



Architectural Review Board Agenda

December 4, 2024 – 3:00 P.M.

ADMINISTRATIVE

The meeting was called to order by the Chair, Catarina Echols, at 3:00 pm.

1. Roll Call

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

Members Present: Cartledge Blackwell, Catarina Echols, Stephen Howle, Stephen McNair, Jennifer Roselius, and Barja Wilson

Members Absent: Abby Davis, Karrie Maurin, and Cameron Pfeiffer-Traylor

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

2. Approval of Minutes from November 20, 2024

Cartledge Blackwell moved to approve the minutes from the November 20, 2024, meeting.

The motion was seconded by Barja Wilson and approved unanimously.

3. Approval of Mid-Month COAs granted by Staff

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

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

MID-MONTH APPROVALS - APPROVED

- Applicant:** Fortified Exteriors, LLC
Property Address: 8 Oakland Terrace
Issue Date: 11/13/2024
Project: Reroof with shingles. Color: Charcoal
- Applicant:** Jesco, Inc.
Property Address: 72 S. Royal Street
Issue Date: 11/13/2024
Project: Patch and repair holes on exposed south brick wall where needed. Paint wall in a cream color to match the façade.
- Applicant:** B & M Roofing
Property Address: 16 S. Monterey
Issue Date: 11/13/2024

- Project:** Reroof with shingles. Color: Charcoal
4. **Applicant:** Langan Construction Inc
Property Address: 101 Ryan Ave
Issue Date: 11/18/2024
Project: Reroof detached garage with shingles. Color: Charcoal
5. **Applicant:** Mobile Public Library
Property Address: 701 Government Street
Issue Date: 11/18/2024
Project: Construct new pedestrian path connecting Washington Street sidewalk to paved plaza at main library entrance. Walking path to be approximately 9' wide. Path material to be one of the following: concrete pavers, fine gravel, or permeable concrete pavers. Existing building spotlights to be updated to LED fixtures.
6. **Applicant:** Stephanie Reaves
Property Address: 12 N Jackson Street
Issue Date: 11/18/2024
Project: 1. Install a 2.6' x 2.6' wood circular sign with raised wood lettering
The sign will include the company logo and will read " The Frenchmen/Les Hommes Français/Mobile, Alabama/Established 2024. Colors: black, gold, and white
2. Install a 24" wide x 48" tall freestanding menu board sign.
7. **Applicant:** Robert Dueitt Construction LLC
Property Address: 910 Government Street
Issue Date: 11/19/2024
Project: Replace rotten siding in-kind where needed. Repaint to match existing.
8. **Applicant:** All Weather Roofing & Construction LLC
Property Address: 7 Gladys Ave
Issue Date: 11/19/2024
Project: Reroof with shingles. Color: Pewter.
9. **Applicant:** The Construction Expert, LLC.
Property Address: 61 S Georgia Avenue
Issue Date: 11/19/2024
Project: Reroof with shingles. Color: Charcoal.
10. **Applicant:** Lush Florist & Gifts
Property Address: 221 Dauphin Street
Issue Date: 11/19/2024
Project: 1. Install a previously approved sign at new location 221 Dauphin.
a. Sign will be wood 4' by 4' hand-painted suspended sign.
b. Sign will be hung from balcony over the store entrance.
c. Sign will read "Lush Florist & Gifts"
11. **Applicant:** Richard Beckish
Property Address: 252 Rapier Ave
Issue Date: 11/19/2024
Project: Replace rotten railing along roof of front porch to match existing in materials, dimension, and profile.
12. **Applicant:** Briskman Law Firm
Property Address: 150 Government Street

- Issue Date:** 11/20/2024
Project: Install a 2' W x 3'H aluminum hanging blade sign and window decal on east storefront window.
 a. Blade sign will read "Briskman Law Firm" beneath company logo, and will be white in color with blue graphics
 b. Window decal sign will measure roughly 20" x 20" and read "Briskman Law Firm/ S. Joshua Briskman, Esq." beneath company logo in black and gold.
13. **Applicant:** Ben Murphy Co., Inc.
Property Address: 160 S. Dearborn
Issue Date: 11/22/2024
Project: Reroof with shingles. Color: Pewter
14. **Applicant:** Professional Roofing & Construction
Property Address: 10 Common Street
Issue Date: 11/22/2024
Project: Reroof with shingles. Color: Weather Wood

APPLICATIONS

1. 2024-67-CA

Address: 112 Bush Avenue
Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Applicant/Agent: Philip Cianciola/SFN Holdings, LLC.
Project: Construct new single-family dwelling
APPROVED - **CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

2. 2024-68-CA

Address: 1662 Government Street
Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Applicant/Agent: Brandon Maye
Project: Replace non-compliant windows; remove inappropriate box casings from front porch columns
APPROVED - **CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

3. 2024-69-CA

Address: 259 S. Broad Street
Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Applicant/Agent: Douglas Kearley on behalf of Blake Collum
Project: Remove aluminum siding; open existing rear porch; fenestration alteration: remove concrete steps, stoop and sidewalk on north elevation: in-kind repairs and replacements
APPROVED - **CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

4. 2024-70-CA

Address: 1011 Augusta Street
Historic District: Oakleigh Garden

Applicant/Agent: Douglas Kearley on behalf of Ryan McKee
Project: Construct a second-floor addition to existing rear wing
APPROVED - **CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

5. 2024-71-CA

Address: 100 Canal Street
Historic District: Church Street East
Applicant/Agent: Micheal Cartoski/FD Stonewater
Project: Apply wall plaque sign to entrance alcove wall on building's west elevation
APPROVED - **CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

OTHER BUSINESS

1. The next ARB meeting will be held on Wednesday, December 18, 2024.



Agenda Item #1

Certified Record 2024-67-CA

DETAILS

Location:

112 Bush Avenue

Summary of Request:

Construct new single-family dwelling

Applicant (as applicable):

Philip Cianciola

Property Owner:

Alex Cocchiola

Historic District:

Old Dauphin Way

Classification:

Vacant lot

Summary of Analysis:

- The proposed structure complies with the Guidelines’ standards for placement and size. The massing and scale are not compatible with the surrounding neighborhood.
- All submitted materials are approvable under the guidelines for new construction.
- The fenestration patterns, details and ornamentations are somewhat consistent with the traditional patterns of development seen in the district, with some deviations that require attention.

Report Contents:

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

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 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 to the Historic Development property files, this property has appeared once before the Architectural Review Board (ARB). A COA approving the demolition of the historic structure on the site was issued in November 2024.

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Construct a one-story single-family dwelling.
 - a. The new structure would be oriented to the west with a 25’-0” setback. Side yard setbacks on the north and south would measure 14-10” and 5’-6” respectively.
 - b. The proposed one-story house would measure 35’-8” wide by 64’-11” deep. An attached garage on the east end would measure 21’-0” wide by 22’-3” deep (along the north elevation).
 - c. The structure would feature a full-width front porch set under a front gable roof. A cross-gable roof would rise behind the porch roof, covering the main block of the house. The measurement to the top of the cross-gable roof would be 22’-9” high. The roof structures would be clad in shingles.
 - d. The house would sit on a 2’-4” high raised foundation clad in brick veneer, topped by a rowlock course. Foundation vents would be regularly spaced along the elevations.
 - e. Fenestration would be comprised of two-over-two vinyl clad windows of varying sizes. A paneled door with upper lights is proposed for the front entry and rear door. One panel door would be located on the east end of the south elevation of the garage. A 16’-0” paneled garage door is proposed for the rear garage. The proposed door materials were not provided.
 - f. Plate height from the finished floor would measure 10’-1” high.
 - g. As represented on the plans, the house would be clad in either Hardie fiber cement or wood board-and-batten siding, with either wood or Hardie fiber cement trim.
 - h. The front porch would span the west façade. It would measure 35’-8” wide by 7’-7” deep and be supported by four (4) tapered columns resting on brick plinths.
 - i. Fenestration would appear as follows:
 - West façade (from north to south)
One (1) 3’-0” W x 6’-0” H two-over-two window; pane-and-panel door flanked by multi-light sidelights and transom above; one (1) 3’-0” W x 6’-0” two-over-two window
 - North elevation (from east to west)
Paneled garage door; one (1) 2’-0” W x 3’-0” H two-over-two window, three (3) 3’-0” W by 6’-0” H two-over-two windows regularly spaced along the center third of the elevation; one (1) 4’-0” W x 1’-0” H two-light fixed window
 - South elevation (from west to east)

Two (2) 3'-0" W x 5'-0" H two-over-two windows, regularly spaced on the western third of the elevation; one (1) pair of 6'-0" W x 5'-0" H doubled two-over-two windows, roughly centered on the elevation; one 3'-0" W x 3'-0" H two-over-two window ; one (1) door located on the south elevation of the garage

East elevation (from north to south)

One (1) 3'-0" W x 6'-0" H paneled door, roughly centered on the elevation

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. **10.5** Visually connect the street and building.

- Maintain or install a walkway leading directly from the sidewalk to the main building entry.

14. **10.6** Install a new sidewalk to be compatible with historic ones in the area.

- Maintain the existing width of neighboring sidewalks.
- Use a traditional sidewalk material as seen in the district if permitted by the City Code. Consult Staff if necessary.

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.
- Do not create a new driveway or garage that opens onto a primary street.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The property under review is a contributing structure in the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The application proposes the construction of a one-story single-family residence on the lot at 112 Bush Avenue.

The submitted plans demonstrate that the proposed structure adheres to the *Guidelines'* directive in regard to placement. The front and side yard setbacks fall within the range and pattern that has been established on the block. (6.34, 6.35)

The *Guidelines* state that massing should be designed to appear similar to that of historic buildings in the district, and that the proportions of the front elevations of a new structure should match those of surrounding buildings. The plans convey an attempt to achieve this objective but fall short, mainly due to the choice in roof design. The scale of the roof creates an appearance of excessive and disproportionate massing. The massive cross-gable in particular is out of step with surrounding dwellings. There are two main roof configurations on the street. The earlier Victorian-era cottages tend to have more complex roof structures with a mixture of hip and gable components that allow for a lower overall roof ridge height. The Craftsman-style dwellings on the street almost exclusively feature simple front-gable roofs with or without more diminutive gabled porches. There are examples of nearby houses with gable fronts that span the width of the façade, like the design under review. Both 124 and 119 Bush Avenue are such examples. When comparing the proportions of these existing structures with the submitted plans, differences in proportions become apparent. For example, 124 Bush Avenue has a similar front width as the proposed house. However, the gable roofline extends the length (or depth) of the entire house, with no taller cross gable rising above it, when looking at the façade.

The scale of the proposed new dwelling better adheres to the *Guidelines*, with some departures. The designs comply with the *Guidelines'* directive to use building, floor, and foundation heights that are compatible with nearby properties. The 2'-4" raised foundation is consistent with adjacent properties and is appropriately distinguished by brick cladding topped by a rowlock course. The proposed ceiling height is also standard for the surrounding area. However, the scale of the roof in proportion to the ceiling heights is out of sync with that of neighboring dwellings. (6.37, 6.43)

The fenestration rhythm on the west façade and north elevation appropriately echoes the development traditions along the street. The north elevation drawing presents an expanse of blank wall (except for a small single light window located near the top plate) on its west end, near the front of the structure. Traditionally, a side wall would consist of more regular openings across the elevation. Additionally, the blank wall is located toward the more visible front of the structure, which, according the *Guidelines*, increases the importance of adherence to conventional patterns. The floorplans show that the small window is intended for a bathroom, with the blank area planned for a front bedroom. To create a more appropriate fenestration rhythm, an additional window could be installed on the north wall of the bedroom. (6.38)

The wood/Hardie siding and shingles proposed for siding, trim, and roofing materials are compatible with those seen on the street and complement the character of the district. However, the vertical orientation of the siding is not consistent with cladding patterns in the immediate vicinity. Vinyl-clad wood is an approved material for new construction windows in the city's historic districts. Windows on the plan are represented as two-over-two, whereas the submitted manufacturer cut sheet shows a six-over-six configuration. (6.39) Although the entry door is compatible with those of nearby historic structures in regard to placement and size, the transom, sidelight, and door with upper lights configuration imparts an awkward expression on the façade. Likewise, the proposed windows in the front gable, the size of the decorative brackets, and other details may need minor adjustments to create a more elevated and cohesive design that better integrates the proposed new structure with the surrounding historic construction. (6.41, 6.44, 6.45)

The *Guidelines* direct that roofs on new construction are to be compatible with nearby buildings in terms of shape, height, pitch, and overall complexity. The proposed roof design, though compliant in material and somewhat in shape, deviates from this guideline as mentioned above. (6.40)

Given the historic context of the surrounding neighborhood, the proposed front porch is a suitable feature for the proposed new construction. The full width configuration, low sloped roof, and tapered supporting columns resting on brick plinths appropriately echoes the craftsman design seen along the street. (6.42)

The site considerations, consisting of a newly paved driveway and walkway would create an area that visually reduces the impact of parking, and would create a connection between the building and the street. (10.5-10.7)

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Christina Wagnmeyer was present to discuss the application with owner Alex Cocchiola on speaker phone to answer questions. Mr. Cocchiola stated that the application involves the construction of a new house on a lot that conforms to the *Guidelines* and is compatible in style and form with neighboring historic properties.

No one from the public came forward to speak in favor of or against the application. No public comments were received.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Annie Allen pointed out that additional drawings were submitted after the Staff report was published, which include alterations to the original drawings that respond to the analysis in the report.

Ms. Roselius stated that she appreciated the changes made to the drawings to correct the stated issues with the design of the house.

Mr. McNair suggested that the transoms above the façade windows are not appropriate and should be removed or altered.

Mr. Blackwell suggested the front windows match the design of the six-over-six windows on the side elevations. He added that if the applicant was amenable to the change, he should consult with Staff to get approval for the new window design.

Mr. Cocchiola was amenable to the alteration.

FINDING FACTS

Ms. Roselius moved that, based on the evidence presented in the Public Testimony, the Board amend the facts to include the revised plans submitted by the applicant, and to state that the discussed façade window changes be submitted for approval by Staff.

Mr. Blackwell 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 would not impair the architectural or historic character of the property or the district, and that the application should be granted a COA.

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



Agenda Item #2

Certified Record 2024-68-CA

DETAILS

Location:

1662 Government Street

Summary of Request:

Replace non-compliant windows; remove inappropriate box casings from porch columns

Applicant (as applicable):

Brandon Maye

Property Owner:

same

Historic District:

Old Dauphin Way

Classification:

Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The porch decking was not replaced in kind with tongue-and-groove boards.
- The condition of the removed windows is unknown, as the work was performed without an issued COA or building permit.
- The proposed window material (vinyl) and sizes not matching the existing openings do not conform to the *Guidelines*.
- Removal of the front porch frieze and balustrade was performed without an issued COA and counter to the *Guidelines*.
- Enclosure of the chamfered front porch posts is not a treatment consistent with the *Guidelines*.

UPDATED SUMMARY

- The updated scope of work includes the installation of an appropriate window which fits the original openings on the more visible elevations.
- Porch decking would remain.
- Enclosures around chamfered front porch posts would be removed.

Report Contents:

Property and Application History 2

Scope of Work 2

Applicable Standards 2

Staff Analysis 4

Attachments 6

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 property at 1662 Government Street is a c. 1905 two-story frame Folk Victorian style house with complex massing and a full-width front porch. The 1925 Sanborn map shows the dwelling originally was L-shaped with a two-story porch infilling in the rear void. A one-story frame garage existed behind the house, in the same general location as the existing carport. A photo appearing to date from the 1940s or 1950s in the Historic Development Department’s file shows the rear porch extant, but it was fully enclosed as living space at an unknown date. A later one-story shed-roofed porch on the rear (north) elevation was enclosed at an unknown date. A photo of similar vintage (1940s/1950s) shows the front porch bordered by a railing with balusters, and 2007 through 2023 Google Street Views photographs show the front porch enclosed by a plain railing and frieze suspended from the cornice between chamfered post supports.

This property appeared three times before the Old Dauphin Way Review Board (ODWRB). In September 1990, a COA (Certificate of Appropriateness) was granted to perform repairs on the garage. The ODWRB approved repair/replacement of the front porch decking with 1”x4” tongue-and-groove boards in October 1995. In October 2024, an after-the-fact application was presented to the Board that included inappropriate alterations. This application was tabled with a directive to resubmit.

SCOPE OF WORK

ORIGINAL SCOPE OF WORK

1. Replace all porch decking with plain 1’x4” boards.
2. Replace all windows except beneath front porch with vinyl types.
 - a. The windows being installed are one-over-one ViWinTech Shoreline 2150 Series DP-50 windows.
 - b. To fill the entire original openings, the window sashes are supplemented by wide horizontal mullions with single light “transoms” above.
3. Enclose chamfered front porch supports with 1"x8" wood to square with plain bases and capitals.
4. Remove porch frieze and balustrade.

UPDATED SCOPE OF WORK

1. Porch decking would remain.
2. Remove enclosures on existing chamfered front porch supports and retain.
3. Replace previously installed inappropriate vinyl windows and transoms on the east and west elevations of the original block of the house with one-over-one aluminum clad window which would fit the openings. Vinyl windows and transoms installed on the later additions would remain.

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 materials.
 - Remove only those materials which are deteriorated and beyond reasonable repair.
2. **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.
3. **5.19** Where repair is impossible, replace details and ornamentation accurately.
- When replacing historic materials, 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.
4. **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.
5. **5.21** When historic windows are not in a 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.

6. **5.22**

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)

7. **6.5** Repair a porch in a way that maintains the original character.
8. **6.6** If replacement is required, design it to reflect the time period of the historic structure.
- Replace a historic porch element to match the original.
 - Use replacement materials and elements that are appropriate to the style, texture, finish, composition, and proportion of the historic structure.
 - Match the balustrade of a house to the design and materials of the porch.
 - Do not completely replace an entire porch or element unless absolutely necessary. Only replace the element or portion of an element that requires replacement.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The house at 1662 Government Street is a contributing resource within the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The application under review seeks after-the-fact approval for porch decking replacement, replacement of all but three (3) windows with vinyl sashes, the removal of the porch balustrade and frieze, and the enclosure of chamfered porch posts with 1"x8" boards.

In September 2024, the Historic Development office received a call from a member of the public reporting that the windows at the subject property were being replaced without the issuance of a COA. Upon visiting the property, staff discovered that, in addition to window replacements, the porch decking, balustrade, and trim had been removed, and the chamfered porch posts were boxed within 1"x8" boards. The work in question was not authorized by a building permit. A Stop Work Order was issued, and the homeowner was instructed to apply for a COA.

The *Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts (Guidelines)* instruct that historic building materials should be preserved through repair; only those materials not in reasonably repairable condition should be removed. (5.4, 5.20) The *Guidelines* further state, "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." (5.20) The condition of the front porch decking and the removed windows is not known and cannot be ascertained as there is no known documentation of such.

The front porch decking was previously replaced in 1995, per the issued COA. Although the current design guidelines were adopted in 2016, their instruction to replace existing historic materials with those matching the original in profile, dimension, and material appears to have been specified in the COA's scope of work. (5.19) The recently replaced decking was not historic, but the COA issued almost 30 years ago specified 1"x4" tongue-and-groove boards. The decking now in place is not consistent with the previously approved decking, which would have been appropriate for a house of the subject property's vintage.

The *Guidelines* instruct that unrepairable historic windows should only be replaced with windows that match the design of the originals (5.21), and historic materials in general, should match the original in profile, dimension, and material. (5.19) "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." Vinyl windows are expressly considered unacceptable in Mobile's historic districts. (5.22) The replacement vinyl windows currently installed in fifteen (15) of the house's 31 windows do not match the existing, historic windows in light configuration, size, or material.

The front porch frieze and balustrade have been removed, and the chamfered wood porch posts have been boxed with 1"x8" boards. Regarding stylistic elements and ornamentation in general, the *Guidelines* clearly state that historic stylistic and architectural details and ornamentation are to be preserved. "Preserve storefronts, cornices, turned columns, brackets, exposed rafter tails, jigsaw ornaments, and other key architectural features that are in good condition." (5.17) Because no application for a COA was made prior to the frieze and balustrade being removed and the porch posts being boxed, there was no opportunity to ascertain the condition of those elements. The *Guidelines* instruct that porch repairs should be conducted such that the porch's original character is preserved. (6.5) Further, porch elements should not be replaced unless absolutely necessary. (6.6) The work completed on the porch thus far appears to contravene the *Guidelines*.

UPDATE TO APPLICATION

This application was reviewed by the ARB at their October 16th meeting. The application was tabled, and the applicant was instructed to meet with Staff in order to submit a new application which addressed how the

inappropriate window installation would be resolved, along with the front porch decking, and columns. It was further emphasized that the current scope of work would require design drawings.

The updated scope of work, listed above, would result in the retention of the existing porch decking and columns. One-over-one aluminum clad windows that would fit the original window openings (no specific dimensions were provided) would be installed on the original main block of the dwelling. The aluminum clad material is an approvable window material. The one-over-one light configuration is also appropriate as, though not original, the building historically had windows with this configuration. (5.22)

The vinyl windows and transoms previously installed would remain on the less visible east and west elevations of the rear (north) later additions and enclosed porch. These windows would also remain across the rear (north) elevation, which cannot be seen from the street. Windows that have not yet been removed on the rear elevation would be retained and repaired.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Brandon Maye was present to discuss the application. He stated that he is replacing the vinyl windows on all elevations with aluminum clad wood windows, apart from those on the rear enclosed porch and northern end of east and west elevations.

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Roselius inquired about reinstalling the decorative trim on the front porch.

Meredith Wilson pointed out that Staff had discovered that historically, the house did not have the decorative trim to which Ms. Roselius was referring.

Ms. Roselius asked if the new windows would have simulated divided lights. Mr. Maye replied that they would.

Ms. Echols asked if the newly installed transoms would be removed and if the new windows would fit the existing openings. Mr. Maye replied that the transoms would be removed and that the new windows would fit the openings.

Mr. Maye's window installer spoke to the Board, explaining that the new windows would be part of a kit that would not disrupt the trim.

FINDING FACTS

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

Mr. McNair 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 would not impair the architectural or historic character of the property or the district, and that the application should be granted a COA.

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



Agenda Item #3

Certified Record 2024-69-CA

DETAILS

Location:

259 S. Broad Street

Summary of Request:

Remove aluminum siding; open existing rear porch; fenestration alterations; remove concrete steps, stoop and sidewalk on north elevation; in-kind repairs and replacements

Applicant (as applicable):

Douglas Kearley

Property Owner:

Blake Collum

Historic District:

Oakleigh Garden

Classification:

Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- Proposed work is predominantly in-kind repairs and replacements which comply with the *Guidelines* and can be approved at the Staff level.
- The proposed fenestration alterations establish an appropriate rhythm across the elevations. The replacement windows and door conform with the *Guidelines* in regard to placement, size, profile, and material. In certain cases, existing windows are being relocated and reused on the structure.

Report Contents:

Property and Application History..... 2
 Scope of Work..... 2
 Applicable Standards 3
 Staff Analysis 4
 Attachments 5

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 259 S. Broad Street is a c. 1900 hipped roof raised framed cottage with Victorian detailing. The four-bay façade consists of a gable roof bay window on the north end and a front porch spanning the three southern bays, supported by turned posts with carved decorative brackets. The current structure is square with a narrow rear projection. The 1904 Sanborn shows a more vernacular form on the site, consisting of a narrow and deep rectangular block with an offset rear projecting wing punctuated by an open porch running along the length of its south elevation. The subsequent 1924 overlay depicts a form more closely resembling the present structure. The rear wing with open porch matches that of the 1904 design. It is likely that the house was remodeled to resemble its neighbor to the south at 261 S. Broad, which also consists of a bay window on the north end of the façade, and a front porch to the south. Over time, the house has undergone extensive alterations such as the application of aluminum siding, the enclosure of the rear wing porch, window alterations, and the addition of a shed roof porch on the east elevation.

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

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Remove aluminum siding. Repair or replace wood siding to match existing.
2. Open existing porch on south elevation of rear projection.
3. Carry out the following fenestration alterations:

West façade

- Remove door on north end of porch and install a new wood window. Replace entry door with salvaged wood door.

South elevation of main block

- Close two (2) small openings with wood siding to match existing.

South elevation of rear projection

- Install three (3) pairs of 2'-6" wide by 6'-8" high aluminum clad wood multi-light French doors, evenly distributed across the south elevation of rear projection.

North elevation of main block

- Remove (2) and relocate windows on north elevation as shown on submitted plans. Openings would be filled with wood siding to match existing. The relocation would result in four (4) two-over-two windows dispersed across the elevation with three grouped toward the east end and one located toward the west end (as seen on submitted plans).
- Remove door and small window associated with existing concrete stoop and steps (also to be removed).

North elevation of rear projection

- Remove existing door on east end of elevation and replace with new two-over-two window to match existing windows.
- Remove two (2) existing two-over-two windows located on the centered projecting bay along the elevation. Install two (2) two-light aluminum clad wood windows and fill remainder of opening with wood siding to match existing (as seen on submitted plans)

- Close existing small opening and remove water heater closet located on recessed bay at the west end of the projection.

East elevation of main block

- Remove two (2) existing windows. Install one (1) 2'-0" x 2'-0" window centered on the bay.

East elevation of rear projection

- Remove existing window and door. Openings would be filled with wood siding to match existing. Install one (1) multi-light wood door north of existing door opening.

4. Repair and restore existing wood windows.
5. Remove doors on south elevation and replace with salvaged wood door.
6. Repair or replace wood cornice, front porch columns, railings and brackets to match existing.
7. Remove concrete steps and stoop on north elevation.

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. **5.5** Preserve and restore the visibility of original historic materials.
 - Consider removing later covering materials that have not achieved historic significance.
 - Once a non-historic siding is removed, repair the original, underlying material.
 - Carefully remove a later stucco finish if the process does not damage the underlying original building material if possible.
 - Do not remove a later stucco covering if the process may damage the underlying original building material. Test the stucco to assure that the original material underneath will not be damaged.
 - Do not cover or obscure original building materials.
3. **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.
4. **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.
5. **5.15** Repair or replace a damaged historic door to maintain its general historic appearance.
 - Replacements should reflect the age and style of the building.
 - Use materials that are visually comparable to that of the original.
 - Do not use solid core or flush doors.

ACCEPTABLE DOOR MATERIALS Materials that are the same as the original, or that appear similar in texture and finish to the original are acceptable.

These often include:

- » Wood panel
- » Wood panel with glass lights
- » Leaded glass with lead cames
- » Metal with a painted finish
- » Other materials original to the building

UNACCEPTABLE DOOR MATERIALS Materials that do not appear similar to the original in texture and finish are unacceptable.

These often include:

- » Unfinished Metal
- » Fiberglass or synthetic
- » Wood flush doors

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.

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)

7. **6.5** Repair a porch in a way that maintains the original character

STAFF ANALYSIS

The property under review is a historic structure located in the locally designated portion of Oakleigh Garden Historic District. The application proposes predominantly in-kind repairs and restoration work which are in line with the *Guidelines* and can be approved administratively. (5.4-5.7, 5.15, 5.20, 6.5) Additionally, fenestration alterations are proposed for the north and south, and east elevations.

On the north and east elevations, proposed closures of existing fenestrations openings would be filled with wood siding to match existing. All proposed new windows would be aluminum-clad wood. Removed wood windows on the north elevation would be relocated as shown on submitted plans. On the south elevation of the rear projection, the proposed three pairs of French doors are consistent with the style and rhythm of fenestration of the dwelling, and comply with the Guidelines regarding material, proportion, and profile.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Douglas Kearley was present to discuss the application. He explained the exterior work that was proposed for the project; pointing out that the house used to be a rooming house, and the intent is to convert it back into a single-family residence.

No one from the public came forward to speak in favor of or against the application. No public comments were received.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Echols and MR. Blackwell commended Mr. Kearley for his work.

FINDING FACTS

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

Mr. Blackwell 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. Wilson seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.



Agenda Item #4

Certified Record 2024-70-CA

DETAILS

Location:

1011 Augusta Street

Summary of Request:

Construct a second-floor addition to existing rear wing

Applicant (as applicable):

Douglas Kearley

Property Owner:

Ryan McKee

Historic District:

Oakleigh Garden

Classification:

Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- Proposed addition would match the footprint of existing rear wing.
- Addition would sit to the rear of the main block, slightly higher than the main roof with minimal visual impact.
- Materials, fenestration, details, and design are compatible with the architectural character of the historic structure, and are compliant with the *Guidelines*.

Report Contents:

Property and Application History..... 2
 Scope of Work..... 2
 Applicable Standards 2
 Staff Analysis 4
 Attachments 5

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 1011 Augusta Street, also known as the Percy House, is a c. 1904 frame one-and-a-half story central hall cottage with classical detailing. It is rectangular in plan with a rear wing to the east. This form is depicted on the 1904, 1924, and 1955 editions of the Sanborn maps. Currently, a rear porch, which was enclosed in 2002, runs along the west elevation of the rear wing. This porch is not represented on any historic maps and was likely added in the 1960s when, according to Historic Development vertical files, alterations were made to the property. At this time, dormers were added to each slope of the main block's roof to create living space on the upper floor, when the house was converted into apartments. Apart from the addition of the dormers and alterations to rear including window replacement and the porch addition and subsequent enclosure, the house generally retains its original fabric.

This property appeared once before the Architectural Review Board (ARB) when in 2002 a project to enclose the rear porch was approved.

SCOPE OF WORK

Construct a second-floor addition to existing rear wing.

- a. The proposed addition would be located behind the main block of the structure and would match the footprint of the existing one-story rear wing, with a 6'-0" wide by 23'-0" deep upper porch along the west elevation. The addition would rise 8'-0" to the top of plate.
- b. The addition would be topped by a hipped roof clad in shingles to match existing.
- c. The walls of the addition would be clad in Hardie smooth siding which would match the existing weatherboard siding on the house. A new wood cornice, similar to that on the original house, would be installed along the elevations.
- d. Fenestration would include aluminum clad wood windows and doors.
- e. The proposed porch along the west elevation would be supported by four (4) 6" square wood posts, evenly distributed across the elevation. A 3'-0" high wood railing would enclose the porch between the posts.
- f. Fenestration would appear as follows:

South elevation

No fenestration is proposed for this elevation.

West elevation

One (1) pair of French doors, each measuring 2'-0" wide by 6'-8" high doors, centered on the elevation.

East elevation

Two (2) two-over-two 2'-10" wide by 4'-0" high windows, evenly distributed across the elevation.

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. **6.21** 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 dwelling at 1011 Augusta is a contributing resource in the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. The application under review seeks approval to construct a second-floor addition to the historic rear wing to the south of the structure's main block.

The *Guidelines* call for the placement of an addition to an existing historic structure to appear subordinate to the main structure. The proposed addition would be constructed on the footprint of the existing rear wing. This, along with its placement to the rear of the dwelling creates minimal visual impact, achieving the above-stated standard of the appearance of inferiority. In further compliance with the *Guidelines*, the scale and the rhythm of the proposed addition is congruous with that of the original structure in its preservation of consistent floor heights and roof form, traditional fenestration patterns, and horizontal elements such as the similar cornice board. (6.10,6.11, 6.14,6.15) The retention of the existing cornice on the rear wing would serve to clearly differentiate the historic structure from the second-floor addition. (6.12)

The materials, finishes, and details proposed for exterior walls, roof, porch, and fenestration of the addition match or complement those of the original historic structure, maintaining its architectural integrity and visual character. Likewise, the design and placement of the proposed porch under a hipped roof with symmetrical door placement on the west elevation which mimics symmetry seen elsewhere on the structure provides continuity and harmony in design. (6.13, 6.16, 6.18, 6.21)

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Douglas Kearley was present to discuss the application. He explained the exterior work that was proposed for the project; pointing out that the house used to be a rooming house, and the intent is to convert it back into a single-family residence.

No one from the public came forward to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. No public comments were received.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. McNair asked Mr. Kearley if any windows on the back of the house will be enclosed. Mr. Kearley replied that they would not.

FINDING FACTS

Mr. Blackwell moved that, based on the evidence presented in the application, the Board find 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 proposed application would not impair the architectural or historic character of the property or the district and that the application should be granted a COA.

Mr. Stephen Howle seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.



Agenda Item #5

Certified Record 2024-71-CA

DETAILS

Location:

100 Canal Street

Summary of Request:

Install 48 square-foot wall sign.

Applicant (as applicable):

Michael Cartoski on behalf FD Stonewater, LLC.

Property Owner:

FD Stonewater, LLC

Historic District:

Church Street East

Classification:

Non-contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The proposed new wall sign would be 48 square feet, which, including a monument sign already approved, would bring the total signage area to 102 square feet. This exceeds the 64 square feet allowed in the *Guidelines* per commercial tenant by 38 square feet.
- The proposed location of the wall sign within a recessed entrance vestibule minimizes the visual impact of the sign.
- The proposed sign construction and materials comply with the *Guidelines*.

Report Contents:

Property and Application History 2

Scope of Work 2

Applicable Standards 2

Staff Analysis 3

Attachments 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.

Prior to 1960, the area surrounding the subject property was a densely developed residential neighborhood of mostly one-story frame houses. Urban Renewal projects of the 1960s resulted in widespread demolitions in the area. In 1964, the City began construction of a new Civic Center to the north of the subject property. The area surrounding the subject property functioned as a parking area for the Civic Center from its opening until 2023. That year, construction began on the new district headquarters building for the United States Army Corps of Engineers.

Per the vertical files of the Historic Development Department, the larger parcel, of which the subject parcel was part until recently, has appeared five (5) times previously before the Architectural Review Board (ARB). In November 1983, the ARB approved placement of a commemorative plaque on a brick base at the corner of Claiborne Street and Auditorium Drive (now Civic Center Drive). The installation of a 100' telecommunications tower and construction of a one-story 10'x16' accessory structure on a small parcel to the immediate north of the subject parcel were approved by the ARB in July 1998. The ARB approved the construction of two steel and glass bus shelters located along the Lawrence Street side of the parcel was approved in October 2009. Most recently, the current applicant received approval in concept (square footage/footprint, height of the proposed building, height of the proposed fence, and proposed setbacks) on August 17, 2022. Full approval of the proposed office building was granted on November 16, 2022. In April 2023, the ARB approved the construction of a single-story entrance vestibule along the primary façade to bring the building setback more in line with the surrounding district.

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Install a wall sign within the northwest corner entrance alcove.
 - a. The proposed sign would consist of the USACE castle logo and text "US Army Corps of Engineers Mobile District. The signage area would measure 7'- 3 1/4" wide by 6'-7 1/4" high, for a total of approximately 48 square feet.
 - b. The logo will be back painted on 1"-thick exterior grade acrylic with polished edges.
 - c. The text will be pin mount lettering using 1"-thick exterior grade powder-coated metal with 1/2" standoff to align in the same plane as the USACE logo.

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

1. **11.3** Design a new sign to be compatible with the character of a building and the district.
2. **11.5** New signs are restricted to a maximum of 64 square feet.
3. **11.6** Place a sign to be compatible with those in the district.
 - When placing a new sign on a historic building, locate a sign to emphasize design elements of the historic building façade.
 - Mount a sign to fit within existing architectural features.
4. **11.7** Use a sign material that is compatible with the materials of the building on which it is placed and the district. New materials that achieve the effect of traditional materials and lighting solutions will be considered on a case by case basis.
 - Do not use highly reflective materials for a sign. All plastic faced box signs are not allowed.

- Design a sign to be subordinate to the building façade.
5. **11.8** Where necessary, use a compatible, shielded light source to illuminate a sign.
- Consider direct lighting toward a sign from an external, shielded lamp when possible.
 - Use a warm colored light to illuminate a sign when possible.
 - If halo lighting is used to accentuate a sign or building, locate the light source so that it is not visible.
 - If a back-lit sign is used, illuminate each individual letter or element separately.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the installation of a wall sign with an approximate area of 48 square feet on a non-contributing property located at 100 Canal Street in the Church Street East Historic District.

The proposed sign would be composed of a logo back-painted on clear a clear acrylic panel and a text of powder-coated metal pin lettering. The *Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts (Guidelines)* direct that new signage in historic districts should be “compatible with the character of a building and the district.” (11.3) The proposed sign materials would be consistent with the non-historic and non-contributing nature of the existing building.

The proposed sign area of 48 square feet is within the maximum permitted sign area for tenants of commercial properties in historic districts. (11.5) However, when added to an approximately 54 square-foot monument sign for which a Certificate of Appropriateness was issued May 24, 2024, the total signage for the property would be 102 square feet, exceeding the maximum allowable signage area by 38 square feet. The proposed signage would be minimally visible from the public right-of-way, as it would be set behind a brise soleil within a recessed entrance vestibule and would not front directly on any public street. In addition, the entrance vestibule is set back approximately 250 feet from St. Lawrence Street.

The applicant has already applied for a sign variance with the Board of Adjustment (BOA). The BOA will hear the application at their December 2 meeting.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Griffin Hornyak was present to discuss the application. He noted that the proposed sign will be located on the northwest corner of the building in a partially enclosed entry alcove with minimal visibility from the street.

No one from the public came forward to speak in favor or in opposition to the application. No public comments were received.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Roselius asked where the previously approved monument sign would be located.

Mr. Hornyak pointed out that the sign was not a true monument sign and would be located on the west end of the southern fence.

Ms. Roselius commented that, given the proposed location of the sign, she was not opposed to granting a COA.

FINDING FACTS

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

Mr. McNair 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 would not impair the architectural or historic character of the property or the district, and that the application should be granted a COA.

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

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:31pm.