streetscape.

After demolition, the applicant proposes no further development of the property at the location of the addition beyond removing debris, leveling the site, and providing ground cover. (12.0)

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Spencer Ruggs was present to discuss the application. He stated that the addition is in an extreme dilapidated state and is in peril of falling over on its own.

No one from the public came forward to discuss the application. No public comments were received.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Maurin stated that given the placement and condition of the later added wing, that she had no objection to approving the demolition.

Ms. Roselius asked if the addition is attached to the main dwelling.

Mr. Ruggs stated that it is adjacent, and maybe superficially attached, but that the addition could not be accessed from the interior of the main dwelling, and that its removal would not impact the main structure.

Ms. Traylor stated that normally the Board does not like to see buildings demolished but that she agreed with fellow Board members regarding the circumstances and approval of this application.

FINDING FACTS

Mr. McNair moved that, based on the evidence presented in the application, the Board find facts as written by Staff.

Ms. Maurin seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Ms. Traylor moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, the application would not impair the architectural or historic character of the property or the district, and that the application should be granted a COA.

Ms. Barja Wilson seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.

With no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:12 pm.