



Architectural Review Board Agenda

September 4, 2024 – 3:00 P.M.

ADMINISTRATIVE

The meeting was called to order by the Chair, Catarina Echols, at 3:01 pm.

1. Roll Call

Christine Dawson, Historic Development staff, called the roll as follows:

Members Present: Cartledge Blackwell, Abby Davis, Catarina Echols, Karrie Maurin, Stephen McNair, Jennifer Roselius, and Barja Wilson

Members Absent: Stephen Howle and Cameron Pfeiffer-Traylor

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

2. Approval of Minutes from August 21, 2024

Cartledge Blackwell moved to approve the minutes from the June 18, 2024 meeting.

The motion was seconded by Karrie Maurin and approved unanimously.

3. Approval of Mid-Month COAs granted by Staff

Jennifer Roselius moved to approve the mid-month COAs granted by Staff.

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

MID-MONTH APPROVALS

- | | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| 1. Property Address: | 659 Dauphin Street |
| Issue Date: | 08/12/2024 |
| Project: | <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Install 6' tall horizontal wood slat fencing with two metal double-leaf gates along Dauphin Street side of parking area between 659 and 651 Dauphin Street.2. Install 4' to 6' tall horizontal wood slat fencing with one double-leaf wood slat gate along the Conti Street side of the parking area.3. Pave parking area with gravel or asphalt.4. Replace existing emergency egress stairs on rear (south) elevation with painted steel egress stairs. |

5. Replace existing steel doors on rear (south) elevation in kind (one on 1st floor, one on 2nd floor). Replace the existing door at east end of north elevation with painted steel or aluminum-clad wood.
6. Patch stucco on all elevations as needed. Paint to match.
7. Repair existing aluminum windows on north, south, and west elevations.
8. Remove two northernmost windows on the second floor of east elevation. Replace them with aluminum or aluminum-clad windows to match the dimensions and light pattern.
9. Replace existing metal canopy on north elevation in kind.
10. Install painted sectional overhead door in the northern third of the east elevation.
11. Install aluminum-clad or wood paneled door to immediate north of new overhead door.

2. **Property Address:** 205 Government Street
Issue Date: 8/13/2024
Project: Repair/replace partial roof on Government Plaza. Replace coping, flashing, joint sealant, roofing system, and some doors. Remove abandoned roof top equipment.
3. **Property Address:** 70 Ethridge Street
Issue Date: 08/14/2024
Project:
 1. Remove existing chain-link fence. Replace it with a 6'0" wood privacy fence to follow the footprint of the existing fence but sitting back from the front plane of the structure on its south elevation.
 2. Repair and replace in-kind damaged and deteriorated spindles/railings where needed on the front porch.
 3. Repaint exterior siding and trim with BLP Mobile paints (colors to be approved by Staff).
 4. Remove non-historic (2011) windows on north elevation of garage and replace with two wood carriage-style garage doors. Garage doors would emulate original garage doors in placement and design. Doors would be painted in BLP Mobile paint colors to match the garage and dwelling. Wood lap siding and trim to match existing would be installed around and between doors.
 5. Reroof with Pinnacle Pristine Shingles. Color: Hearthstone
4. **Property Address:** 311 McDonald Street
Issue Date: 08/19/2024
Project: Reroof with shingles. Color: Old English Pewter
5. **Property Address:** 162 S. Warren Street
Issue Date: 08/19/2024
Project: Remove and replace the door on the west end of north elevation with paneled door to fit the existing opening. Painted to match existing.
6. **Property Address:** 150 Government Street
Issue Date: 08/20/2024
Project: Termite damage repair to third-floor window sash and header at interior courtyard: Remove window, replace damaged wood pieces in kind to match existing. Reinstall window.
7. **Property Address:** 1608 Monterey Place

- Issue Date: 08/22/2024
 Project: Reroof with shingles. Color: Charcoal
8. **Property Address:** 1569 Dauphin Street
 Issue Date: 08/22/2024
 Project: Install a 29'x13'-9" rectangular fiberglass swimming pool SE of the house.
9. **Property Address:** 1172 Elmira Street
 Issue Date: 08/23/2024 (reissue of COA originally issued on 3/31/2022)
 Project:
 1. Repaint with Sherwin Williams as follows. Body: Rockwood Sash Green (2810); Trim: Pure White (7008); Windows: Renwick Heather (2818); Front Door: Jazz Age Coral (0058)
 2. Reroof in-kind with architectural shingles in Virginia Slate color.
 3. Repair millwork in-kind to match in material, dimensions, and design.

APPLICATIONS

1. 2024-25-CA

Address: 406 Wisconsin Avenue
Historic District: Leinkauf
Applicant / Agent: Baumgardner House Raising, LLC d/b/a BHL Federal, LLC
Project: Demolition of 1-story frame house. New construction: 1-story single-family Residence

APPROVED - **CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

2. 2024-44-CA

Address: 204 S. Dearborn Street
Historic District: Church Street East
Applicant / Agent: Veronica Philon and Jake James
Project: Construct rear addition

APPROVED - **CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

3. 2024-45-CA

Address: 1555 Dauphin Street
Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Applicant / Agent: Nunez M Construction, LLC on behalf of Jane Inge
Project: Replace front porch columns with fiberglass columns of similar design

APPROVED - **CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**



Agenda Item #1

Certified Record 2024-25-CA

DETAILS

Location:

406 Wisconsin Avenue

Summary of Request:

Demolish existing one-story frame single-family residence. New Construction: Construct one-story frame single-family residence.

Applicant (as applicable):

Baumgardner House Raising, LLC,
d/b/a BHL Federal, LLC

Property Owner:

Essie Etheridge

Historic District:

Leinkauf

Classification:

Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The extant structure has been deemed not fit for rehabilitation under the *Home Recovery Alabama Program (HRAP)*.
- The proposed new construction is of similar size and form of the existing.
- The proposed new construction design incorporates elements that echo those of the original structure.
- The materials proposed for the new structure are compliant with the design guidelines for new construction.
- An addendum to the previous submitted structural report has been provided by the applicant.
- A timeline outlining the progress of the application and evolution of submitted drawings is provided in the Staff analysis.

Report Contents:

Property and Application History	2
Scope of Work	2
Applicable Standards	3
Staff Analysis	7

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 406 Wisconsin Avenue is a single-story wood-frame bungalow with a jerkinhead roof and a full-width porch across its primary (east) elevation. This section of Wisconsin Avenue was first platted in 1922, and Wisconsin Avenue is not listed in City Directories prior to 1924. The 1924 City Directory lists Edward Balzli as residing at 406 Wisconsin Avenue, and the 1925 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map shows a property with a similar footprint to the extant residence in the same location. An estimated construction date of 1924 is therefore appropriate for the residence. Stylistic evidence further supports a construction date of 1924, given the heavy square porch columns, exposed rafter ends, and the paired three-over-one windows, all of which are typical of modest dwellings of the early 1920s.

This property appeared before the Architectural Review Board (ARB) in May 2024 with the same application, to demolish the existing structure and construct a new single-family residence. The application was tabled with the provision that the applicant further consult with Historic Development staff to alter the design of the new construction to be more compatible with the historic character of the neighborhood and district. The application came again before the Board in July 2024 with altered drawings and additional inspection reports. The application was tabled again, with further recommendations provided for the new construction drawings, along with the request for more substantial structural evidence. A Design Review Committee meeting was conducted on August 7, 2024, at which time the applicant was asked to extend the driveway westward so that cars could be parked behind the front plan of the house.

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Demolish existing house.
2. Construct a single-family one-story residence.
 - a. The new structure would be oriented on the lot such that the front setback from the ROW on Wisconsin Avenue would measure 25'-2". Side yard setbacks on the north and south would measure 7'-2" and 14'-0" respectively.
 - b. The proposed one-story, three-bay dwelling would be rectangular in shape and would measure approximately 28'-10" wide by 52'-3" deep for a total of 1507 sf.
 - c. The structure would be topped by a gable/hipped roof with a full-width front porch under the gable. The roof structure would be clad in architectural shingles.
 - d. The house would sit on a 1'-6" high foundation of brick piers. Recessed wood lattice panels would be used for infill on the north, south, and west elevations. Recessed brick infill would be installed across the east (front) elevation.
 - e. Fenestration would be comprised of 14 single-hung one-over-one vinyl-clad wood windows and two steel paneled entry doors.
 - f. Plate height from the finished floor would measure 9'-0", with a roof ridge height of 17'-2 ½".
 - g. The house would be clad in fiber cement siding and trim.
 - h. A front porch would span the east façade. It would measure 28'-10" wide by 8'-3" deep and be supported by alternating paired and single wood square columns sitting on brick plinths. The outer paired columns would measure 2'-3 ½ wide in total; with the single inner columns each measuring 2'-3 ½ wide. A brick knee wall would enclose the porch. Approximately five (5) brick

steps, measuring 7'-7 1/2" wide, would access the front porch, centered on the elevation. Wood handrails and brick cheek walls would flank either side of the steps.

- i. A 10'-3" wide by 7'-0" deep recessed porch would be located on the south end of the west (rear) elevation. The porch would access a rear paneled entry door which would measure 3'-0" wide by 6'-8" high. The rear porch would be enclosed by a wood handrail and accessed by five (5) wood steps on the west.

- j. Elevations would appear as follows:

East façade (from south to north)

Pair of one-over-one windows, each measuring 3'-0"x5'-0", centered on the porch columns; paneled door (sitting slightly south of center); pair of one-over-one windows, each measuring 3'-0"x5'-0", centered on the porch columns.

West elevation (from north to south)

Corner board; one (1) one-over-one window measuring 3'-0"x3'-0"; corner board; one (1) one-over-one window measuring 3'-0" wide by 3'-0" high; square post.

North elevation (from east to west)

Side profile of brick cheek wall and wood handrail; corner board; one (1) one-over-one window measuring 3'-0"x 5'-0"; one pair of one-over-one windows measuring 3'-0"x5'-0"; one (1) one-over-one window measuring 3'-0"x3'-0", somewhat regularly dispersed across the elevation; corner board

South elevation (from west to east)

Side profile of wood handrail; square post; six-paneled door; corner board; two (2) pairs of one-over-one windows, each measuring 3'-0"x5'-0", both located in the east half of the elevation; corner board; brick knee wall; brick plinth and wood column; side profile of brick cheek wall and wood handrail

3. Site improvements would include the following:

- A 4'-0"-wide walkway would connect the sidewalk to the front porch steps. Just before the front porch steps, the walkway would widen to create a 5'-0"x5'-0" concrete pad.
- Likewise, a 5'-0"x5'-0" concrete pad would also be installed at the base of the rear porch steps.
- A 9'-0"-wide concrete driveway would replace the existing driveway on the south end of the lot. The driveway would widen to 12'-0" to match the width of the driveway apron.

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. **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.
- 3. **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.
- 4. **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.
- 5. **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.
- 6. **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
- 7. **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
8. **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
9. **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.
10. **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.
11. **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

12. **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.
13. **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

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 application proposes the demolition of the structure at 406 Wisconsin Avenue and the subsequent construction of a new one-story single-family residence.

The *Guidelines* state that when demolition is contemplated, the current significance of the structure should be considered. The subject house is considered a contributing property in the locally-only designated portion of Leinkauf Historic District. The one-story wood-frame bungalow represents a style which became widely popular in Mobile in the early twentieth century, after the First World War. The flexible plan, wide porches, protective overhangs, and simple decoration made this style easy to build and affordable for the up-and-coming middle class. The modest interpretation of the Craftsman style at 406 Wisconsin is a character-defining feature of Mobile's built heritage, and variations of it can be seen throughout the city's historic districts. Elements such as the square porch columns, masonry knee and cheek walls, exposed rafters, and three-over-one windows serve to define this house as an example of the vernacular interpretation of Craftsman style architecture in Mobile.

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." In the case of the subject property the building has sustained some superficial deterioration including areas of rotten or missing siding, along with damaged roof rafters and mortar corrosion between brick courses on foundation piers. There is some visual evidence of sunken piers signifying settling of the structure over time, which is common for historic homes in this region. A structural assessment report was submitted with the application which notes areas of deficiencies. The noted items in the report are typical of an aging building and do not indicate that the building cannot be rehabilitated or that it is a public hazard. **As stated in the application history above, the applicant was asked at the July 17th ARB meeting to provide a structural assessment that contains more bolstered argument for the demolition of the existing structure. The original assessment from Cobalt has been submitted containing an addendum addressing further structural deficiencies and danger as well as an account of the qualifications of the inspector.**

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. As stated above, the Craftsman style was enthusiastically embraced in Mobile during the early 20th century, as the simple design and the climate was well suited to this architectural trend

and to Mobile's post-war growth. The 1956 Sanborn map reveals that after the subdivision of this section of Wisconsin Street in 1922, nineteen single-family homes were built along both sides of the street between Eslava Street on the north and Ohio Street to the south. Almost all of these residences denote a form very similar to 406 Wisconsin. All of the homes are extant, with few modifications, with the exception of 405 Wisconsin, which was replaced with a new home around 1990. The demolition of the historic home at 406 Wisconsin would diminish the integrity of this minimally altered example of pre-World War II planned development in the Leinkauf Historic District.

Another consideration directed by the *Guidelines* is the impact that a demolition would have on surrounding structures. In this case, the applicant has submitted plans for the construction of a new single-family residence. The plans are analyzed against the *Guidelines* below. (12.0)

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 406 Wisconsin would sit similarly on the lot as the existing house and the neighboring properties. With a proposed front setback of 25'-2" and side yard setbacks of 7'-2" and 14'-0", the proposed structure would sit similarly on the lot as the existing historic house and would also fall within the established range that occurs on surrounding lots. (6.34, 6.35)

The historic structures in the immediate vicinity of the subject property vary slightly in size and details but are fairly consistently one-story structures, rectangular in shape, some with off-set front or side projections. The proposed design for the subject lot is fairly consistent in massing, proportions, and height with neighboring historic structures, with a lack of offset side walls along the elevations expressed on many of the surrounding buildings, which creates a pattern of projections and recesses. 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 and lattice infill is likewise compatible with the historic neighborhood. (6.36, 6.37, 6.43).

The street on which the subject property is located, along with immediate cross streets, is predominately populated with one-story gable or hipped-roof bungalows of three or four bays sitting on raised foundations and comprised of full or half-width front porches and restrained Craftsman style detailing such as exposed rafters, square columns, decorative brick detailing, and masonry knee walls. The majority of these residences possess long side elevations, many with occasional projections and recesses, and varying fenestration patterns. Proposed features of the three-bay, one-story bungalow-like design such as the gabled facade, full-width front porch, and foundation design reflects the design of the existing structure, uphold conventions of the district, and assimilate the proposed new construction with neighboring historic buildings, as the *Guidelines* advise. The proposed materials of fiber cement siding, wood, and shingles are acceptable building materials for new construction within Mobile's historic districts, which respect the traditional building materials observable on nearby historic structures and throughout the historic district. The applicant has stated that the front and rear paneled entry doors would be of steel construction. Vinyl clad wood, proposed for the windows, is an approved window material for new construction under the *Guidelines*, though a three-over-one lite configuration would be more appropriate than the proposed one-over-one pattern. The solid-to-void ratios along the side and rear elevations are not entirely compatible with those of nearby historic structures. Expanses of blank walls such as those seen on the south and west elevations in the submitted plans are not present on historic bungalows in the neighborhood; however, the full-width front porch and recess created by the rear porch serves to visually create variation along the elevations. (6.38 - 6.42, 6.44, 6.45).

The proposed installation of a concrete walkway connecting the existing sidewalk to the façade is a practice directed by the *Guidelines*. However, the 5'x5' concrete pad proposed for the west end of the walkway is not a common feature seen at surrounding historic properties. The replacement of the existing driveway would provide parking to the side and rear of the building, as called for in the *Guidelines*. (10.5, 10.7)

The key features of the façade and front porch have evolved over the course of the Board's review of the application in order to comply with recommendations provided by the Board to create a more appropriate design that better conforms to the *Guidelines* and visually brings the proposed new construction into closer harmony with the historic streetscape so as not to impair the architectural integrity of the surrounding area. The application with new construction drawings has appeared twice before the ARB and once in a Design Review Committee. The most recent alterations to the drawings include adding a faux louvered vent in the gable above the porch and two exposed brackets under the ridge on the façade, centering each pair of façade windows between the porch columns, expressing split columns on the north and south end plinths of the porch, and adding larger columns to the inner plinths. (6.38 – 6.42)

Summary of evolution of new construction drawings for 406 Wisconsin:

- **May 15, 2024: ARB Meeting**
 - The application to demolish the structure at 406 Wisconsin Avenue and construct a new structure on the site came before the Board. Plans included a hipped roof 5'-8" deep front porch spanning the façade's two southern bays and a projecting northern bay.
 - The minutes show that feedback from the Board was focused on the plate height and finished floor heights matching those of the existing and of the surrounding historic structures. Conversation also centered around the façade and the fact that a full-width porch would be more appropriate. The applicant was advised to temporarily withdraw the application and engage in further talks with Staff.
- **July 17, 2024: ARB Meeting**
 - Revised drawings were presented to the Board and included a gable roof and an 8'-3" deep full-width front porch supported by square columns resting on brick plinths, which better match those of the existing and surrounding structures.
 - Board comments mainly centered around the gap between the top of the windows and bottom of the roof, which was too large in comparison to the surrounding historic structures, the suggestion of placing a faux louvered vent in the front gable, and the issue of the windows not being centered between the porch columns.
- **August 7, 2024: Design Review Committee**
 - The applicant met with a Design Review Committee, which included Board members Mr. Stephen Howle, Ms. Jennifer Roselius, and Mr. Stephen McNair.
 - The presented drawings included the addition of a faux louvered vent in the front gable, the centering of each pair of façade windows on the porch columns, and the addition of larger columns on the inner porch plinths.
 - The applicant was asked if it was possible to extend the driveway farther west in order that cars could be parked to the side of the house and not forward of the front plane of the building. It was also noted that there would be no objection to using gravel rather than concrete if necessary.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Stephen Weirup, Project Manager; Chris Boswell, General Contractor; Melissa Burnett, Assistant Construction Manager, and Essie Etheridge, owner, were present to discuss the application.

Mr. Weirup introduced Mr. Boswell and gave an overview of the evolution of the project and the Design Review Committee which met on August 7th.

No one from the public came forward to speak for or against the application. No written comments were received.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Roselius discussed the Design Review Committee, stating that the plans look good and the revised site plan includes the extension of the driveway past the house. She added that the main issue with this application at this point is the demolition of an existing historic structure. She asked the applicant to go through the amended structural report.

Mr. Weirup gave an overview of the report, sharing that after the July 17th ARB meeting local inspectors were hired to provide reports, which mirrored Cobalt's original report's conclusion that the structure is not suitable for rehabilitation. He stated that Cobalt was called back with questions received from the Board, and request for stronger and more detailed language explaining the issues causing the deterioration of the building's structural integrity. Mr. Weirup then noted excerpts from the report's addendum regarding the flooring system, roof, and other damaged area, stating that the report concludes that rehabilitation would be prohibitively expensive, which tires into feasibility.

Mr. McNair noted that the amount of material that would most likely need to be replaced, would in essence result in new construction.

Mr. Weirup concurred with Mr. McNair, adding that attempting to replace the rotten flooring system, foundation settlement, roof decking, in addition to termite damage and moisture content would result in a newly constructed building.

Abby Davis thanked the applicants for working through this project so diligently. She asked for the proposed material of the center porch columns.

Mr. Blackwell stated that they would be Hardie to match the material of the siding.

Bruce McGowin added that ADECA did not intend to fund additional historic homes within local historic districts.

Ms. Roselius stated that the ARB takes the demolition of historic structures seriously. In this case, given that wholesale replacement is necessary, demolition may be the best for the integrity of the district. She added that when considering the historic integrity of a district, that it does not solely include the built environment, but the integrity of culture and social aspects of the neighborhood; and allowing a long-term contributing resident of a community to remain plays a role in maintaining a neighborhood's historic integrity.

FINDING FACTS

Mr. Blackwell moved that, based on the evidence presented in the application, the Board finds the facts in the Staff's report of the application, as written.

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Blackwell moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, while demolition of the structure would impair the architectural or historic character of the property and the district, the application should be approved due to the conditions of the building and nature of proposed new construction design, and should be granted a COA.

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



Agenda Item #2

Certified Record 2024-44-CA

DETAILS

Location:

204 S. Dearborn Street

Summary of Request:

Construct addition to rear elevation

Applicant (as applicable):

Ernst and Veronica J. Philon

Property Owner:

Veronica J. Philon and James Jake

Historic District:

Church Street East

Classification:

Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The one-story rear addition would project from an existing non-historic rear addition from the early 1980s, which replaced an original rear projection.
- The addition would be subordinate to the historic structure and would be appropriately placed.
- Foundation and ceiling heights of the addition would match those of the existing structure.
- All proposed materials are compatible and approvable under the *Guidelines*.

Report Contents:

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

PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

Church Street East Historic District was initially listed in the National Register in 1971 under Criteria A (historic significance) and C (architectural significance) for its local significance in the areas of architecture, education, and urban planning. The district is significant for its concentration of multiple 19th century architectural styles and because it encompasses the site of Mobile in the early 1700s. The district boundaries were expanded in 1984 and 2005.

The structure at 204 S. Dearborn Street is a one-and-a-half story frame worker's cottage constructed c. 1871. The steeply pitched, side-gabled roof shelters an integral, full-width front porch. A one-story shed-roof rear projection spans the width of the main block. The dwelling is represented on the Sanborn map as having a narrow one-story projection off the north end of rear elevation through the 1955 overlay. Photos from c. 1978 show a rear full-width one-story rear block consisting of a cross-gable roof to the north and shed roof sloping to the south. This integrated roof design suggests that the original projection was widened to incorporate the full width of the building. Historic photos from the late 1970s show the dwelling as heavily altered. In the early 1980s, the house underwent an extensive rehabilitation, during which the rear addition was demolished and replaced with the existing shed roof addition.

According to Historic Development records, this property has appeared once before the Architectural Review Board. In 2014, a COA was issued to replace ten vinyl windows on the original portion of the house with salvaged six-over-six wood windows.

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Construct an addition to the existing one-story addition on the west (rear) elevation.
 - a. The proposed addition would run the width of the existing house and measure 24'-2" deep, including an interior portion (12'-2" deep) and a back porch (12'-0" deep).
 - b. The existing rear shed roof addition would be converted to a cross gable which would be extended over the proposed. The roof would be shingled to match the existing roof.
 - c. The addition would sit on a foundation of brick piers which would match the existing foundation height. Framed wood lattice panels would be installed between the piers.
 - d. The rear porch would be integrated under the gable roof and would be supported by four (4) 4"x4" square posts with caps, equally dispersed across the elevation. Three 4'-0" wide wood steps on the northeast corner of the porch would rise from north to south. A wood handrail with pickets would be installed to the west of the steps.
 - e. Fenestration: Two (2) proposed one-over-one windows would be aluminum-clad wood and measure 3'-0" side by 3'-0" high.. One existing wood entry door currently on the rear elevation would be relocated to the rear elevation of the addition.
 - f. Elevations of the proposed addition would appear as follows:
 - East (rear) elevation(from north to south)
Corner board; one (1) window, centered on north bay; one (1) entry door, centered on the elevation; corner board.
 - North elevation(from east to west)
(No fenestration is planned for this elevation) Corner board; porch column.
 - South elevation(from west to east)
Porch column; corner board; one (1) window, roughly 3 ½ ' from in from the corner board on the south wall.

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

1. **6.9** Place an addition so that it is subordinate to the historic residential structure.
 - Place and design an addition to the rear or side of the historic building wherever possible.
 - Place a vertical addition in the rear so it is not visible from the street.
2. **6.10** Design an addition to be compatible in massing and scale with the original historic structure.
 - Design the massing of an addition to appear subordinate to the historic building.
 - Where feasible, use a lower-scale connecting element to join an addition to a historic structure.
 - Where possible, match the foundation and floor heights of an addition to those of the historic building.
3. **6.11** Design the exterior walls of an addition to be compatible in scale and rhythm with the original historic structure.
 - Design the height of an addition to be proportionate with the historic building, paying particular attention to the foundation and other horizontal elements.
 - Design the addition to express floor heights on the exterior of the addition in a fashion that reflects floor heights of the original historic building.
4. **6.12** Clearly differentiate the exterior walls of an addition from the original historic structure.
 - Use a physical break or setback from the original exterior wall to visually separate the old from new.
 - Use an alteration in the roofline to create a visual break between the original and new, but ensure that the pitches generally match.
5. **6.13** Use exterior materials and finishes that are comparable to those of the original historic residential structure in profile, dimension and composition. Modern building materials will be evaluated for appropriateness or compatibility with the original historic structure on an individual basis, with the objective of ensuring the materials are similar in their profile, dimension, and composition to those of the original historic structure.
 - Utilize an alternative material for siding as necessary, such as cement-based fiber board, provided that it matches the siding of the historic building in profile, character and finish.
 - Use a material with proven durability.
 - Use a material with a similar appearance in profile, texture and composition to those on the original building.
 - Choose a color and finish that matches or blends with those of the historic building.
 - Do not use a material with a composition that will impair the structural integrity and visual character of the building.
 - Do not use a faux stucco application.
6. **6.14** Design a roof of an addition to be compatible with the existing historic building.
 - Design a roof shape, pitch, material and level of complexity to be similar to those of the existing historic building.
 - Incorporate overhanging exposed rafters, soffits, cornices, fascias, frieze boards, moldings or other elements into an addition that are generally similar to those of the historic building.

- Use a roofing material for an addition that matches or is compatible with the original historic building and the district.
7. **6.15** Design roofs such that the addition remains subordinate to the existing historic buildings in the district.
- Where possible, locate a dormer or skylight on a new addition in an inconspicuous location.
 - In most cases, match a roof and window on a dormer to those of the original building.
8. **6.16** Design doors and doorways to an addition to be compatible with the existing historic building.
- If a historic door is removed to accommodate the addition, consider reusing it on the addition.
 - Design a door and doorway to be compatible with the historic building.
 - Use a door material that is compatible with those of the historic building and the district.
 - Use a material with a dimensionality (thickness) and appearance similar to doors on the original historic building.
 - Design the scale of a doorway on an addition to be in keeping with the overall mass, scale and design of the addition as a whole.
9. **6.18** Design a new porch to be compatible with the existing historic building.
- Design the scale, proportion and character of a porch addition element, including columns, corner brackets, railings and pickets, to be compatible with the existing historic residential structure.
 - Match the foundation height of a porch addition to that of the existing historic structure.
 - Design a porch addition roofline to be compatible with the existing historic structure. However, a porch addition roofline need not match exactly that of the existing historic building. For example, a porch addition may have a shed roof.
 - Use materials for a porch addition that are appropriate to the building.
 - Do not use a contemporary deck railing for a porch addition placed at a location visible from the public street.
 - Do not use cast concrete steps on façades or primary elevations.
10. **6.19** Design piers, foundations and foundation infill on a new addition to be compatible with those on the historic building.
- Match the foundation of an addition to that of the original.
 - Use a material that is similar to that of the historic foundation.
 - Match foundation height to that of the original historic building.
 - Use pier foundations if feasible and if consistent with the original building.
 - Do not use raw concrete block or wood posts on a foundation.
11. **6.20** Use details that are similar in character to those on the historic structure.
- Match a detail on an addition to match the original historic structure in profile, dimension and material.
 - Use ornamentation on an addition that is less elaborate than that on the original structure.
 - Use a material for details on an addition that match those of the original in quality and feel.
 - Match the proportions of details on an addition to match the proportions used on the original historic structure.
12. **6.21** Design a window on an addition to be compatible with the original historic building.

- Size, place and space a window for an addition to be in character with the original historic building.
- If an aluminum window is used, use dimensions that are similar to the original windows of the house. An extruded custom aluminum window approved by the NPS or an aluminum clad wood window may be used, provided it has a profile, dimension and durability similar to a window in the historic building.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The historic structure at 204 S. Dearborn Street is a contributing resource within the Church Street East Historic District. The application under review includes the construction of a new rear addition.

The *Guidelines* call for the placement of an addition to an existing historic structure to appear subordinate to the main structure. The total footprint of the proposed addition and porch, 681 sf, is approximately 80% of the building's current footprint (approximately 839sf). However, the massing created by the original building's upper half-story (for a total of 1380 sf of living space) allows for a one-story extension, placed at the rear, without visually disrupting the building's historic massing. The scale and rhythm of the proposed addition communicates with the original structure in its preservation of consistent ceiling and floor heights, traditional fenestration patterns, and solid-to-void ratios. (6.10,6.11, 6.14,6.15)

The *Guidelines* state that an addition should be clearly differentiated, either by a physical break or an alteration in roofline. (6.12) Although the proposed addition would extend from a non-historic addition, the earlier addition was built on the footprint of an original rear projection. Thus, it may be advisable to either retain the existing corner boards or add similar vertical pieces on the north and south elevations to distinguish the historic massing from the new addition.

The proposed full-width rear porch integrated under the addition's gabled roof, the use of materials and elements such as railings and pickets which echo those of the original front porch, and the matching foundation height all serve to create compatibility between the new porch and this historic workman's cottage. (6.18)

The materials, finishes, and details proposed for exterior walls, porch, roof, fenestration, and foundation of the addition match or complement those of the original historic structure, maintaining its architectural integrity and visual character. (6.13, 6.16, 6.19-6.21)

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Ernest Philon, Ms. Veronica Philon, and Mr. Donald Johnson were present to discuss the application. M. Philon explained that the purpose of the project was to create more needed space at the rear of the dwelling.

No one from the public came forward to speak for or against the application. No written comments were received.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Catarina Echols asked the applicant if the addition's materials would match the existing materials.

Mr. Philon replied that they would.

Ms. Echols asked if windows would be reused.

Mr. Johnson replied that one new window would be installed on the rear elevation and on the right side of the addition.

Ms. Roselius asked if the rotten window is located on the c. 1980s addition.

Mr. Johnson replied that the window is on the original portion of the house.

Mr. McNair asked the applicant if there was a plan to distinguish the new addition with a vertical element, explaining that this is best practice to denote historic portions from later additions.

Mr. Johnson was amenable.

Ms. Davis asked the applicant what material is proposed for the porch columns.

Mr. Johnson replied that wood would be used.

FINDING FACTS

Ms. Davis moved that, based on the evidence presented in the application, the Board finds the facts in the Staff's report of the application, as written.

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Blackwell moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, the application does not impair the architectural or historic character of the property or the district and should be granted a COA, pending the use of a vertical board to distinguish the new addition.

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



Agenda Item #3

Certified Record 2024-45-CA

DETAILS

Location:

1555 Dauphin Street

Summary of Request:

Replace front porch columns with fiberglass columns of similar design

Applicant (as applicable):

Nunez M Construction, LLC.

Property Owner:

Jane Inge

Historic District:

Old Dauphin Way

Classification:

Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The existing columns show signs of deterioration and loss of structural integrity.
- The proposed replacement columns generally match the dimensions of the existing with the exception of a lack of tapering seen on the existing columns.
- The fiberglass material of the proposed replacement columns could be considered an acceptable substitute material.

Report Contents:

Property and Application History	2
Scope of Work	2
Applicable Standards	2
Staff Analysis	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.”

The frame structure at 1555 Dauphin Street is a two-story American Foursquare dwelling with a hip roof with wide overhangs and exposed rafters that shelters two porches. A first-story porch extends past the façade on the east and wraps around the side one bay deep. The two-bay second-story porch has a molded handrail. Both porches are supported by slightly tapered Tuscan columns.

Historic Development property files indicate that the existing home was constructed c. 1911 for William A. Douglas, a banana importer, replacing an earlier small frame cottage. Around 1990 alterations were carried out to the rear of the house, and a two-story rear addition was constructed, along with a new carport and connecting breezeway. A masonry wall and gate were installed along the east and south lot lines in 2014.

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

SCOPE OF WORK

Remove and replace all existing porch columns (eight in total).

- a. The proposed replacement columns would retain the Tuscan profile of the existing columns, including the base and capital.
- b. The new columns would generally match the dimensions of the existing first-floor porch columns; however, they would not taper as the existing columns do.
- c. Dimensions: The proposed new columns would sit on a square base which would measure 12' -6 5/8" wide by 3 3/8" high. The shaft would have a diameter of 14" and would measure 10'-0" high.
- d. The original columns are wood, whereas the proposed replacements would be fiberglass.
- e. The new columns would be painted to match existing.

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

1. **5.17** Preserve historic stylistic and architectural details and ornamentation.
 - Preserve storefronts, cornices, turned columns, brackets, exposed rafter tails, jigsaw ornaments and other key architectural features that are in good condition.
 - Retain historic details and ornamentation intact.
 - Retain and treat exterior stylistic features and examples of skilled craftsmanship with sensitivity.
 - Repair historic details and ornamentation that are deteriorated.
 - Employ preventive maintenance measures such as rust removal, caulking and repainting.

- Minimize damage to historic architectural details when repairs are necessary.
 - Document the location of a historic feature that must be removed and repaired so it may be repositioned accurately.
 - Patch, piece-in, splice, consolidate or otherwise upgrade deteriorated features using recognized preservation methods.
 - Stabilize or fix isolated areas of damage using consolidants. Epoxies and resins may be considered for wood repair.
 - Protect significant features that are adjacent to the area being worked on
2. **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.
 - A measured drawing may be required in these instances to recreate missing historic details from photographs.
 - Do not apply architectural details that were not part of the original structure. For example, decorative mill work should not be added to a building if it was not an original feature. Doing so would convey a false history.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The property under review is a contributing structure the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The subject application seeks approval to replace eight wood round tapered porch columns – five on the first story and three on the second story – with eight new fiberglass round non-tapered columns.

The *Guidelines* state that historic architectural features and elements should be preserved, and repairs should be carried out to deteriorated or damaged areas, instead of replacement. However, they specify that when repair is not possible, replacement features should match the original in profile, dimension, and material. Photographic and visual evidence show that some of the porch columns have significantly deteriorated in areas that are integral to the structural soundness of the column and the front porch. The proposed replacement columns would match the Tuscan profile expressed by the existing columns. (5.17, 5.19) Although they would match the existing columns' height on the first and second stories, the replacement columns lack the slightly tapered design of the original. Further, the second-story columns are slightly smaller in diameter. The taper feature and the pairing of a wider column on a first-story with a narrower column on a second-story is exhibited on surrounding historic structures of a similar period as the subject dwelling, both in the immediate vicinity and throughout the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. Replacing the columns on the first and second stories with columns of equal diameter may not be considered an accurate detail replacement as specified in the *Guidelines*. (5.19)

Although the *Guidelines* discuss replacing details with those that match in material, they further stipulate that a substitute material may be considered if it appears similar in character and finish to the original. The use of fiberglass for the replacement columns could be allowable if deemed similar in character and finish. (5.17)

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Ms. Blanca Saravia was present to discuss the application. She shared that the owner of 1555 Dauphin wishes to replace the porch columns with those of a different material and a non-tapered design.

No one from the public came forward to speak for or against the application. No written comments were received.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Roselius asked the applicant why the owner chose a non-tapered replacement column.

Ms. Saravia responded that the decision was based on preference.

Ms. Maurin asked if the first and second floor columns have the same dimensions.

Ms. Saravia replied that they do.

Mr. Blackwell commented that he had no concern with the material change of the columns to fiberglass. He noted the example of the Portier House, where wood columns were replaced with fiberglass columns of the same style.

Ms. Roselius stated that there appears to be a difference in size in the columns from the first floor to the second. She asked if the current taper was 14' to 12" from bottom to top.

Ms. Davis asked for verification that the applicant was stating that the columns did not change in height from the first to second floor.

Ms. Saravia stated that the columns were the same dimensionally on both floors. She added that a non-tapered column would be more capable of holding the weight of the porch.

Ms. Davis asked if there would be a structural column placed inside the fiberglass column.

Ms. Saravia stated that the column would be hollow.

Ms. Davis asked if there was a tapered option available in the same material.

Ms. Saravia replied that there was, but the non-tapered style was requested by the owner.

Ms. Echols stated that there is usually a structural column inside a fiberglass wrap.

Mr. McNair concurred with Ms. Echols, adding that the hollow column need reinforcement.

Ms. and Ms. Echols agreed that the tapering should be continued up through the second story.

Mr. Blackwell asked if the applicant would be amenable to adding a structural element.

Ms. Saravia replied that she would.

Ms. Maurin asked the applicant if it is certain that the upper floor columns are the same size as the first floor columns.

Ms. Saravia stated that she was certain.

Ms. Davis stated that she had no objections to the material change, if loads were verified; but that the columns need to be tapered.

Ms. Roselius stated that the *Guidelines* specify that replacements of key architectural elements be identical to the original in profile. She asked the applicant if the owner would be amenable to a tapered column.

Ms. Saravia stated that she would ask her client.

Ms. Echols added that the tapered style would have the same loading capacity, yet the joining of the column and capital would be much appropriate.

Ms. Roselius told the Board that she would be willing to give approval for a tapered column.

FINDING FACTS

Ms. Davis moved that, based on the evidence presented in the application, the Board finds the facts in the Staff's report of the application, amended to include a fiberglass column tapered to match existing columns.

Ms. Roselius seconded the motion, and it was approved with a 6:0 vote, with Mr. Blackwell abstaining.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

Ms. Davis seconded the motion, and it was approved with a 6:0 vote, with Mr. Blackwell abstaining.

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:39 pm.

These minutes were approved by the ARB at their September 18, 2024 meeting.