



Architectural Review Board Agenda

November 6, 2024 – 3:00 P.M.

ADMINISTRATIVE

The meeting was called to order by the acting Chair, Cartledge Blackwell, at 3:01 pm.

1. Roll Call

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

Members Present: Cartledge Blackwell, Abby Davis, Karrie Maurin, Cameron Pfeiffer-Traylor, Jennifer Roselius, and Barja Wilson

Members Absent: Catarina Echols, Stephen Howle, and Stephen McNair

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

2. Approval of Minutes from October 16, 2024

Jennifer Roselius moved to approve the minutes from the October 16, 2024 meeting.

The motion was seconded by Karrie Maurin and approved unanimously.

3. Approval of Mid-Month COAs granted by Staff

Abby Davis moved to approve the mid-month COAs granted by Staff.

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

MID-MONTH APPROVALS - APPROVED

- Applicant:** All Weather Roofing & Construction LLC
Property Address: 907 Church Street
Issue Date: 10/08/2024
Project: Reroof with shingles. Color: Pewter.
- Applicant:** Veronica Philon
Property Address: 312 Marine Street
Issue Date: 10/09/2024
Project: Repaint exterior using the following Sherwin Williams paint colors:
Main Body and Window Trim - Colonnade Gray
Fascia - Extra White
Front Door - Palmetto St. Bronze

3. **Applicant:** The KP Group
Property Address: 1166 New St. Francis Street
Issue Date: 10/11/2024
Project: Reroof with shingles. Color: black. Replace rotten siding as-needed on all elevations to match existing.
4. **Applicant:** The KP Group
Property Address: 1459 Dauphin Street
Issue Date: 10/11/2024
Project: Reroof with shingles. Color: Black.
Construct a new 3'-0" wood picket fence along the north property line and on the east and west property lines in front (north) of the front wall plane. Construct a new 6-foot wood privacy fence along the east property line behind (south) of the front wall plane. Repair existing areas of wood fence to match existing.
5. **Applicant:** Fortified Exteriors LLC
Property Address: 1704 McGill Ave. Unit A
Issue Date: 10/11/2024
Project: Reroof with Gauge Tuff Rib Metal Roof. Color: Black
6. **Applicant:** Winston Bennett
Property Address: 15 S. Conception St
Issue Date: 10/14/2024
Project: Construct new extruded aluminum 4-rod overhead canopy system over main entrance on west façade. Canopy would measure 23'-2" wide x 4'-0" deep.
Baked enamel paint finish: Color - bronze
7. **Applicant:** Guy Brothers Roofing
Property Address: 159 Levert Ave
Issue Date: 10/15/2024
Project: Reroof with shingles. Color: Atlas Pewter (gray)
8. **Applicant:** RATA Investments LLC
Property Address: 159 S Jefferson St.
Issue Date: 10/15/2024
Project:
 1. Reroof with shingles. Color: Charcoal
 2. Repaint exterior in the following colors:
Main body - Classical White (SW 2829)
Trim - Sage (SW 2860)
Porch decking and front door - Mineral Natural
9. **Applicant:** Lowe's Home Center LLC
Property Address: 155 S Monterey Street
Issue Date: 10/15/2024
Project: Remove the rear entry door and replace it with a pane-and-panel steel door to fit the existing opening.
10. **Applicant:** Fortified Exteriors LLC
Property Address: 62 Fearnway
Issue Date: 10/16/2024
Project: Reroof with shingles. Color: Slate
11. **Applicant:** Katherine Flowers

- Property Address:** 922 Conti Street
Issue Date: 10/17/2024
Project: Replace damaged 8'-0" wood privacy fence to match existing with exception of placement of the new gate, which will abut the west elevation 1/2 north of the existing gate, so as to sit behind the building's front plane. Paint fence to match existing.
12. **Applicant:** Cooner Construction LLC
Property Address: 156 Macy Place
Issue Date: 10/17/2024
Project: Reroof with shingles. Color: Cambridge Dual Black
13. **Applicant:** Gerald Gillis Jr. dba Impeccable Rooftops LLC
Property Address: 1314 Dauphin Street
Issue Date: 10/18/2024
Project: Remove existing shingles, underlayment, and even metal. Install new eve metal. Install new shingles. Color: charcoal.
14. **Applicant:** Michael Jones
Property Address: 117 Bush Avenue
Issue Date: 10/23/2024
Project: Reroof with shingles. Color: charcoal
15. **Applicant:** Franchise Management Services
Property Address: 561 St. Francis Street
Issue Date: 10/24/2024
Project: Reroof in-kind with TPO overlay.
16. **Applicant:** Chad Comingore
Property Address: 10 Common Street
Issue Date: 10/24/2024
Project: Repair and replace rotten siding as needed to match existing. Repair windows to match existing. Reroof with shingles. Color: Weather Wood Replace 3 non-original aluminum windows on south (side) and west (rear) elevations with six-over-six wood windows to match existing in dimension, molding profiles, and lite configuration. Repair and replace rotten wood elements on front porch in-kind to match. Repaint exterior using Behr paints in following color scheme:
Main body color: S340-4 Back to Nature
Porch deck, lattice, and shutters: N410-7 North Woods
Door: S100-7 Medieval Wine
Trim: White
Trim: White
17. **Applicant:** Robert Burns
Property Address: 1215 Church Street
Issue Date: 10/25/2024
Project: Install a prefabricated gable roof shed clad in wood siding. Roof will be clad in 29 Gauge metal and will measure 10.5' high by 10'-0" wide by 12'-0" deep. The shed will be located to the rear of the of the dwelling, on the southwest corner of the lot and will measure
18. **Applicant:** Ponquinette Improvements LLC

Property Address: 1214 Elmira Street
Issue Date: 10/28/2024
Project: Repair and replace wood siding, trim, and porch elements to match existing.
 Paint exterior in following colors:
 Main body - Light green
 Trim – Cream
 Reroof with shingles. Color: Weather wood

19. Applicant: Jimmie Dickinson
Property Address: 275 Houston Street
Issue Date: 10/28/2024
Project: Reroof with shingles. Color: Charcoal

APPLICATIONS

1. 2024-59-CA

Address: 1419 Monroe Street/257 Stocking Street
Historic District: Leinkauf
Applicant/Agent: Rachele Reis
Project: Demolish ancillary structure at rear of lot
APPROVED - **CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

2. 2024-60-CA

Address: 1172 Elmira Street
Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Applicant/Agent: Will Keeney/Southern Labor and Contracting
Project: Demolish ancillary structure and construct new garage structure
APPROVED - **CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

3. 2024-61-CA

Address: 1164 Texas Street
Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Applicant/Agent: Will Keeney/Southern Labor and Contracting
Project: Demolish existing structure
APPROVED - **CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

4. 2024-62-CA

Address: 1010 Caroline Avenue
Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Applicant/Agent: Cory Bronenkamp/Acre Development, LLC.
Project: Construct one-story frame single-family residence
APPROVED - **CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

5. 2024-63-CA

Address: 960 Dauphin Street
Historic District: Old Dauphin Way

Applicant/Agent: Robert Brown on behalf of R&G Properties, Inc.
Project: Replace wood siding on sides and rear elevations with fiber cement board; repair/replace wood siding on primary façade in kind; Replace windows and some doors, including resizing a majority of existing window openings; Repair existing porches, including installing new railing on second-floor porch; Complete porch and deck on east elevation; Repaint.
APPROVED - **CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

6. 2024-64-CA

Address: 2308 Ashland Place
Historic District: Ashland Place
Applicant/Agent: Robert McCown on behalf of Will Price and Curry Stahl
Project: Construct new single-family dwelling
APPROVED - **CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

7. 2024-65-CA

Address: 112 Bush Avenue
Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Applicant / Agent: Philip Cianciola/SFN Holdings, LLC.
Project: Demolish one-story single-family dwelling
APPROVED - **CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

8. 2024-53-CA

Address: 256 S. Broad Street
Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Applicant / Agent: Bud Walker on behalf of Nick & Theresa Chamblee
Project: Construct pool house in rear yard
APPROVED - **CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

OTHER BUSINESS

1. The next ARB meeting will be held on Wednesday, November 20, 2024.



Agenda Item #1

Certified Record 2024-59-CA

DETAILS

Location:

1419 Monroe Street

Summary of Request:

Demolish ancillary structure at rear of lot

Applicant (as applicable):

Rachel Reis

Property Owner:

Same

Historic District:

Leinkauf

Classification:

Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The ancillary structure incurred significant damage from a fire in March 2024.
- The ancillary structure is original to the property and has undergone extensive alterations.
- Although the structure sits at the rear of the lot at 1419 Monroe, it is orientated towards Stocking Street.
- The application proposes the creation of a sodded yard 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 1419 Monroe Street is c. 1913 stucco single-story Craftsman style dwelling with classical detailing. In 1994, the rear porch was enclosed in 1994. The 1925 Sanborn Map shows a one-story ancillary structure located on the southeast corner of the lot, labeled as a garage. On the subsequent 1956 overlay, the garage is represented as a two-story structure which includes a garage, with a dwelling above (This structure has a separate street address of 257 Stocking Street). After 1956, the east lot line at 1419 Monroe was altered to include the southern portion of the neighboring lot to the east. In 1995, the footprint of the ancillary structure was expanded and the building was altered significantly. In March 2024, this structure was severely damaged by fire.

According to the Historic Development property files, this property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board (ARB).

SCOPE OF WORK

Demolish ancillary structure.

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

1. **10.0** Vacant Lots

The appearance of a vacant lot can potentially negatively impact the character of a historic district. When a vacant lot exists or is created through demolition, property owners must properly maintain, landscape and/or screen the property. This applies to a temporarily vacant lot. Owners must landscape a vacant lot with a ground cover approved by the ARB, such as grass. The owner must maintain the ground cover and keep the property free of trash and debris, as required by the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Mobile.

2. **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 property under review is a contributing structure in the Leinkauf Historic District. The application proposes the demolition of the two-story ancillary structure which sits to the south (rear) of the main dwelling and faces Stocking Street to the west.

The *Guidelines* require that the following be considered when a demolition is proposed: the architectural significance of the building, the impact the demolition will have on the streetscape, and the nature of future utilization of the site.

Significance

The ancillary structure proposed for demolition is historic and original to the property. However, as mentioned above, it has undergone extensive alterations that have resulted in a loss of historic architectural integrity.

Condition

The subject structure has recently sustained extensive damage from a fire in March 2024 and is no longer habitable.

Impact on the Street and District

The structure’s present expression (prior to the fire) does not contribute to the historic streetscape of Stocking Street. However, because it reads as a dwelling that fronts Stocking Street, its deletion would create the appearance of a vacant lot along the street.

Nature of Proposed Development

According to the owner, the insurance company has deemed the structure a total loss; and the cost to repair exceeds the value of the building. Due to the placement of the ancillary structure to the rear of the main dwelling, the application proposes the creation of a sodded rear yard in place of the structure’s footprint. (12.0)

Because, as mentioned above, the orientation of the lot and subject structure are such that a demolition would produce the appearance of a vacant lot on Stocking Street, the proposed sodded yard would be in agreement with the *Guidelines’* call to landscape and/or screen a vacant lot. Additional landscaping or fencing may further define the area as a rear yard associated with 1419 Monroe. (10.0)

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Ms. Rachel Reis, the property owner, was present to discuss the application. Ms. Reis explained that the structure had partially burned in April and could not be tarped. Extensive fire damage combined with months of water intrusion have resulted in damage that is too expensive to make repair practical.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board did not have any questions for the applicant or for staff.

FINDING FACTS

Ms. Jennifer Roselius moved that, based on the evidence presented in the Public Testimony, the Board find facts as written by staff.

Ms. Abby Davis seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Ms. Davis 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.



Agenda Item #2

Certified Record 2024-60-CA

DETAILS

Location:

1172 Elmira Street

Summary of Request:

Remove existing garage and construct new enclosed garage

Applicant (as applicable):

Will Keeney/Southern Labor and Contracting

Property Owner:

KL Investments, LLC

Historic District:

Oakleigh Garden

Classification:

Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The concrete block garage structure proposed for demolition is in a state of decline
- The structure does not contribute to the architectural character of the subject streetscape
- The proposed plans for a new garage structure show that the new building would occupy the same area on the lot as the extant structure
- The proposed new building complies with the Guidelines in regard to placement, massing, scale, and materials

Report Contents:

Property and Application History..... 2
 Scope of Work..... 2
 Applicable Standards 3
 Staff Analysis 6
 Attachments 8

PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

Oakleigh Garden Historic District was initially listed in the National Register in 1972 under Criteria A (historic significance) and C (architectural significance) for its local significance in the areas of architecture, landscape architecture, and planning and development. The district is significant for its high concentration of 19th- and 20th-century architectural types and styles and significant in the area of landscape architecture for its canopies of live oaks planted from 1850 to 1910. The district is significant in the area of planning and development as the location of Washington Square, one of only two antebellum public parks remaining in Mobile. The district was expanded in 1984, and an updated nomination was approved in 2016.

The property at 1172 Elmira is a one-and-a-half story Craftsman style bungalow with hipped center gable, exposed rafters, and a full-width recessed porch supported by four wood paneled box columns resting on brick plinths. Brick infill was installed between the columns at some point prior to 1989, creating a modified knee wall which now encloses the porch. A concrete block garage structure sits to the east of the dwelling. According to Historic Development survey records, the dwelling was constructed c. 1931 and was originally designed as a duplex addressed as 1172 and 1174 Elmira. It is possible that the construction date may be earlier, as the 1925 Sanborn overlay shows a dwelling of similar size and form, with an attached store structure extant on the lot. This structure was either deleted in whole, or the store block was removed and the dwelling converted into a duplex prior to the 1956 survey. More research is needed to make this determination. The 1956 Sanborn overlay includes a grouping of adjacent or connected one-story accessory structures located to the east of the dwelling, which stretch across the north property line and create an 'L' shape, turning westward on the adjacent lot to the north. The southernmost of these structures, located on subject lot, is symbolized on the map as a concrete block structure. Aerial photography reveals the footprint of these structures extant today.

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

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Demolish concrete block garage structure.
2. Construct a new garage structure.
 - a. The structure would sit on the northeast corner of the lot. It would sit back 4' off the north property line and would sit 0.2' off the east property line.
 - b. The structure would measure 14' -6" wide 26'-0" deep, with the height measuring 9' -0" high to the top of the plate.
 - c. The structure would be topped by a hipped roof, clad in architectural shingles. An extended eave overhang on the west elevation would be underpinned by two decorative brackets regularly spaced along the elevation.
 - d. The structure would sit on a concrete slab-on-grade foundation.
 - e. The structure would be clad in wood lap siding. All trim would be wood.
 - f. Fenestration would include the following:
 - A pane-and-panel simulated wood garage door measuring 10'-0" wide by 7'-0" high would be centered on the south elevation (actual door material would be approved by Staff prior to installation)
 - A pane-and-panel wood entry door measuring 3'-0" wide by 7'-0" would be located on the north end of the west elevation
 - g. The structure would be painted in the following Sherwin Williams colors:
 - Siding – Rockwood Sash Green (2810)
 - Trim – Pure White (7008)
 - Doors – Jazz Age Coral (0058)

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.
2. **9.1** Design an accessory structure to be subordinate in scale to that of the primary structure.
 - If a proposed accessory structure is larger than the size of typical historic accessory structures in the district, break up the mass of the larger structure into smaller modules that reflect traditional accessory structures.
 3. **9.2** Locate a new accessory structure in line with other visible accessory structures in the district.
 - These are traditionally located at the rear of a lot.

ACCEPTABLE ACCESSORY STRUCTURE MATERIALS

Materials that are compatible with the historic district in scale and character are acceptable.

These often include:

- » Wood frame
- » Masonry
- » Cement-based fiber siding
- » Installations (Pre-made store-bought sheds, provided they are minimally visible from public areas)

UNACCEPTABLE ACCESSORY STRUCTURE MATERIALS

Materials that are not compatible with the historic district in scale and character are unacceptable.

These often include:

- » Metal (except for a greenhouse)
- » Plastic (except for a greenhouse)
- » Fiberglass (except for a greenhouse)

STAFF ANALYSIS

The subject property is a contributing resource within the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. The application under review includes the proposed demolition of an existing ancillary structure, and the subsequent construction of a new garage structure at the same location on the lot.

In regard to the 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.

Significance

The garage structure proposed for demolition is part of a network of adjacent accessory structures on the subject lot and the lot to the north. It is unclear whether the garage structure is contemporary with the main dwelling. Additionally, a comparison of accessory structures on the 1925 Sanborn map with the 1956 overlay indicates that the existing network may consist of buildings relocated to create the present arrangement. Of note is a parapet wall located on the north end of the subject structure, which further suggests that the structure did not originate at its present site. Beyond this one existing architectural feature, the primitive and utilitarian design of the garage

does not indicate a particular architectural style and is not representative of rare building type or form in the district or beyond.

Condition

The *Guidelines* state that “demolition may be more appropriate when a building is deteriorated or in poor condition.” The submitted COA application states that the structure is unsound. Visually, it is unclear if the garage is structurally compromised. However, there is visible evidence of failings in mortar joints and inferior temporary repairs in an attempt to close up openings, etc. The roof is in obvious need of replacement. The structure, in its current state, requires substantial repairs and replacement.

Impact on the Street and District

The subject structure’s construction, design, placement, and relationship to adjacent structures suggest that it was not purpose built in situ, but was moved to its present location out of necessity. Consequently, it does not contribute significantly to the historic context or architectural character of the surrounding streetscape or the district at large.

Nature of Proposed Development

The application proposes the construction of a new garage structure which would roughly occupy the footprint of the current structure.

In regard to scale, the *Guidelines* state that accessory structures be subordinate in size to the main structure. (9.1) The proposed building’s footprint would measure 377 sf, making it smaller than that of the primary dwelling on the lot which is approximately 1550 sf. Also subordinate is the one-story, slab-on-grade height of the proposed garage, compared to the existing one-and-a-half story building which rests on a raised foundation.

The proposed traditional placement of the structure to the side of the lot complies with the *Guidelines’* placement directive. (9.2)

In addition to the above listed *Guidelines*, accessory structures are meant to adhere to guidelines for new residential construction in historic districts (Chapter 6). Within this context, the proposed garage complies with the relevant guidelines for building materials and finishes, roofs, doors and doorways, foundations, and windows. (6.39, 6.40, 6.41, 6.42, 6.43, 6.45)

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Will Keeney, the property owner, was present to discuss the application. Mr. Keeney stated that the concrete-block garage building was not original to the property and lacked the architectural detail of the main dwelling. Mr. Keeney further explained that the roof was severely compromised. Mr. Keeney stated that he would like to remove the existing structure and replace it with a smaller garage structure that would better echo the architectural style of the main dwelling.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Karrie Maurin asked the applicant what materials he proposed using for the garage exterior. Mr. Keeney stated that the siding would be 1/5 wood lap siding to match the main dwelling. All trim and the passage door would be wood. Mr. Keeney proposed a fiberglass or metal garage door with a “wood look.”

Ms. Cameron Pfeiffer-Traylor noted there were only two elevations shown in the submitted drawings. She asked the applicant what was intended for the north and east elevations. Mr. Keeney stated that these would each be blank with no fenestration. The wood siding and trim would be as shown on the west and south elevations. Mr. Keeney indicated that the new structure would maintain the zero lot line setback on the east property line.

Ms. Maurin asked if the roofline would match that of the dwelling. Mr. Keeney confirmed that the garage would have the same roof slope as the dwelling.

FINDING FACTS

Ms. Abby Davis moved that, based on the evidence presented in the Public Testimony and Board Discussion, the Board find facts as written by staff.

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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



Agenda Item #3

Certified Record 2024-61-CA

DETAILS

Location:

1164 Texas Street

Summary of Request:

Demolish existing structure

Applicant (as applicable):

Will Keeney/Southern Labor and Contracting

Property Owner:

KL Investments, LLC

Historic District:

Oakleigh Garden (local only)

Classification:

N/A

Summary of Analysis:

- The subject property has lost most of its character defining features and does not represent a rare building style or typology in the Oakleigh Garden Historic District.
- The property is in salvageable condition, and its demolition would disrupt a historic grouping of nearly identical shotgun dwellings.
- Construction of a new dwelling would lessen the negative impact of demolition.
- The conceptual design for a new dwelling maintains the basic orientation, spacing, and rhythm of the shotgun grouping.

Report Contents:

Property and Application History..... 2

Scope of Work..... 2

Applicable Standards 2

Staff Analysis 3

Attachments 4

PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

Oakleigh Garden Historic District was initially listed in the National Register in 1972 under Criteria A (historic significance) and C (architectural significance) for its local significance in the areas of architecture, landscape architecture, and planning and development. The district is significant for its high concentration of 19th and 20th-century architectural types and styles and significant in the area of landscape architecture for its canopies of live oaks planted from 1850 to 1910. The district is significant in the area of planning and development as the location of Washington Square, one of only two antebellum public parks remaining in Mobile. The district was expanded in 1984, and an updated nomination was approved in 2016. On the local level, the district was also expanded in 2007 to encompass several blocks of Broad and Texas Streets. The Mobile City Council voted unanimously to approve the local expansion on July 18, 2007. However, these areas were not included in the updated 2016 nomination.

The structure at 1164 Texas Street located in the local only portion of the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. The property is not part of the Oakleigh Garden National Register District, and it is not listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Contributing and non-contributing status are designations approved by the National Park Service within accepted historic district nominations. The subject property is therefore not listed as either contributing or non-contributing.

The simple wood-frame shotgun structure was constructed between 1925 and 1955, with an estimated construction date of c. 1932. The 1925 Sanborn map shows a double shotgun at this location. The single shotgun house that currently exists appears on the 1955 Sanborn map. Aerial photographs from 1938 appear to show a row of single shotguns in the same configuration as the 1955 map, instead of the mix of single and double shotguns seen in the 1925 map. The street numbering in Mobile City Directories first aligns with the 1955 Sanborn map in 1932, suggesting the row of single shotguns had replaced the earlier double shotguns by this date.

The shotgun building form is a common historic typology throughout Oakleigh Garden District and the City of Mobile as a whole. When first constructed, this dwelling was one of a grouping of seven shotgun-type structures with nearly identical footprints. Six of those dwellings remain today in varying degrees of disrepair. The seventh structure – 1166 Texas Street – was demolished sometime before the 2007 expansion. Multiple rear additions were constructed in phases prior to 2007. This has left 1164 Texas street the last house at the west end of the grouping.

According to Historic Development records, this property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board (ARB).

SCOPE OF WORK

Demolish single-story single-family dwelling.

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

1. **10.0** Vacant Lots

The appearance of a vacant lot can potentially negatively impact the character of a historic district. When a vacant lot exists or is created through demolition, property owners must properly maintain, landscape and/or screen the property. This applies to a temporarily vacant lot. Owners must landscape a vacant lot with a ground cover approved by the ARB, such as grass. The owner must maintain the ground cover and keep the property free of trash and debris, as required by the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Mobile.

2. **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 property under review is located within the portion of the Oakleigh Garden Historic District that is only designated on the local level. The property has not been designated as either contributing or non-contributing. The subject application seeks approval to demolish the existing shotgun dwelling at 1164 Texas Street.

The *Guidelines* state that when demolition is contemplated, the current significance of the structure should be considered. The subject house is located outside of the nationally recognized boundaries of Oakleigh Garden Historic District. As such, the property falls under the purview of the Architectural Review Board, but it has not been designated as contributing (or non-contributing) on the National Register of Historic Places. While the construction date of c. 1932 certainly meets the age requirement for listing on the National Register, the loss the original siding, windows, and porch would render the property ineligible.

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.” The subject property is in fair to poor condition. The inappropriate rear additions are in by far the worst condition. It appears that this addition was built in phases using inferior construction techniques. The addition is clad only in plywood sheets, many of which are rotting and buckled with moisture. There is significant vegetation growing on and through the addition roof. Where the plywood sheeting has rotten through entirely on the east elevation, exposed structural members appear to be severely damaged. The original dwelling is in somewhat better condition. The tin roof is corroded but appears to be largely intact, except for vines that are growing through holes in the metal sheets along the roof eaves. The siding also appears to be largely intact, though it is not known what condition the original wood siding is underneath the existing asbestos shingles. Most of the windows have broken or missing panes of glass or have been covered with plywood. Exposed wood trim is almost entirely devoid of paint and in some areas shows signs of water damage and rot. The property has not been cited by municipal enforcement, and the applicant has not provided a structural assessment.

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. This dwelling is one of several examples of modest shotgun dwellings found throughout Mobile’s historic districts and in the Oakleigh Garden District specifically. It is also one of a grouping of six almost identical shotgun dwellings. Of these six extant houses, 1164 Texas has the lowest degree of architectural integrity. Only one of the original six-over-six wood windows remain. All other windows have been removed and replaced with aluminum awning-type windows. Asbestos shingles cover the original wood siding, which is still visible where there are missing or broken shingles. The condition of the original siding is unknown. A poured concrete porch deck set on concrete blocks replaced the original wood porch structure sometime before 2007. If the structure ever featured any

decorative elements that might set it apart from other shotguns in the area, these elements were also lost prior to the local district expansion in 2007.

Another consideration required by the *Guidelines* is the impact that a demolition would have on surrounding structures. Demolition alone with no plan to rebuild would likely pose a threat to the five remaining shotgun homes in the grouping. The homes toward the east end of the grouping are by far the most intact and in the best condition. The westernmost residence of the original seven has already been lost to demolition. The subject property is currently in the worst condition. Its immediate neighbor – 1162 Texas Street – is in a much more stable condition. While it too features replacement windows and asbestos siding, it is occupied and well maintained. In the long term, the creation of an empty lot immediately next to this structure may eventually continue the pattern of deterioration and demolition. However, in the short term, demolition of the subject property may prove beneficial to the neighboring property by removing source of visual blight.

In this case, the applicant does propose construction of a new residence following demolition, which would lessen the negative impact of the demolition to the streetscape. Provided the new structure is appropriate within the historic context of neighboring dwellings, it may even encourage rehabilitation of adjacent properties that are in better condition and retain a greater degree of architectural integrity than the subject property.

The applicant proposes construction of a two-story house that replicates the form of a traditional shotgun house with a camelback addition. The applicant has provided only conceptual drawings that give a general idea of the form and mass of the proposed new construction. The proposed design can therefore only be evaluated on those points. The proposed dwelling would be two bays wide and approximately five bays deep with a front gable roof. If the setback is kept consistent with adjacent structures, this proposed dwelling would maintain the basic orientation and spacing of the original shotgun grouping. However, the proposed camelback would somewhat disrupt the rhythm of the existing streetscape by introducing a two-story structure on a block of predominantly single-story dwellings. Currently the only two-story structure on this portion of Texas Street is a c. 1960 residence at 1172 Texas Street. The use of a camelback instead of a full second story will lessen this disruption of the street scape, and there is historic precedent for constructing camelback addition on existing shotgun. It should be noted that this particular alteration is far more common in crowded urban areas like New Orleans, Louisiana, than it is in Mobile.

Given the incomplete nature of the design concept, approval of demolition at this stage would result in a vacant lot until a complete design could be realized. In the case of temporary vacant lots created through demolition, the *Guidelines* state that owners “must properly maintain, landscape and/or screen the property.” (10.0, 12.0)

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Will Keeney, the property owner, was present to discuss the application. Mr. Keeney stated that he had acquired several properties in the area with the intent of rehabilitating them and that this was the first one he felt he could not justify saving. Mr. Keeney stated that he had not entered the structure because he believed the front door might be partially supporting the front façade. According to Mr. Keeney, the girders along the sides of the building show signs of significant rot and deterioration.

Ms. Meredith Wilson, a member of staff, explained to the staff that the subject property was within the portion of the Oakleigh Garden Historic District that is only locally designated. As such, the subject property is not listed as either contributing or non-contributing to the Oakleigh Garden National Register District.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Karrie Maurin asked for confirmation that the provided plans for new construction on the site were conceptual and were not up for approval today. Mr. Keeney confirmed that the plans were conceptual in nature. Mr. Keeney further explained that he owned the adjoining vacant lot to the west and eventually planned to build two shotgun type residences on these two lots to maintain the rhythm of the existing shotgun grouping to the east.

Ms. Jennifer Roselius asked what the plans for the lot were immediately following demolition if plans for new construction had not been approved. Mr. Keeney stated that the lot would be cleared of debris and seeded with grass. Ms. Roselius asked if the applicant had procured any sort of structural report that deemed the building unsalvageable or unsafe. Mr. Keeney stated that he had not but that the girders looked like Swiss cheese.

Mr. Cart Blackwell commended the applicant for his acknowledgement of the existing shotgun grouping and commitment to maintaining the historic rhythm of the street.

Ms. Abby Davis asked what the timeframe for new construction would be. Mr. Keeney explained that he would like to wrap up his Elmira project first. He stated that construction on these lots would likely begin in late 2025.

Ms. Cameron Pfeiffer-Traylor expressed concern that the proposed two-story new construction would disrupt the pattern of the existing shotgun dwellings. Mr. Keeney responded that he believed that placing the camelback at the rear of the dwelling would sufficiently minimize its impact on the streetscape. Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor stated that the provided plans were incomplete and appeared to be too modern in style and detailing. Mr. Keeney responded that the plans were in a very preliminary stage. He stated that his primary concern was to get the lot safe and secure. He assured the Board that the plans would go through several more iterations, including adding appropriate detailing to fit in with the existing streetscape.

Ms. Maurin asked if the applicant intended to come back at a later date with more detailed plans. Mr. Keeney stated that he would. He also stated that we would present renderings of the proposed design in the context of the streetscape. Ms. Maurin stated that this would be very helpful to the Board in making their decision.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor listed concerns she would like the applicant to address in future revisions, including the boxy proportions, the modern-looking windows, and the turned porch posts, which appeared to her to be too Victorian in style.

Ms. Davis confirmed with staff that the Board was only reviewing the demolition and that the plans were not up for approval.

Mr. Blackwell interjected that the spirit of replacement with two shotgun-type dwellings was good. Ms. Roselius expressed her appreciation for the applicant's thoughtfulness in discussing infill construction. Ms. Roselius asked if the applicant knew of any imminent safety concerns related to the existing structure. Mr. Keeney stated that he felt very strongly that the structure was a hazard and that a stiff wind would blow it over.

FINDING FACTS

Ms. Davis moved that, based on the evidence presented in the Public Testimony and Board Discussion, the Board find facts as written by staff.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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



Agenda Item #4

Certified Record 2024-62-CA

DETAILS

Location:

1010 Caroline Avenue

Summary of Request:

Construct one-story frame single-family residence.

Applicant (as applicable):

Cory Bronenkamp/195, LLC

Property Owner:

Design House, LLC

Historic District:

Old Dauphin Way

Classification:

Vacant Lot

Summary of Analysis:

- The size and massing closely match the historic dwelling that existed on the lot from 1910 to 2011, as well as the neighboring shotgun dwellings.
- All proposed exterior materials are allowed on new construction within the historic districts.
- The pattern and configurations of the window and doors are not in keeping with the shotgun typology or with neighboring historic structures.

Report Contents:

Property and Application History 2

Scope of Work 2

Applicable Standards 3

Staff Analysis 7

Attachments11

PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

Old Dauphin Way Historic District was initially listed in the National Register in 1984 under Criterion C for significant architecture and community planning. The district includes most nineteenth-century architectural styles and shows adaptations of middle-class domestic designs of the nineteenth century to the regional, Gulf Coast climate. It includes “fine examples of commercial, institutional, and religious structures as well as 20th-century apartments.”

The subject property is currently a vacant lot. In 2011, the Architectural Review Board approved the demolition of a shotgun dwelling that was one of a row of five nearly identical shotguns constructed in about 1910. The ARB had denied a previous application for demolition made in 2008. The property owner was issued a Notice of Violation for failure to provide ordinary maintenance in 2007. In 1998, the dwelling was placed on the Mobile Historic Development Commission’s Endangered Properties List.

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Construct a single-family one-story residence.
 - a. The new structure would be oriented with a zero-lot-line setback. Side yard setbacks on the west and east would measure 2’-0” and 3’-0” respectively.
 - b. The proposed one-story shotgun-type dwelling would be rectangular in shape and would measure approximately 16’-10” wide by 34’-0” deep for a total of 544 sf.
 - c. The structure would feature a front gable roof and a full-width porch set under the main roof structure. The roof would be clad in 5-V crimp roofing.
 - d. The house would sit on 1’-high concrete masonry unit piers parged with a sand finish stucco. Submitted drawings and material schedule do not show any infill between piers.
 - e. Fenestration would be comprised of 6 single-hung two-over-two aluminum-clad wood windows and one fiberglass entry door with a single glass light over a recessed panel.
 - f. Plate height from the finished floor would measure 10’-0”, with a roof ridge height of 16’-0”.
 - g. The house would be clad in cementitious board-and-batten siding and 4/4 Hardi fiber cement trim.
 - h. A front porch would span the south façade. It would measure 16’-0” wide by 6’-0” deep and be supported by two 8”-by-8” wood square columns. A simple wood picket railing would enclose the porch. Two (2) wood steps, measuring 4’-2 ½” wide, would access the front porch in line with the off-center front door. A wood picket railing to match the porch railing would flank either side of the steps.
 - i. Elevations would appear as follows:
 - South façade (from west to east)
Porch column; picket railing; door and window grouping centered on façade, consisting of one (1) fiberglass door with single light over recessed panel and two (2) two-over-two windows, each measuring 2’-6” x 5’-0”; one (1) fixed window centered in gable, measuring 1’-0” x 1’-6”
 - East elevation (from south to north)
Side profile of porch stair, column, and picket railing; corner board; one (1) two-over-two window measuring 2’-6” x 5’-0”; one (1) two-over-two window measuring 3’-0” x 5’-0”; corner board.
 - West elevation (from north to south)
Corner board; one (1) two-over-two window measuring 2’-0” x 5’-0”; one (1) two-over-two window measuring 2’-0” x 3’-0”; corner board; side profile of picket railing, column, and porch stair.
 - North elevation (from east to west)
Corner board; corner board.
3. The application does not propose any site improvements.

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

1. **6.38** Design exterior building walls to reflect traditional development patterns of nearby historic buildings.
 - Use a ratio of solid to void that is similar in proportion to those of nearby historic buildings.
 - Reflect the rhythm of windows and doors in a similar fashion on all exterior building walls. The ARB will consider all building walls; however, building walls facing streets may face increased scrutiny.
 - Use steps and balustrades in a similar fashion as nearby historic structures.
 - Design building elements on exterior building walls to be compatible with those on nearby historic buildings. These elements include, but are not limited to: • Balconies • Chimneys • Dormers
2. **6.41** Design a new door and doorway on new construction to be compatible with the historic district.
 - Place and size a door to establish a solid-to-void ratio similar to that of nearby historic buildings.
 - Place a door in a fashion that contributes to the traditional rhythm of the district as seen in nearby historic buildings.
 - Incorporate a door casement and trim similar to those seen on nearby historic buildings.
 - Place and size a special feature, including a transom, sidelight or decorative framing element, to complement those seen in nearby historic buildings.
 - Use a door material that blends well with surrounding historic buildings. Wood is preferred. Paneled doors with or without glass are generally appropriate.
3. **6.42** Design a porch to be compatible with the neighborhood.
 - Include a front porch as part of new construction if it is contextual and feasible.
 - When designing a porch, consider porch location, proportion, rhythm, roof form, supports, steps, balustrades and ornamentation relative to the main building and porches in the district.
 - Design the elements of a porch to be at a scale proportional to the main building.
 - Where a rhythm of porches exists on a street or block, design a porch that continues this historic rhythm.
 - Design a rear or side porch that is visible from the public right-of-way to be subordinate in character to the front porch.
4. **6.44** Use details and ornamentation that help new construction integrate with the historic buildings in the district.
 - Use a decorative detail in a manner similar to those on nearby historic buildings. A modern interpretation of a historic detail or decoration is encouraged.
 - Do not use a decorative detail that overpowers or negatively impacts nearby historic buildings.
5. **6.45** Locate and design windows to be compatible with those in the district.
 - Locate and size a window to create a solid-to-void ratio similar to the ratios seen on nearby historic buildings.
 - Locate a window to create a traditional rhythm and a proportion of openings similar to that seen in nearby historic buildings.
 - Use a traditional window casement and trim similar to those seen in nearby historic buildings.
 - Place a window to match the height of the front doorway.
 - Place a window so that there is proportionate space between the window and the floor level.
 - Do not place a window directly abut the fascia of a building.
 - Use a window material that is compatible with other building materials.
 - Do not use a reflective or tinted glass window.
 - Use a 1/1 window instead of window with false muntins. A double paned window may be acceptable if the interior dividers and dimensional muntins are used on multi-light windows. A double paned 1/1 window is acceptable.
 - Do not use false, interior muntins except as stated above.

- Recess window openings on masonry buildings.
 - Use a window opening with a raised surround on a wood frame building.
14. **10.5** Visually connect the street and building.
- Maintain or install a walkway leading directly from the sidewalk to the main building entry.
16. **10.10** Provide a landscaped front yard for a residential property in a historic district.
- Maintain a predominant appearance of a planted front yard/lawn.
 - Minimize paved areas in a front yard.
 - Consider using decorative modular pavers, grass and cellular paving systems in order to minimize the impact of hard surface paving where grass or other plant materials are not used.
 - In commercial areas, consider using landscaping to screen and soften the appearance of surface parking areas. Use an internal and perimeter landscaping treatment to screen a fenced or walled parking area.
 - Do not use landscaping to hide a design feature that is inconsistent with these Design Review Guidelines.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The application proposes the construction of a new one-story single-family residence.

The *Design Review Guidelines* provide directives for new construction within Mobile’s historic districts. Front yard setbacks of a new residential structure should fall within the range established on the street. The new structure proposed for 1010 Caroline Avenue would sit directly on the south property line. The historic shotgun that was demolished in 2011 had also sat directly on the south property line, as do the three extant shotguns immediately to the west of the subject property. With side yard setbacks of 2’-0” and 3’-0”, the proposed structure would sit similarly on the lot as the pre-existing historic house and would also fall within the established range that occurs on surrounding lots. (6.34, 6.35)

As stated, the structure previously on this site had been one of four nearly identical shotguns, the other three of which are still extant. The proposed design for a new shotgun-type dwelling is therefore consistent in massing, proportions, and height with neighboring historic structures. The contributing buildings in its immediate vicinity sit on raised foundations which appear to be comparable in height to that proposed for the subject property. The intended use of masonry piers is compatible with the historic neighborhood. (6.36, 6.37, 6.43).

The proposed materials of fiber cement siding, wood, and asphalt shingles are acceptable building materials for new construction within Mobile’s historic districts. Aluminum-clad wood windows are an approved material for both existing and new construction. The front entry door will be fiberglass. While the Guidelines state that wood doors are preferred, fiberglass doors are not strictly forbidden on new construction. Alternative modern materials should “blend well with surrounding historic buildings.” (6.39 – 6.41, 6.43 – 6.45)

The proposed window and door configurations are not entirely in keeping with the shotgun typology, especially the several extant shotguns that line Caroline Avenue. The light and panel configuration of the proposed door is common in the Old Dauphin Way Historic District, but it is not usually seen on shotguns. There are several existing shotguns along Caroline Avenue, all of which have solid wood doors in 2-, 4-, and 6-panel configurations. The application currently proposes using either a two-over-two or six-over-six window configuration. While two-over-two windows are common throughout the district and have some precedent on Caroline Avenue, six-over-six windows are by far the most common on shotgun dwellings. All existing shotguns on Caroline Avenue have six-over-six windows. (6.41, 6.45).

The relative spacing of the window and door openings is also not in keeping with the shotgun typology. Shotgun dwellings are historically two bays wide with a single door and window of approximately the same width evenly spaced across the façade. The proposed grouping of a door and two windows in the center of the primary façade is a notable break with the regularly spaced single door and window on existing shotguns. The shotgun located at 1005 Caroline Avenue does have paired front windows, but these were installed after 1983. Gable windows are also not typical of shotguns in general, and the proposed Roman-lattice light configuration is far more decorative than any fenestration seen on the neighboring dwellings. The proposed window spacing on the side elevations is more in keeping with the shotgun typology. The use of three different window sizes on these elevations is not. However, it should be noted that the narrow side yards mean that the full side elevations will rarely be seen and will have minimal impact on the streetscape. The lack of any fenestration on the rear (north) elevation is not at all typical of the shotgun typology, which quite famously has a rear door that perfectly aligns with the front. However, the mid-block location of the dwelling means that this elevation is not at all visible from the public right-of-way. (6.38, 6.40, 6.41, 6.45)

The full-width porch is entirely in keeping with the shotgun typology and the subject property's immediate neighbors. The simple box columns and square picket railing are especially indicative of the modest vernacular architecture common on Caroline Avenue. However, the inclusion of an additional newel post along the long stretch of railing in front of the windows disrupts the typical shotgun façade rhythm. (6.38, 6.42)

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Cory Bronenkamp, the applicant, was present to discuss the application. He stated that he did not have anything to add to the information available to the Board in the Staff's report.

There was no one present from the public to speak for or against the application, and no written public comments were received.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Jennifer Roselius asked if any of the architects present on the Board could speak to the scale and proportions of the proposed façade. Ms. Karrie Maurin responded that the proposed window and door placement was not in keeping with the neighboring shotgun houses and asked if the applicant was willing to rework the façade. Mr. Bronenkamp stated that he was open to any alterations the Board wished to make.

Ms. Abby Davis asked the applicant if the finish floor height, top plate, and ceiling height of the proposed structure were in alignment with the neighboring shotgun houses. Mr. Bronenkamp stated that he did not know the finish floor height of neighboring structures. He stated that the top plate of neighboring structures was roughly 9 feet, while the proposed structures had a top plate height of 10 feet.

Ms. Davis noted that the neighboring shotgun dwellings had a beam spanning the area above the front porch columns, and that the expression of the beam continued around the side and rear elevations. Ms. Davis suggested the applicant replicate this feature on the proposed design. Ms. Davis further stated that the applicant should align window and door head heights with those of neighboring structures and include a transom window over the front door. Mr. Bronenkamp agreed to including a transom.

Ms. Cameron Pfeiffer-Traylor asked what type of metal roof the applicant was proposing. Mr. Bronenkamp stated that the roof would be 5-V crimp panels. Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor asked if the applicant was amenable to installing

windows with a 6-over-6 sash configuration to be more in line with neighboring structures instead of the 2-over-2 windows currently shown on the drawings. Mr. Bronenkamp stated that he was.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor asked why windows on the side elevations were different in size. Mr. Bronenkamp stated that the narrow side yards made it almost impossible to see the full side elevations from any angle. He stated that he had not put much consideration to window sizes and placement on the side elevations for that reason. He further explained that fire code would likely require him to eliminate some of the glazing on one or both sides, due to the narrow setback on either side.

Ms. Maurin asked how the applicant would alter the window placement on the façade to be more in keeping with neighboring shotgun houses. Ms. Maurin suggested shifting the windows to the right so that the spacing between the left corner board and the door matched the spacing between the right corner board and the door. Mr. Bronenkamp asked if the Board would prefer if he changed the design to have one window instead of two, to be more in keeping with neighboring properties. Ms. Maurin agreed that one window would be more appropriate and recommended that the applicant mimic the façade configuration of the home at 1012 Caroline Avenue.

Ms. Davis interjected that the expression of the beam above the porch columns on the neighboring shotguns wrapped the corners and continued around the side and rear elevations. Ms. Davis stated that including this detail would help alleviate the fact that the proposed window head heights appeared to be too low. Mr. Bronenkamp stated that the current head heights were 6'-8". Ms. Davis stated that an 8' head height would be more appropriate. Ms. Davis also requested that the applicant match the window surrounds to the neighboring structures. Specifically, Ms. Davis suggested that the applicant eliminate the lintel overhang on the façade windows. Instead, the ends of the lintel piece should align with the two vertical frame members. Mr. Bronenkamp agreed to make the recommended changes.

Mr. Bronenkamp summarized the Board's requested alterations as follows: line up the floor heights with those of neighboring dwellings; add a transom over the front door; one façade window centered on the interior room, instead of the two windows shown; align door head height with neighboring dwellings; add beam spanning front columns and wrapping side and rear elevations; and line up window head trim with vertical frame pieces.

Mr. Cart Blackwell asked if the door would be wood. Mr. Bronenkamp asked to use a fiberglass door instead, due to concerns with the durability of modern wood doors. Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor expressed reservations about approving a fiberglass door and asked if the applicant had submitted information about the specific door. Ms. Meredith Wilson stated that the applicant had emailed a cutsheet for the proposed door at the request of staff. Ms. Wilson shared the cutsheet with the Board. Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor stated that the door shown in the cutsheet appeared to be appropriate. Mr. Blackwell indicated that staff could provide final approval for the door.

Ms. Barja Wilson asked if the rafter tails shown on the proposed drawing would remain, given the neighboring shotgun dwellings lacked this detail. Mr. Bronenkamp stated that he would prefer to keep this detail, which he has used in similar projects in the past. Mr. Blackwell interjected that there was precedent for this detail in the area.

Ms. Roselius asked for clarification on what the Board was approving, given the many alterations requested. Mr. Blackwell recommended approval of the application, with the caveat that staff were to include the amendments discussed in the text of the Certificate of Appropriateness.

FINDING FACTS

Ms. Davis moved that, based on the evidence presented in the Public Testimony and Board Discussion, the Board amend the facts to reflect the many discussed alterations to the proposed design.

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Ms. Roselius 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.



Agenda Item #5

Certified Record 2024-63-CA

DETAILS

Location:

960 Dauphin Street

Summary of Request:

Replace wood siding on sides and rear elevations with fiber cement board; repair/replace wood siding on primary façade in kind. Replace windows and some doors, including resizing a majority of existing window openings. Repair existing porches, including installing new railing on second-floor porch. Complete porch and deck on east elevation. Repaint.

Applicant (as applicable):

Paul Davis

Property Owner:

R & G Brown Properties, Inc.

Historic District:

Old Dauphin Way

Classification:

Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The application seeks to amend a previously approved application.
- The Board previously approved wholesale window replacement with custom windows to fit existing openings. The current application proposes raising sill heights of nearly all openings to accommodate standard-size replacement windows. This violates the *Guidelines*' directive to maintain the original opening size when replacing a window.
- The application proposes replacing four windows with faux shutters, which will preserve the size and location of the original openings.
- The application incorporates Board feedback to propose minor changes to the previously approved two-story side porch. Proposed alterations are more in keeping with the style and period of the subject property.
- The *Guidelines* currently allow for replacing wood siding on side and rear elevations with fiber cement board.

Report Contents:

Property and Application History 2
 Scope of Work 2
 Applicable Standards 4
 Staff Analysis 6
 Attachments 9

PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

Old Dauphin Way Historic District was initially listed in the National Register in 1984 under Criterion C for significant architecture and community planning. The district includes most nineteenth-century architectural styles and shows adaptations of middle-class domestic designs of the nineteenth century to the regional, Gulf Coast climate. It includes “fine examples of commercial, institutional, and religious structures as well as 20th-century apartments.”

The two-story, wood-frame, side-hall house with rear service wing was constructed c. 1860. The 1878 Hopkins map shows the original side-hall plan with offset rear service wing and one outbuilding located at the northwest corner of the property. The 1904 Sanborn map shows the historic footprint of the house with a porch wrapping the east and north elevations of the service wing. Four outbuildings were present. Representations on the 1925 and 1956 Sanborn maps are identical. The historic porches along the east and north elevations were removed and a rear addition constructed sometime after 1956. The property is protected by a façade easement held by the Mobile Historic Development Commission, who approved the changes proposed in this application on May 6, 2024.

According to Historic Development Department files, this property has appeared eight times previously: four times before the Old Dauphin Way (ODW) Review Board and four before the Architectural Review Board (ARB).

In May 1997, the ODW Review Board denied an application to maintain a sign erected without a Certificate of Appropriateness. The request was subsequently approved in June 1997. In July 1999, the ODW Review Board approved an application to remove a wooden fence, three external metal fire staircases, a small storage building, awnings on the east and west elevations of the house, and a shed addition to the then-extant garage. In July 2000, the ODW Review Board approved the removal of a non-historic rear addition and the reopening of existing window openings in the north elevation in July 2000. It appears this work was not completed.

In 2003, the ARB approved the addition of a screened porch at the northwest corner of the house, the enclosure with glass of the existing two-story gallery on the east elevation of the rear service wing, installation of a 6' privacy fence, and the construction of a porte-cochere. It appears the screened porch and porte-cochere were never constructed. In November 2020, the ARB approved the construction of a two-story addition on the east side of the rear wing; construction of a free-standing two-car garage; construction of a porte-cochere; fenestration changes to an apparent 20th-century rear addition, east elevation, and south elevation; and construction of a gate beside the driveway. Before this work could be completed, the ARB reviewed and approved another application in April 2021 to complete similar work, including construction of a two-story porch on the east elevation of the rear wing; construction of a two-car attached garage; and fenestration changes to the east and south elevations and to a rear addition. It appears that these projects were stalled during the selective demolition phase and were never completed.

The property last appeared before the Board in May 2024. The ARB then approved the construction of a two-story porch and a deck on the east side elevation of a 19th-century addition, minor changes to the fenestration pattern, and wholesale replacement of existing windows.

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Replace all wood siding on side and rear elevations with fiber cement clapboards.
 - a. Fiber cement clapboards will match existing wood clapboards in dimension and profile.
2. Repair wood siding on primary (south) façade. Use salvaged wood siding from side and rear elevations to replace siding on façade that is damaged or rotten beyond repair.

3. All existing windows would be replaced or infilled. New window openings would be made on the south façade and east side elevations. Two door openings on the south façade would be reframed to accommodate windows. Four windows would be removed from the west elevation of the 19th-century service wing and the openings infilled with inoperable shutters. Multiple window openings without extant windows would be infilled and covered with siding: three on the east side elevation, four on the west side elevation, and two on the north rear elevation. One window opening on the north rear façade would be reframed to accommodate a door.
 - a. Custom wood replacement windows:
 - i. Custom wood replacement windows would replicate the existing box-head windows situated on both levels of the two-story galleries on the primary south façade. Custom windows would match existing in material, dimensions, molding profiles, and lite configuration.
 1. South primary façade: F1, F2, and F4
 - ii. One second-floor door would be removed and the opening reframed to accommodate a window. A replica wood jib door would be installed below the window to match existing.
 1. South primary façade: FB
 - iii. Existing jib doors below windows on primary (south) elevation would remain.
 - b. Standard replacement windows:
 - i. Window material would be aluminum-clad wood. Window sash would be single-hung with a six-over-six lite configuration, simulated divided lites, and a shadow bar between double glazing. Muntins would be 7/8" with a simulated putty profile.
 - ii. Window Type 1 would be typical on the first floor of all elevations:
 1. Dimensions: 41 3/8" x 80"
 2. Sill height at existing first-floor windows would be raised 5" to accommodate the standard window dimensions. Siding would be carried across the resulting gap below the new sill height. The head height and width of the window opening would remain the same.
 - a. East side elevation windows: R1, R2, R3, R4, and R5
 - b. West side elevation windows: : L4, L5, and L6
 3. 6'-0" by 6'-0" opening would be altered to accommodate paired windows with a center mullion.
 - a. North rear elevation window: B2
 4. One existing first-floor door would be removed and the opening reframed to accommodate a window.
 - a. South primary façade: FA
 5. One new window opening would be made on the main dwelling.
 - a. East side elevation: RA
 - iii. Window Type 2 dimensions: 41 3/8" x 76"
 1. Sill height at existing second-floor windows would be raised 1" to accommodate the standard window dimensions. Siding would be carried across the resulting gap below the new sill height. The head height and width of the window opening would remain the same.
 - a. South (primary) façade windows: F3
 - b. East side elevation windows: R6, R7, R8, R9, and R10
 - c. West side elevation windows: L10, L11, L13, and L14
 2. Window would be installed at following locations without altering opening size:
 - a. East side elevation windows: R4 and R5
 - b. North rear elevation windows: BA and BB
 3. Existing 6'-8" by 5'-0" opening would be altered to accommodate paired windows with a center mullion.
 - a. East side elevation: R11 and RC

- b. North rear elevation: B4 and B5
 - c. The following windows would be removed. The openings would be infilled and covered with inoperable fiber cement shutters. Frames would remain in place to simulate a window opening.
 - i. West side elevation: L2, L3, L8, and L9
 - d. The following windows and frames would be removed. Openings would be covered with fiber cement clapboards to match existing siding in dimension and profile.
 - i. West side elevation: L1, L7, and L12
 - ii. North rear elevation: B1, B3, and B6
 - e. Windows were removed from the following locations by a previous owner. Frames would be removed where existing. Openings would be covered with fiber cement clapboards to match existing siding in dimension and profile.
 - i. East side elevation:
 - 1. 1 non-original window opening on first floor of main dwelling
 - 2. 2 framed window openings on 19th-century service wing
 - ii. West side elevation:
 - 1. 1 framed window opening on first floor of main dwelling
 - f. One window on the north rear elevation would be removed and the opening reframed to accommodate a 6-lite aluminum-clad wood door with simulated divided lites and spacer bars.
- 4. Construct a two-story covered porch on the east side of the rear service wing.
 - a. Covered porch would be 33'-2" wide (north-south) and 6'-8" deep (east-west).
 - b. While the previous porch was four bays wide, the application proposes extending the new porch to five bays.
 - c. A metal shed roof would cover the second-floor porch. Six double-height columns would run from the first-floor porch deck all the way to the shed roof.
 - d. The second-floor porch railing would consist of simple metal pickets and handrail. The railing would terminate in a simple wood end post with molded cap at the northeast and southeast corners. No railing is proposed for the first-floor porch.
 - e. A porch stair would span the entire width of the north end of the covered porch. It would consist of four wood steps with simple metal picket handrail.
- 5. Install eight sets of new French doors on the east elevation of the rear service wing: five on the first floor and three on the second.
 - a. Five sets of French doors would be evenly spaced across the five bays of the first-floor porch. A four-lite rectangular transom would sit atop each of the five sets of doors.
 - b. Three sets of French doors would be evenly spaced across the three center bays of the second-floor porch.
 - c. French doors would be aluminum-clad wood with simulated divided lites and spacer bars. Each door would have six lites.
- 6. Construct a deck on the east side of the proposed two-story porch.
 - a. Deck would be 33'-2" wide (north-south) and 14'-8" deep (east-west).
 - b. Deck height would align with first finish floor level.
- 7. Construct a wood stair and a second-story exterior landing at the west end of the north elevation of an existing rear addition.
 - a. Wood stairs would wrap northwest corner of the existing rear addition with a landing where it turns the corner. Stair would terminate in a landing at the second-story finish floor level.
 - b. Stair would feature a metal picket railing with metal handrail. Wood corner posts would be square with molded caps.
- 8. Remove an existing concrete stoop from the south elevation of the rear service wing and alter an existing door opening to accommodate a new sash window.
 - a. Following removal of stoop, infill space between brick piers with new lattice to match existing.
 - b. Window would be installed in door opening (see above).
 - c. Wood siding to match existing would be installed to infill opening below proposed window.

9. Remove existing wood railings on the two-story front (south) porch and replace with new metal railings.
 - a. Metal railings would be simple aluminum picket railings painted black. 4x4" wood corner posts would also be painted black. Corner posts would have decorative end caps.
10. Remove all wood siding on side and rear elevations and replace with fiber cement board with wood grain pattern.
11. Remove existing brick infill between brick piers on south elevation and replace with new lattice to match existing.
12. Repair or replace damaged lattice to match existing.
 - a. Work would occur where necessary on all elevations.

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

1. **5.4** Preserve original building materials.
 - Repair deteriorated building materials by patching, piecing-in, consolidating or otherwise reinforcing the material.
 - Remove only those materials which are deteriorated, and beyond reasonable repair.
 - Do not remove original materials that are in good condition.
2. **5.6** Use original materials to replace damaged materials on primary surfaces where possible.
 - Use original materials to replace damaged building materials on a primary façade if possible. If the original material is wood clapboard, for example, then the replacement material should be a material that matches the original in finish, size and the amount of exposed lap. If the original material is not available from the site, use a replacement material that is visually comparable with the original material.
 - 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.
 - Do not replace building materials on the primary façade, such as wood siding and masonry, with alternative or imitation materials unless it cannot be avoided.
 - Wholesale replacement of exterior finishes is generally not allowed.
3. **5.7** When replacing materials on a non-primary façade or elevation, match the original material in composition, scale and finish.
 - Use original materials to replace damaged materials on a non-primary façade when possible.
 - The ARB will consider the use of green building materials, such as those made with renewable and local resources to replace damaged materials on a nonprimary façade if they do not impact the integrity of the building or its key features.
 - Use alternative or imitation materials that match the style and detail of the original material to replace damaged non-primary building materials.
 - Replace exterior finishes to match original in profile, dimension and materials.
4. **5.17** Preserve historic stylistic and architectural details and ornamentation.
 - Repair historic details and ornamentation that are deteriorated.
5. **5.19** Where repair is impossible, replace details and ornamentation accurately.
 - When replacing historic details, match the original in profile, dimension, and material.
 - A substitute material may be considered if it appears similar in character and finish to the original.
 - Do not apply architectural details that were not part of the original structure.
6. **5.20** Preserve the functional historic and decorative features of a historic window.
 - 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.

- Preserve historic window features, including the frame, sash, muntins, mullions, glazing, sills, heads, jambs, moldings, operation, and groupings of windows.
 - Repair, rather than replace, frames and sashes, wherever possible.
 - For repair of window components, epoxies and related products may serve as effective solutions to material deterioration and operational malfunction.
7. **5.21** When historic windows are not in repairable condition, match the replacement window design to the original.
- 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.
 - Use any salvageable window components on a primary elevation.
8. **5.22** When a historic window is missing on a key character-defining wall, use a historically accurate replacement.
- A new window shall be installed in such a manner as to fit within the original window opening and match in depth and filling of the reveal.

ACCEPTABLE WINDOW MATERIALS

Materials that are the same as the original, or that appear similar in texture, profile and finish to the original are acceptable. These often include:

- Wood sash
- Steel, if original to structure
- Custom extruded aluminum
- Aluminum clad wood
- Windows approved by the National Park Service

UNACCEPTABLE WINDOW MATERIALS Materials that do not appear similar to the original in texture, profile and finish are unacceptable. These often include:

- Vinyl
- Mill-finished aluminum
- Interior snap-in muntins (except when used in concert with exterior muntins and intervening dividers)

9. **6.5** Repair a porch in a way that maintains the original character.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The subject property is a contributing structure to the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The application under review proposes substantial alterations to an application the Board approved on May 15, 2024. The ARB previously approved the following scope of work: the construction of a new two-story covered porch and a deck on the east side elevation; construction of an exterior wood stair on the north rear elevation; material changes to the two-story front porch; removal of an existing stoop and entry door on the south elevation; comprehensive stabilization and repair work, including spot replacement of wood siding with fiber cement board on side and rear elevations; and significant fenestration changes on all elevations, including window replacement, infill of existing window openings, installation of one new window opening, and installation of new exterior door openings.

The application currently under review proposes the following deviations from that approved scope of work: alterations to the configuration of the new two-story covered porch on the east side elevation; replacement of all siding on the side and rear elevation with fiber cement board; replacement of original wood windows on the south primary façade with replica wood windows to fit the existing openings; alterations to all other existing window openings to accommodate standard-size aluminum-clad wood windows.

Two-Story Side Porch: Alterations to Approved Scope

The application proposes the following alterations to the previous design. The metal shed roof, which initially was only shown covering the three center bays, would now cover all five bays of the second-story porch. All six columns would be full-height and reach from the first-floor porch to the second-story roof. The previous design featured four full-height columns spanning the three center bays. A single-story column flanked the full-height columns on either side, creating a tripartite configuration with two single-story wings flanking the two-story center portion.

The *Guidelines* call for a new porch to be compatible with the neighborhood in placement, proportion, rhythm, materials, and ornamentation. The Guidelines further stipulate that a rear or side porch that is visible from the public right-of-way should be subordinate in character to the front porch. The proposed side porch would be located in the same location of a non-extant porch structure shown on Sanborn maps dating back to 1904. The porch would be lower in height than the front porch, in appropriate proportion to the rear service wing, which has a lower roof ridge height than the main dwelling. The proposed 8" square wood columns are appropriately less ornamented than the elaborately fluted octagonal columns of the main porch while still echoing the more simply detailed rectangular pilasters on the side and rear elevations. (6.9, 6.11, 6.13)

The proposed alterations to the approved design are minor and will create a porch configuration that is more in keeping with the age and style of the main dwelling. Second-story gallery porches of this period typically remain the same height across the entire elevation, without the step down created at either end where the proposed porch roof did not extend fully across the second-floor porch deck in the previously approved design. The new design also incorporates feedback from the Board at the original hearing on May 15. Board members Cartledge Blackwell and Cameron Pfeiffer-Traylor encouraged the applicant to consider extending the roof across the entire second-story gallery to protect the porch deck from premature weathering.

Replacement Windows: Alterations to Approved Scope

The current application seeks two major alterations to the previously approved scope. First, the new application proposes using standard-size aluminum-clad wood windows to replace almost all existing windows. This will require resizing the existing openings to accommodate the standard-size windows. Previously the board approved custom aluminum-clad wood windows that would fit the existing openings. Second, the new application proposes removing four windows on the west side of the 19th-Century service wing. The openings would be infilled with inoperable fiber cement shutters to simulate window openings. The window frames would remain in place. Previously the Board approved replacing the existing windows in this location with custom aluminum-clad wood windows that fit the opening.

The current application proposes two different sizes for replacement windows. Window Type 1 requires a framed opening that is 3'-6" wide and 6'-9" tall. Window Type 2 requires a framed opening that is 3'-6" wide and 6'-5" tall. The typical first-floor window opening is 3'-6" wide and 7'-2" tall. The typical second-floor window opening is 3'-6" wide and 6'-6" tall. The application proposes raising the sill height at first-floor window openings 5" to accommodate Window Type 1. The sill height would be raised 1" at second-floor window openings to accommodate Window Type 2.

The Guidelines state, "The type, size, framing, and dividing lights of windows, as well as their location and configuration (rhythm), help establish the historic character of a building." If replacement is deemed necessary, replacement windows "shall match the existing as per location, framing, and light configuration." The Guidelines further specify when installing new windows at existing window openings, the new windows "shall be installed in such a manner as to fit within the original opening and

match in depth and filling of the reveal.” The Guidelines prioritizes preservation of windows on the front and highly visible side elevations over rear elevations and side elevations that are not easily visible from the public right-of-way. (5.21, 5.22)

The application proposes resizing almost all of the existing window openings. This does not comply with the Guideline’s direction to preserve the original location, size, and configuration of window openings. The application does propose maintaining original window openings and installing custom windows on the south primary façade of the main dwelling. This is in keeping with the Guideline’s emphasis on preserving original fenestration patterns on front facades. However, the application does propose resizing one window opening on the south elevation of the 19th-Century service wing and the highly visible east side elevations of both the main dwelling and the service wing. Resized window openings on the west elevation are less conspicuous but still may be viewed from the public right-of-way, especially the those on the main dwelling. Resizing of openings is less detrimental at rear north elevations. The rear addition represents the most recent portion of the house, and this area exhibits a mix of window types that represent varied past renovations.

The proposed infill of four windows on the west elevation with inoperable shutters partially complies with the Guidelines. Maintaining the original frames in their current location will preserve the rhythm of the fenestration patterns on the west side elevation. While this treatment removes historic fabric in the form of original wood windows, it does make it possible for a future owner to reinstall period-appropriate windows in these openings at a later date. Since the Board previously approved replacing the existing windows in this location, the provision of faux shutters in place of new windows does not represent a significant reduction in historic material when compared to the previously approved design.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Paul C. Davis, the architect and owner’s representative, was present to discuss the application. Mr. Davis stated that his client wished to remove four windows on the west elevation for privacy reasons and to free up wall space. Mr. Davis explained alterations made to the design for the two-story side porch, which were done in line with recommendations made by the Board on the previous application. Mr. Davis further explained that the wood lap siding on the side and rear elevations was in worse condition than originally thought and that previous renovations had introduced wood siding of different sizes. Finally, Mr. Davis stated that his client would like to resize the window openings to accommodate standard window sizes. Mr. Davis noted that there had been many alterations to the side elevations, so that the fenestration patterns were no longer consistent with what would have been there originally. Mr. Davis further explained that the window head heights would remain the same and the sills would be raised the necessary amount. Mr. Davis stated his belief that, since the window width and spacing would remain the same, the change would not significantly alter the rhythm of fenestration.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Jennifer Roselius asked if any of the siding on the rear and sides was salvageable. Mr. Davis responded that some was and that any sound siding would be used to patch areas of missing or damaged siding on the front façade.

Ms. Roselius asked how many window openings would be resized. Mr. Davis responded that all window openings would be resized except those on the principal façade of the main dwelling.

Ms. Cameron Pfeiffer-Traylor expressed concern that making the window openings 4 inches shorter would have a significant impact on the fenestration pattern. Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor stated that she was not sure that the

Guidelines allowed for replacing all siding on side or rear elevations with fiber cement. Ms. Meredith Wilson, a member of Staff, clarified that the *Guidelines* did allow for fiber cement on side and rear elevations but discouraged its use on primary facades.

Mr. Robert Brown, the property owner, was present and asked to speak on the matter of the windows. Mr. Brown stated that the manufacturer did not make standard windows that fit the original openings. Mr. Brown further stated that the proposed windows would replicate the existing 6-over-6 sash configuration and that the exterior window frames would remain. Mr. Brown stated that using a single standard window size would return the exterior to a more uniform appearance. Ms. Wilson, Staff member, clarified that the application was proposing a shorter window on the second floor and a taller window on the first floor, in line with the existing relative window sizes. Sill heights would be raised 4 inches on the first floor and only 1 inch on the second floor.

Ms. Abby Davis asked for confirmation that the width of the window openings would remain the same. The applicant stated that they would. Ms. Davis stated that she did not see a negative impact on the rhythm of window openings if the width and placement remained unchanged. Mr. Cart Blackwell expressed his approval for the proposed alterations, noting the various alterations and inconsistencies currently existing at the property.

Ms. Karrie Maurin added that she saw no issue with the proposed change to fiber cement siding on the sides and rear.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor expressed opposition to resizing the window openings since in her reading of the *Guidelines* they strictly forbid changing the sizes of window openings. Mr. Blackwell stated that the *Guidelines* should be read in the context of the unique conditions present at each subject property.

FINDING FACTS

Ms. Davis moved that, based on the evidence presented in the Public Testimony and Board Discussion, the Board find facts as written by staff.

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Ms. Roselius 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. Maurin seconded the motion. The motion passed with a 5:1 vote.

Ms. Cameron Pfeiffer-Traylor voted against approving but with an explanation. Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor commended the applicant on the work they were doing but stated that she could not approve resizing the window openings given the *Guidelines'* strictures against doing so.



Agenda Item #6

Certified Record 2024-64-CA

DETAILS

Location:

2308 Ashland Place Avenue

Summary of Request:

Construct new single family residence with attached garage

Applicant (as applicable):

Robert McCown

Property Owner:

Will Price and Curry Stahl

Historic District:

Ashland Place

Classification:

Vacant lot

Summary of Analysis:

- The c. 1923 1 ½ story Craftsman style house original to the lot was severely damaged by fire in 2019 and demolished the following year.
- The proposed plans (with minor alterations) received approval by the ARB in 2020.
- The proposed design meets the Guidelines' standards in regard to placement, mass, scale, and building components.

Report Contents:

Property and Application History 2

Scope of Work 2

Applicable Standards 4

Staff Analysis 8

Attachment.....10

PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

Ashland Place Historic District was listed in the National Register in 1987 under Criteria A (community planning) and C (architectural significance). The neighborhood initially was platted in 1907 and centered around land once occupied by the Augusta Evans Wilson homestead. The neighborhood was an early streetcar suburb along the Springhill Avenue trolley line. The district is significant for its concentration of architectural types and styles popular between 1900 and 1955, including Georgian and Federal Revivals, Colonial and Classical Revivals, Craftsman, Mission Revival, and Tudor Revival.

Ashland Place Historic District was listed in the National Register in 1987 under Criteria A (community planning) and C (architectural significance). The neighborhood initially was platted in 1907 and centered around land once occupied by the Augusta Evans Wilson homestead. The neighborhood was an early streetcar suburb along the Springhill Avenue trolley line. The district is significant for its concentration of architectural types and styles popular between 1900 and 1955, including Georgian and Federal Revivals, Colonial and Classical Revivals, Craftsman, Mission Revival, and Tudor Revival.

Dr. William H. Oates, a local physician, purchased the lot at 2308 Ashland Place Avenue in 1923. He had a 1-1/2-story frame dwelling over an English basement constructed later that same year. The Craftsman style house featured heavy ornamental eave brackets and wood clapboard siding that flared outward at the base of the exterior walls. The dwelling was around 54' wide by 60' deep, with its footprint covering approximately 3200 square feet. In 2019, lightning struck the dwelling, and it suffered severe fire damage. The Architectural Review Board approved demolition of the house in 2020.

According to Historic Development Department files, this property has appeared five times previously. In 1988, the Board approved the construction of a stair tower to the rear of the property. In April 2005, the Board approved the installation of a 5-6' green powder-coated chain link fence on the west property line. The following October, the Board approved a 6' white painted picket fence in lieu of the previously approved chain link fence. The Board approved demolition of the house in February 2020 following the September 2019 fire.

The subject property last appeared in November 2020, when the Board approved construction of a single-family residence that was roughly 80' wide by 53' deep, with a footprint of approximately 4200 square feet.

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Construct a two-story single-family residence with attached garage/wood shop.
 - a. The new structure would be set back from the Ashland Place Avenue ROW approximately 39'-0", with side yard setbacks on the east and west of approximately 25'-0" and 5'-0" respectively.
 - b. The overall dimensions of the house would be approximately 118' -0" wide by 74'-10 ½" deep.
 - c. The house would appear to rest on a continuous brick foundation with areas of overlapping fiber cement siding. The height of the first floor above grade would be approximately 4'-6".
 - d. The walls would be clad in fiber cement lap siding with 4" exposure.
 - e. The ceiling heights would be 10'-0" on the first floor and 9'-0" on the second floor.
 - f. All windows would be aluminum clad and would include a mix of double-hung sashes of various light configurations, and multi-light fixed and operable casement windows.
 - g. The front door and mudroom door (south elevation) would be paneled wood doors. The three (3) sets of French door accessing the open patio would be aluminum-clad wood. The door on the east end of the grill porch would be wood. Second story doors would be multi-light aluminum-clad.
 - h. The dominant roof would be side-gabled clad in asphalt shingles, with an option of cedar shakes. A double-peaked front-facing gable would crown the south elevation of the main block. A shed-roofed gable would be located at the approximate center of the north slope of the roof.

i. South Elevation (Façade)

- 1) The south elevation would be dominated by the double-peaked gable. Two rectangular wood vents above bracketed trim would be located near the apex of each gable. A brick chimney would be visible towards the west end of the elevation.
- 2) Eight six-over-six windows would be symmetrically placed on the second floor beneath the bracketed, cove-molded trim. Windows would be dispersed in a 2-4-2 rhythm.
- 3) A hipped-roofed porch would be located the center of the first floor. The porch roof would be clad in flat seam copper and would be supported by four wood timber posts, bracket, and beam.
- 4) The porch would be approximately 20' wide by 6' deep.
- 5) The porch would be accessed by a flight of brick steps and supported by a continuous brick foundation wall.
- 6) Fenestration would be as follows from west to east: nine-over-one window; nine-over-one window; nine-over-one window; wood paneled door; set of three nine-over-one windows.
- 7) A one and one-half story two-car garage would be connected to the house by a mudroom measuring 21'-0" wide. The mudroom would have a side-gabled roof and be sheathed in fiber cement siding with 4" exposure. A wood paneled door would be located at the center of the south elevation of the mudroom, and the door would be flanked by twelve-over-twelve windows. The door would be accessed via three wood steps. A brick patio measuring 21'-0" wide by 9'-10 ½" deep would span the south elevation of the mudroom.
- 8) The side-gabled garage and wood shop would measure 22' wide by 43'-6" deep and stand approximately 25' tall. A shed-roofed dormer with three eight-over-eight windows would be located at the center of the south slope of the roof. The garage would be clad in fiber cement siding with 4" exposure. The two wood overlay paneled, single-car doors would each measure 2'-10" wide by 7'-6" high. A flared pent eave would shelter the garage doors. Two glass lanterns would flank the garage doors.

j. North Elevation (rear)

- 1) The rear elevation would include the rear elevations of the garage and mudroom with grill porch; and the rear elevation of the main block of the house.
- 2) The rear elevation of the garage would consist of paired slab would doors beneath a thirty-light fixed casement window.
- 3) The rear elevation of the mudroom would consist of one (1) paneled entry door; paired eight-over-eight windows; one multi-light aluminum-clad single door. This portion of the elevation would be recessed under a porch supported by two wood timber posts, brackets, and beam. The posts would rest on a brick knee wall. Two additional brackets would flank the east and west ends of the porch. Brick steps flanked by brick cheek walls would access the porch.
- 4) The porch would abut the projecting north elevation of the sunroom. This portion of the rear elevation would consist of four (4) twelve-over-twelve double-hung sash windows, centered on the elevation.
- 5) The remainder of the elevation would consist of the three (3) pairs of multi-light aluminum-clad doors, which would access the living room; and a grouping of three (3) windows centered on the primary bedroom's north wall. This grouping would consist of on twelve-over-twelve window flanked by two nine-over-nine windows.
- 6) On the second floor, a shed-roofed balcony would be located at the center of the north slope of the roof. The porch would be enclosed on the east and west sides by fiber cement lap siding with a 7" exposure and flared base. This siding would wrap around to the north side, partially enclosing the opening. Two decorative brackets would flank the opening below the fascia board. A brick chimney would rise through the south slope of the roof to the west of the balcony. One multi-light entry door would access the balcony, with a pair of eight-over-eight double hung sash windows located to the west of the door.

- 7) The living room would access a brick open patio measuring roughly 22'-0" by 22'-0" . This patio would be enclosed by a brick porch wall and would be accessed by brick steps on the its northeast side.
- k. East Elevation
 - 1) The eastern slope of the south elevation's double-peak and the front porch would define the southernmost most portion of the east elevation. Two rectangular wood attic vents matching those on the south elevation would be present in the east-facing gable.
 - 2) The east elevation's fenestration (from south to north) would consist of a pair of twelve-light operable casement windows beneath bracketed molding on the second floor. The fenestration of the first floor would be as follows: a set of three windows, including one twelve-over-twelve window flanked by two nine-over-nine windows , at the south end and a pair of eight over eight double hung sash windows at the north end.
 - 3) The fenestration of the east elevation of the garage would be as follows: one eight-over-eight window centered on the first and second levels. One eight-over-eight double-hung sash window would be located on the north end of the wood shop's east wall.
 - 4) One brick chimney would be visible from this side of the house, roughly at center.
 - i. West Elevation
 - 1) A flat-roofed, square bump-out measuring 20'-2" wide and 7'6" deep would be located at the center of the first floor on the west gabled end wall of the house's main block. The bump-out would rest upon a raised brick foundation. A flared parapet wall at the roofline would serve as railing for the upper story balcony created by the bump-out.
 - 2) The first floor of the west elevation would consist of one (1) eight-over-eight double hung sash window on the northern portion of the garage/woodshop's west wall; the profile of the brick porch wall and steps; a grouping of five (5) windows across the west wall of the sunroom which would consist of a nine-over-nine double hung sash window centered on the wall and flanked by pairs of twelve-over-twelve double hung sash windows; a multi-light fixed casement window would be centered on the bump-out along the building's west wall.
 - 3) The second level would consist of, from north to south, one (1) eight-over-eight double hung sash window on the northern portion of the wood shop's west wall, the brick chimney rising from the north slope of the mudroom roof, the second chimney rising from the north slope of the house's main block, and the house's west-facing gable. Two attic vents matching those on the south elevation would be located at the apex of the gable. One (1) multi-light single entry door, flanked by two eight-over-eight double hung sash windows would be symmetrically located on the second-floor level beneath a bracketed molding.
2. Conduct site improvements
 - a. Create a driveway and motor court accessing the garage and mudroom steps from the alley.
 - b. Create a walkway connecting the sidewalk along Ashland Place Avenue to the front steps leading to the front entry porch.

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

1. **6.34** Maintain the visual line created by the fronts of buildings along a street.
 - Where front yard setbacks are uniform, place a new structure in general alignment with its neighbors.
 - Where front yard setbacks vary, place a new structure within the established range of front yard setbacks on a block.
2. **6.35** Maintain the side yard spacing pattern on the block.
 - Locate a structure to preserve the side yard spacing pattern on the block as seen from the street.
 - Provide sufficient side setbacks for property maintenance.

- Provide sufficient side setbacks to allow needed parking to occur behind the front wall of the house.
3. **6.36** Design the massing of new construction to appear similar to that of historic buildings in the district.
 - Choose the massing and shape of the new structure to maintain a rhythm of massing along the street.
 - Match the proportions of the front elevations of a new structure with those in the surrounding district.
 4. **6.37** Design the scale of new construction to appear similar to that of historic buildings in the district.
 - Use a building height in front that is compatible with adjacent contributing properties.
 - Size foundation and floor heights to appear similar to those of nearby historic buildings
 - Match the scale of a porch to the main building and reflect the scale of porches of nearby historic buildings.
 5. **6.38** Design exterior building walls to reflect traditional development patterns of nearby historic buildings.
 - Use a ratio of solid to void that is similar in proportion to those of nearby historic buildings.
 - Reflect the rhythm of windows and doors in a similar fashion on all exterior building walls. The ARB will consider all building walls; however, building walls facing streets may face increased scrutiny.
 - Use steps and balustrades in a similar fashion as nearby historic structures.
 - Design building elements on exterior building walls to be compatible with those on nearby historic buildings. These elements include, but are not limited to: • Balconies • Chimneys • Dormers
 6. **6.39** Use exterior materials and finishes that complement the character of the surrounding district.
 - Use material, ornamentation or a color scheme that blends with the historic district rather than making the building stand out.
 - If an alternative material is used that represents an evolution of a traditional material, suggest the finish of the original historic material from which it evolved.
 - Use a material with proven durability in the Mobile climate and that is similar in scale, character and finish to those used on nearby historic buildings.

ACCEPTABLE MATERIALS

Materials that are compatible in character, scale and finish to those used on nearby historic buildings are acceptable. These often include:

- Stucco
- Brick
- Stone
- Wood (lap siding, shingles, board and batten)
- Concrete siding
- Cement fiber board siding
- Skim stucco coat

UNACCEPTABLE MATERIALS

Materials that are incompatible in character, scale and finish to those used on nearby historic buildings are unacceptable. These often include:

- Metal siding
- Vinyl siding
- Unfinished concrete block
- Plywood
- Masonite
- Vinyl coatings
- Ceramic coatings
- Exterior insulation and finishing system (EIFS) wall systems

7. **6.40** Design a roof on new construction to be compatible with those on adjacent historic buildings.

- Design the roof shape, height, pitch and overall complexity to be similar to those on nearby historic buildings.
- Use materials that appear similar in character, scale, texture and color range to those on nearby historic buildings.
- New materials that have proven durability may be used.

ACCEPTABLE ROOF MATERIALS

Materials that are similar in character, scale, texture, and color range to those used on nearby historic buildings are acceptable. These often include:

- Asphalt dimensional or multi-tab shingles
 - Wood shake or shingle
 - Standing seam metal
 - Metal shingles
 - 5-V crimp metal
 - Clay tile
 - Imitation clay tile or slate
8. **6.41** Design a new door and doorway on new construction to be compatible with the historic district.
 - Place and size a door to establish a solid-to-void ratio similar to that of nearby historic buildings.
 - Place a door in a fashion that contributes to the traditional rhythm of the district as seen in nearby historic buildings.
 - Incorporate a door casement and trim similar to those seen on nearby historic buildings.
 - Place and size a special feature, including a transom, sidelight or decorative framing element, to complement those seen in nearby historic buildings.
 - Use a door material that blends well with surrounding historic buildings. Wood is preferred. Paneled doors with or without glass are generally appropriate.
 9. **6.42** Design a porch to be compatible with the neighborhood.
 - Include a front porch as part of new construction if it is contextual and feasible.
 - When designing a porch, consider porch location, proportion, rhythm, roof form, supports, steps, balustrades and ornamentation relative to the main building and porches in the district.
 - Design the elements of a porch to be at a scale proportional to the main building.
 - Where a rhythm of porches exists on a street or block, design a porch that continues this historic rhythm.
 - Design a rear or side porch that is visible from the public right-of-way to be subordinate in character to the front porch.
 10. **6.43** Design piers, a foundation and foundation infill to be compatible with those of nearby historic properties.
 - Use raised, pier foundations.
 - If raised foundations are not feasible, use a simulated raised foundation.
 - Do not use slab-on-grade construction. This is not appropriate for Mobile's historic neighborhoods. If a raised slab is required, use water tables, exaggerated bases, faux piers or other methods to simulate a raised foundation.
 - Do not use raw concrete block or exposed slabs.
 - If foundation infill must be used, ensure that it is compatible with the neighborhood.
 - If solid infill is used, recess it and screen it with landscaping.
 - If lattice is used, hang it below the floor framing and between the piers. Finish it with trim.
 - Do not secure lattice to the face of the building or foundation.
 - Do not use landscaping to disguise inappropriate foundation design.

ACCEPTABLE FOUNDATION MATERIALS

Materials that are similar in character, texture and durability to those used on nearby historic buildings are acceptable. These often include:

- Brick piers
- Brick infill

- Wood (vertical pickets)
- Framed lattice infill

UNACCEPTABLE FOUNDATION MATERIALS

Materials that are not similar in character, texture and durability to those used on nearby historic buildings are unacceptable. These often include:

- Mineral board panels
- Concrete block infill
- Metal infill
- Plywood panel infill
- Plastic sheeting infill
- Vinyl sheeting infill

11. 6.44 Use details and ornamentation that help new construction integrate with the historic buildings in the district.

- Use a decorative detail in a manner similar to those on nearby historic buildings. A modern interpretation of a historic detail or decoration is encouraged.
- Do not use a decorative detail that overpowers or negatively impacts nearby historic buildings.

12. 6.45 Locate and design windows to be compatible with those in the district.

- Locate and size a window to create a solid-to-void ratio similar to the ratios seen on nearby historic buildings.
- Locate a window to create a traditional rhythm and a proportion of openings similar to that seen in nearby historic buildings.
- Use a traditional window casement and trim similar to those seen in nearby historic buildings.
- Place a window to match the height of the front doorway.
- Place a window so that there is proportionate space between the window and the floor level.
- Do not place a window to directly abut the fascia of a building.
- Use a window material that is compatible with other building materials.
- Do not use a reflective or tinted glass window.
- Use a 1/1 window instead of window with false muntins. A double paned window may be acceptable if the interior dividers and dimensional muntins are used on multi-light windows. A double paned 1/1 window is acceptable.
- Do not use false, interior muntins except as stated above.
- Recess window openings on masonry buildings.
- Use a window opening with a raised surround on a wood frame building.

ACCEPTABLE WINDOW MATERIALS

Materials that are similar in character, profile, finish and durability to those used on nearby historic buildings are acceptable. These often include:

- Wood
- Vinyl-clad wood
- Aluminum-clad customized wood
- Extruded Aluminum

UNACCEPTABLE WINDOW MATERIALS

Materials that are not similar in character, profile, finish and durability to those used on nearby historic buildings are unacceptable. These often include:

- Mill finish metal windows
- Snap-in or artificial muntins
- Vinyl

13. 6.46 Design shutters and awnings to be compatible with the building. »

- Use a shutter that fits the reveal of a window opening precisely.
- Use an awning that fits proportionately over the window or door opening with an appropriate overlap at the side.
- Use an awning with a simple design and material.

- Use an awning with a color that is compatible with the overall building's color scheme. Canvas is preferred.
14. **10.5** Visually connect the street and building.
- Maintain or install a walkway leading directly from the sidewalk to the main building entry.
15. **10.7** Minimize the visual impact of parking.
- Locate a parking area at the rear or to the side of a site whenever possible.
 - Use landscaping to screen a parking area.
 - Minimize the widths of a paved area or a curb cut.
 - If a curb cut is no longer in use, repair the curb. In some areas, granite curbs may be required.
 - Do not use paving in the front yard for a parking area. Paving stones might be acceptable in certain instances.
 - Do not create a new driveway or garage that opens onto a primary street.

ACCEPTABLE WALK AND PAVING MATERIALS

Materials that have a similar character, durability and level of detail to walks and paved areas associated with historic properties in the district are acceptable. These often include:

- Gravel or crushed stone
 - Shell
 - Brick
 - Cobblestone
 - Grasspave or grasscrete (mix of grass and hard surface paving material that provides a solid surface)
16. **10.10** Provide a landscaped front yard for a residential property in a historic district.
- Maintain a predominant appearance of a planted front yard/lawn.
 - Minimize paved areas in a front yard.
 - Consider using decorative modular pavers, grass and cellular paving systems in order to minimize the impact of hard surface paving where grass or other plant materials are not used.
 - In commercial areas, consider using landscaping to screen and soften the appearance of surface parking areas. Use an internal and perimeter landscaping treatment to screen a fenced or walled parking area.
 - Do not use landscaping to hide a design feature that is inconsistent with these Design Review Guidelines.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The subject property, 2308 Ashland Place Avenue, is located within the Ashland Place Historic District. The application under review involves construction of a single-family residence on a corner lot. The submitted plans are a slightly altered version of those submitted and approved by the ARB in November 2020.

In the case of new residential construction within Mobile's historic districts, several items are taken into account 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 Guidelines for New Residential Construction* state that new buildings should be responsive to and maintain the alignment of traditional façade lines (6.34), as well as the rhythm of side and rear setbacks (6.35). The property under review, a corner lot, 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 the adjacent property at 206 Levert Avenue and properties within this property's viewshed at 159 and 201 Levert Avenue and 2301, 2305, and 2309 Ashland Place Avenue. The side setbacks are traditional in dimension. The driveway 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 (6.36). The proposed house adopts a traditional cottage massing. A dominant gabled roof tops the building. The south (façade) elevation's partial-width porch is typical of the neighborhood and the building type. The outward massing of the building, a rectangular block with advancing and retreating wall planes, is similar to massing found in the neighborhood and recalls the house originally located on this lot (6.40). The height of the foundation seems to mimic the foundation height of the previous house (6.37). The massing of the structure, the first floor being 10' ceilings below a 9' second story height, is compatible with the architectural context of the contributing landscape in which it is situated (6.37).

Scale refers to a building's size in relationship to other buildings. The *Guidelines* state that new construction should be in scale with nearby historic buildings (6.37). The adjacent residence at 206 Levert Avenue is one story in height, but other residences within the viewshed of this property are one and one-half to two stories in height, as the proposed residence would be. 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 *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 (6.41, 6.44). The paneled door employed for the front (south elevation) entrance reflects doors seen on similar residences in the district, and the use of both multi-light sashes and casement windows is well precedented, as this assortment was employed in the original house on the property (6.41). The wall treatments are visually compatible with the surrounding architectural and historical context (6.38, 6.39). The proposed window spacing mimics a traditional solid-to-void ratio along the south façade. (6.45)

In accord with the *Guidelines*, the building materials, while mostly modern alternatives, blend with those employed in the past and in immediate surroundings (6.39). Fiber cement board siding and aluminum clad windows and doors are approved for new construction within Mobile's historic districts.

The installation of walkway to connect the existing sidewalk to the structure complies with the *Guidelines* for site improvements. (10.5) The installation of a motor court reflects the parking patterns seen on similar lots in the immediate neighborhood. Its proposed location on the east side of the lot minimizes the visibility of parking, as directed in the *Guidelines*. (10.7) The proposed site plan incorporates the existing landscape into the design. (10.10)

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Ms. Robert McCown, the architect and owner representative, was present to discuss the application. Mr. McCown stated that he did not have any information to add to the Staff's report.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Roselius asked the applicant to summarize any differences between the plans approved in 2020 and those currently before the Board. Mr. McCown responded that the connector between the house and garage had been extended, the overall footprint had been somewhat enlarged, the chimney had been enhanced with additional ornamentation, and gutters and downspouts had been added in various locations.

Ms. Karrie Maurin asked if any porches had been enclosed. Mr. McCown responded that a rear porch had been infilled. Mr. McCown further stated that the front porch had received additional embellishments as well as a gutter and downspouts.

FINDING FACTS

Ms. Jennifer Roselius moved that, based on the evidence presented in the Public Testimony and Board Discussion, the Board find facts as written by staff.

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Ms. Davis 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.



Agenda Item #7

Certified Record 2024-65-CA

DETAILS

Location:

112 Bush Avenue

Summary of Request:

Demolish historic dwelling

Applicant (as applicable):

Philip Cianciola

Property Owner:

Alex Cocchiola

Historic District:

Old Dauphin Way

Classification:

Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The historic structure was constructed during the original development period of the subject block.
- The structure has been allowed to fall into disrepair over an extended period of time.
- A fire in 2024 further damaged the property.
- Municipal Enforcement has cited the property multiple times in 2024. City Council declared it a nuisance in August 2024 and has approved its demolition by the City.

Report Contents:

Property and Application History 2

Scope of Work 2

Applicable Standards 2

Staff Analysis 2

Attachments 3

PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

Old Dauphin Way Historic District was initially listed in the National Register in 1984 under Criterion C for significant architecture and community planning. The district includes most nineteenth-century architectural styles and shows adaptations of middle-class domestic designs of the nineteenth century to the regional, Gulf Coast climate. It includes “fine examples of commercial, institutional, and religious structures as well as 20th-century apartments.”

According to Historic Development survey records, the single-story frame Victorian cottage at 112 Bush Avenue was constructed c. 1910. With an intersecting gable roof, the façade consists of a projecting pedimented gable bay to the south, and a full-width front porch supported by turned posts with matching balustrade. Sanborn Insurance maps illustrate the that a porch was added to span the rear ell between 1925 and 1956. Aerial and site photography reveal that the rear porch was enclosed and subsequent rear additions were constructed, most likely beginning in the 1960s. The dwelling has been allowed to fall into disrepair over the last two decades, and was further damaged by a fire in 2024. The property has been cited by the city’s Municipal Enforcement Department multiple times over the past year. It was declared a public nuisance by Mobile City Council in August 2024 and was slated for demolition.

According the Historic Development property files, this property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board (ARB).

SCOPE OF WORK

Demolish one-story single family dwelling

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

1. **10.0** Vacant Lots

The appearance of a vacant lot can potentially negatively impact the character of a historic district. When a vacant lot exists or is created through demolition, property owners must properly maintain, landscape and/or screen the property. This applies to a temporarily vacant lot. Owners must landscape a vacant lot with a ground cover approved by the ARB, such as grass. The owner must maintain the ground cover and keep the property free of trash and debris, as required by the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Mobile.

2. **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 property under review is a contributing structure in the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The application proposes the demolition of the historic dwelling on the property.

The *Guidelines* require that the following be considered when a demolition is proposed: 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.

Significance

The 1925 Sanborn map shows the subject block of Bush Avenue populated predominantly by single-story frame Victorian cottages and bungalows on the east side of the street, which were constructed between c.1905-1915. The structure at 112 Avenue is one of the larger cottages built during this period of development. By the mid-1950s, the previously undeveloped lots on the west side of the street were filled with small Craftsman style bungalows constructed in the early 1930s. These two distinct styles dominate this portion of the street, denoting not only two periods of development in this historic neighborhood, but the evolution of architectural styles. 112 Bush Avenue contributes significantly to this context, particularly as one of the few larger cottages built on the street during the earlier development campaign.

Condition

As mentioned above, the subject structure has been allowed to fall into a severely deteriorated state over time. In addition, the house sustained further damage from a fire earlier in 2024, rendering it structurally unsafe.

Impact on the Street and District

Although the subject structure does not represent a rare or one of the last building styles or forms in Mobile, the deletion of the house at 112 Bush Avenue would disrupt the grouping of seven (7) extant Victorian cottages which were constructed during the first development period along the east side of Bush Avenue between Spring Hill Avenue and Old Shell Road. Its demolition would diminish the discernable historic development pattern along the street.

Nature of Proposed Development

The current owner has plans to clear the lot after demolition and prepare the property for new construction. The applicant has met with Historic Development Staff to discuss the guidelines for new construction in Mobile's historic districts and has provided preliminary renderings and floorplans. According to the owner, plans and drawings included in an application for a COA are forthcoming. (12.0)

Due to the preliminary status of the proposed future development of the subject lot, the creation of a vacant lot after demolition must be considered. The applicant should provide information regarding how the lot would be maintained, in compliance with the *Guidelines'* call to suitably landscape or screen the property, until the future development plans are finalized and approved. (10.0)

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Ms. Annie Allen, a member of Staff, explained that the property owners were based in Nevada and New York and were unable to attend the meeting. Ms. Allen stated that Mr. Alex Cocchiola, the owner's representative, was available on the phone if the Board had any questions that staff could not answer.

Mr. Albert Reasonover of 114 Bush Avenue addressed the Board in favor of the application to demolish. Mr. Reasonover stated that there was a fire at 112 Bush Avenue shortly after he closed on his home at 114 Bush Avenue. Mr. Reasonover further stated that since that time homeless individuals frequently broke into the house

for shelter. Mr. Reasonover described seeing other individuals removing copper pipes and other items from inside the house.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Jennifer Roselius asked if the City would be demolishing the house. Ms. Allen responded that the owner was opting to demolish it himself to avoid having a lien placed on the property.

Ms. Abby Davis asked what the plan was for redeveloping the site after demolition. Ms. Allen stated that in the short term the owner would remove any debris, level the site, and seed it for grass. Ms. Allen also informed the Board that the applicant had recently submitted plans for new construction, which would be before the Board in the near future.

Ms. Cameron Pfeiffer-Traylor expressed her reluctance to approve of any demolition but stated that in this case she saw that the structure was too far gone. Ms. Roselius added that if the Board denied the applicant's request to demolish, the City would demolish it, putting the expense of doing so on the taxpayers of Mobile.

FINDING FACTS

Ms. Jennifer Roselius moved that, based on the evidence presented in the Public Testimony and Board Discussion, the Board find facts as written by staff.

Ms. Abby Davis seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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



Agenda Item #8

Certified Record 2024-53-CA

DETAILS

Location:

256 S. Broad Street

Summary of Request:

Construct an accessory pool house

Applicant (as applicable):

Bud Walker

Property Owner:

Nick and Theresa Chamblee

Historic District:

Oakleigh Garden

Classification:

Non-contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The property under review is non-contributing; however, if resurveyed it would most likely be re-designated as contributing.
- The Mobile Historic Development Commission (MHDC) holds an architectural façade easement on the subject property. Approval for the subject project was granted by the MHDC’s Properties Committee on October 7, 2024.
- The proposed one-story accessory structure sits to the rear of the property and is subordinate to the main dwelling on the lot in massing and scale.
- Materials proposed for the structure are approved for new construction under the *Guidelines*.

Report Contents:

Property and Application History..... 2

Scope of Work..... 2

Applicable Standards 3

Staff Analysis 3

Attachments 4

PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

Oakleigh Garden Historic District was initially listed in the National Register in 1972 under Criteria A (historic significance) and C (architectural significance) for its local significance in the areas of architecture, landscape architecture, and planning and development. The district is significant for its high concentration of 19th- and 20th-century architectural types and styles and significant in the area of landscape architecture for its canopies of live oaks planted from 1850 to 1910. The district is significant in the area of planning and development as the location of Washington Square, one of only two antebellum public parks remaining in Mobile. The district was expanded in 1984, and an updated nomination was approved in 2016.

The structure at 256 S. Broad Street is a two-story frame dwelling with a full-width two-story gallery and late Italianate detailing across the east facing façade. According to Historic Development records, the house was constructed c. 1870-1880. In the 1950s and 1960s, a concrete commercial addition was constructed on the front of the structure, and asbestos shingle siding was applied over the original wood siding. At this time the two-story front porch was removed. The building fell into disrepair. In 1999, the property underwent an extensive rehabilitation and preservation campaign, during which the later additions and coverings were removed, and the building's exterior was restored to its original design as accurately as possible.

This property has appeared twice before the Architectural Review Board (ARB). In 1998 a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) was issued for rehabilitation work at the property. A second COA was issued in the same year to rebuild the front and rear porches.

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Construct a one-story pool house
 - a. The structure would measure 15'-0" wide by 41'-0" deep. It would sit west (to the rear) of the main structure, approximately 8'-0" off both the south and west property lines and approximately 7'-5" off the north property line.
 - b. The structure would measure 10'-0" high from finished floor to top of plate.
 - c. The structure would be topped by a gable roof, clad in architectural shingles.
 - d. The structure would sit on an 8" slab-on-grade foundation. A 12' horizontal cementitious trim board would run along the bottom of the wall at each elevation above the slab to simulate a raised foundation.
 - e. The structure would be clad in cementitious wood siding. Trim and fascia would also be cementitious wood.
 - f. A recessed front porch would span the gable end east façade. The porch would be supported by two 12" wood square posts. A circular louvered vent would be centered on the façade gable. A three-panel bifold door would be centered on the façade.
 - g. A single entry door would be located on the westernmost third of the north elevation. The door would be accessed by a concrete stoop, which would measure approximately 3'-6" wide by 4'-0" deep. A 36" shingled awning would project over the door opening.
 - h. Fenestration would include the following:
 - Six (6) vinyl-clad single-light, fixed windows measuring 4'-0" wide by 2'-0" high
 - One (1) wood three-panel, one-light glass bifold doors, measuring 5'-0" wide by 6'-8" high
 - One (1) wood frame single-light glass exterior door measuring 2'-8" wide by 6'-8" high
 - i. Elevations would appear as follows:
 - East façade (south to north)
Square post; three-panel bifold glass doors; square column
 - West elevation (north to south)
Concrete stoop; corner board; one (1) fixed window, centered on the elevation; corner board

North elevation (east to west)

Square post; corner board; two (2) fixed windows, regularly spaced along the east half of the elevation; one (1) single-light door; corner board

South elevation (west to east)

Corner board; one (1) fixed window, roughly centered on the west half of the elevation; two (2) fixed windows, regularly spaced along the east half of the elevation; corner board; square post

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

1. **9.1** Design an accessory structure to be subordinate in scale to that of the primary structure.
 - If a proposed accessory structure is larger than the size of typical historic accessory structures in the district, break up the mass of the larger structure into smaller modules that reflect traditional accessory structures.
2. **9.2** Locate a new accessory structure in line with other visible accessory structures in the district.
 - These are traditionally located at the rear of a lot.

ACCEPTABLE ACCESSORY STRUCTURE MATERIALS

Materials that are compatible with the historic district in scale and character are acceptable.

These often include:

- » Wood frame
- » Masonry
- » Cement-based fiber siding
- » Installations (Pre-made store-bought sheds, provided they are minimally visible from public areas)

UNACCEPTABLE ACCESSORY STRUCTURE MATERIALS

Materials that are not compatible with the historic district in scale and character are unacceptable.

These often include:

- » Metal (except for a greenhouse)
- » Plastic (except for a greenhouse)
- » Fiberglass (except for a greenhouse)

STAFF ANALYSIS

The application under review seeks approval for the construction of an accessory pool house structure. The subject property is currently a non-contributing property within the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. It should be noted however, that if resurveyed, the property would most likely be re-designated as contributing. Additionally, the Mobile Historic Development Commission (MHDC) holds an easement on the property, requiring approval of any exterior changes by the MHDC. The project submitted in this application received the required approval by the Commission's Properties Committee on October 7, 2024.

In regard to scale, the *Guidelines* state that accessory structures be subordinate in size to the main structure. (9.1) The proposed building's footprint would measure approximately 615 sf, making it smaller than that of the primary dwelling on the lot which is approximately 900sf. Also subordinate is the one-story height of the pool house, compared to the existing two-story historic structure.

The proposed traditional placement of the structure at the rear of the lot complies with the *Guidelines'* placement directive. (9.2)

In addition to the above listed *Guidelines*, accessory structures are meant to adhere to guidelines for new residential construction in historic districts. (Chapter 6) Within this context, the proposed pool house complies with the relevant guidelines for building materials and finishes, roofs, doors and doorways, foundations, and windows. (6.39, 6.40, 6.41, 6.42, 6.43, 6.45)

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Bud Walker, the contractor and owner representative, was present to discuss the application. Mr. Walker stated that he did not have any information to add to the Staff's report.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Cameron Pfeiffer-Traylor asked what the paint colors would be. Mr. Walker responded that the pool house would be painted to match the main house.

FINDING FACTS

Ms. Jennifer Roselius moved that, based on the evidence presented in the Public Testimony and Board Discussion, the Board find facts as written by staff.

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Ms. Roselius 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. Abby Davis seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.

There being no other business, Mr. Blackwell adjourned the meeting at 4:34pm