Architectural Review Board Minutes
August 7, 2024 – 3:00 P.M.

ADMINISTRATIVE

The meeting was called to order by the Chair, Catarina Echols, at 3:09 pm.

1. Roll Call
Christine Dawson, Historic Development staff, called the roll as follows:

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

Members Absent: Cartledge Blackwell and Abby Davis

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

2. Approval of Minutes from July 17, 2024

Cameron Pfeiffer-Traylor moved to approve the minutes from the June 18, 2024 meeting.

The motion was seconded by Jennifer Roselius and approved unanimously.

3. Approval of Mid-Month COAs granted by Staff

Ms. 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. **Applicant:** Felder Services
   Property Address: 920 Conti Street
   Issue Date: 07/09/2024
   Project: 1. Reroof with asphalt shingles in gray.
   2. Repair/replace siding with matching wood.
   3. Repaint in kind. Siding repair and repainting will be on the west, south, and east elevations.
2. **Applicant:** Russell Perkins
   Property Address: 102 Gilbert Street

Issue Date: 07/09/2024
Project: Reroof in kind with shingles in Black.

3. **Applicant:** Thomas Industries Inc
Property Address: 2256 Deleon Avenue
Issue Date: 07/09/2024
Project: Reroof in kind with cedar shakes. Flashing to match existing.

4. **Applicant:** All Weather Roofing and Construction LLC
Property Address: 266 Roper Street
Issue Date: 07/10/2024
Project: Reroof in kind with shingles.

5. **Applicant:** Thomas Latham
Property Address: 12 N. Reed Avenue
Issue Date: 07/10/2024
Project: Repaint house as follows: Body - SW Magnetic Grey; Trim, columns, and windowsills - SW Alabaster; BM Nightfall; Porch decking and stairs - BM Nightfall.

6. **Applicant:** All Weather Roofing and Construction LLC
Property Address: 1567 Bruister Street
Issue Date: 07/10/2024
Project: Reroof in kind with shingles.

7. **Applicant:** M & T Construction and Painting LLC
Property Address: 7 Hannon Avenue
Issue Date: 07/10/24
Project: Repaint as follows. Body and Trim: BLP DeTonti Square Off White; Porch decking: SW Classic French Gray

8. **Applicant:** SGA Design Group
Property Address: 1550 Government Street
Issue Date: 07/11/24
Project: 1. Remove existing Winn Dixie sign in southern bay of east elevation. Repaint underlying EIFS to match existing.
2. Repaint all red areas on the building exterior in SW Dover Sky.
3. Remove existing decorative lighting on northern half of east elevation.
4. Install five (5) wall sconces along the north half of east elevation, per submitted plans.
5. Remove four (4) glazed units in south end of existing multi-light unit in north half of east elevation. Install two sets of sliding aluminum storefront doors with two-light transoms to fill resulting opening, per submitted plans.
6. Repaint previously painted brick veneer.
7. Install shopping cart corral rail to north of new sliding doors.

9. **Applicant:** Chad E. Foster
Property Address: 116 Gilbert Street
Issue Date: 07/11/24
Project: Reroof in kind with shingles in Charcoal color.

10. **Applicant:** The City of Mobile Real Estate Management
Property Address: 200 Government Street

Issue Date: 07/11/24
Project: Call button signage to consist of Mobile "moustache", Mobile, Alabama; Community Affairs; Office of Professional Responsibility

11. **Applicant:** J & J Roofing and Construction, LLC
Property Address: 1717 Dauphin Street
Issue Date: 07/15/24
Project: Reroof with shingles. Color: Rustic Black

12. **Applicant:** His Hands Construction and Remodeling
Property Address: 1003 Texas Street
Issue Date: 07/17/24
Project: 1. Remove rotten siding and replace in-kind.
2. Repaint the exterior to match the existing one.

13. **Applicant:** All Weather Roofing and Construction LLC
Property Address: 1221 Selma Street
Issue Date: 07/17/24
Project: Reroof with shingles. Color: Natural Shadow

14. **Applicant:** Johnathan Twilley
Property Address: 11 S. Lafayette Street
Issue Date: 07/17/24
Project: Repaint exterior white.

15. **Applicant:** Anthony Andrew Saybe
Property Address: 1662 Government Street
Issue Date: 07/18/24
Project: Reroof with shingles. Color: Pristine Black

16. **Applicant:** Tuff Shed Inc.
Property Address: 1209 Selma Street
Issue Date: 07/18/24
Project: Install 20'x22' prefabricated garage on existing concrete pad at the southwest corner of the property.
1. The building will be clad in engineered wood.
2. The front-gabled roof will be clad in standing-seam metal or similar.
3. The two-vehicle overhead garage door will be paneled steel with five lights across the top row.
4. The fenestration of the west elevation will be as follows, from north to south: 3'x3' one-over-one aluminum window; double-leaf steel pedestrian doors; 3'x3' one-over-one aluminum window

17. **Applicant:** Fortress Construction Services, Inc
Property Address: 206 S. Ann Street
Issue Date: 07/22/24
Project: 1. Reroof guest house with shingles. Color to match existing.
2. Repair and replace damaged/rotten siding and trim on main dwelling. Replacement material will be in-kind and painted to match existing.
3. Add additional joists under rear deck to correct sagging decking boards.

18. **Applicant:** Fortress Construction Services, Inc
Property Address: 360 Gordon Street
Issue Date: 07/22/24

Project: Reroof with shingles. Color: Rustic Black

19. **Applicant:** Elizabeth Stevens
    Property Address: 2120 South Cedar Street
    Issue Date: 07/23/2024
    Project: Repair rotten wood on porch and trim. Repaint porch and trim. Color: Benjamin Moore, White Dove
    Replace rotten wood siding on dormers on north elevation (added in 2014) with fiber cement siding. Paint to match existing.
20. **Applicant:** Maye Properties LLC
    Property Address: 1662 Government Street
    Issue Date: 07/24/24
    Project: Paint exterior of the structure.
    Colors as follows:
    Body- Government Street Olive
    Trim- Ft Morgan Sand
    Porch- Bellingrath Green
    Porch Ceiling - Old Dauphin Way Gold
21. **Applicant:** Guy Brothers Roofing Inc
    Property Address: 102 Levert Avenue
    Issue Date: 07/24/24
    Project: Reroof with shingles. Color: Coastal Granite
22. **Applicant:** Wendmark Fence LLC
    Property Address: 1220 Texas Street
    Issue Date: 07/26/24
    Project: 1.Remove existing rotten tongue and groove decking on front porch and replace and repaint in-kind.
    2. Replace rotten lap siding in-kind where needed. Repaint to match existing.

APPLICATIONS

1. 2024-37-CA

Address: 962 Dauphin Street
Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Applicant / Agent: Chad E. Foster
Project: Reroof with Gavalume 26g Tuff Rib metal panels.
WITHDRAWN - **CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

2. 2024-13-CA

Address: 30 Hannon Avenue
Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Applicant / Agent: Cozart Construction on behalf of Hannah Wagner
Project: After-the-Fact Approval: Reframe rear addition, fenestration changes, and install drop siding.
APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS - **CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

3. 2024-39-CA

Address: 218 St. Francis Street
Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street Commercial
Applicant / Agent: Justine Bixler/United Way of Southwest Alabama
Project: Paint exterior brick and trim.
APPROVED - **CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

4. 2024-40-CA

Address: 911 Dauphin Street
Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Applicant / Agent: K.I.M. Kearley on behalf of Historic Restoration Society
Project: Install three-part brick, stucco, and iron gate along Conti Street side of property.
APPROVED - **CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

5. 2024-41-CA

Address: 918 Conti Street
Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Applicant / Agent: Douglas Kearley on behalf of George and Dina Blankenship
Project: Exterior restoration, rear addition, and new driveway
APPROVED - **CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

6. 2024-35-CA

Address: 105/107/109 S. Jefferson Street
Historic District: Church Street East
Applicant / Agent: Figures Investment, Inc.
Project: New construction: three (3) two-story townhouses
APPROVED - **CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

OTHER BUSINESS

1. The next ARB meeting will be held on Wednesday, August 21, 2024.
2. Design Review Committee meetings regarding the following two properties will be conducted immediately following the August 7th ARB meeting. No public comment will be accepted.
   a. 900 Government Street
   b. 406 Wisconsin Avenue

Agenda Item #1
Certified Record 2024-37-CA

DETAILS

Location:
962 Dauphin Street

Summary of Request:
Reroof with Gavalume 26g Tuff Rib metal panels

Applicant (as applicable):
Chad E. Foster

Property Owner:
Robert Ovastrom

Historic District:
Old Dauphin Way

Classification:
Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- Metal is an approved replacement material for roofs in Mobile's historic districts, provided that it is compatible with the scale and architectural style of the structure.
- The subject structure is larger in scale and more formal stylistically than structures that are regularly approved for metal roofs.
- The MHDC holds an easement on the property. Material alterations must be reviewed and approved by the MHDC's Properties Committee. The Committee has reviewed the requested change and does not feel that a metal roof is appropriate to the property.

Report Contents:

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 Department records, the dwelling at 962 Dauphin Street was built c. 1854 by Daniel C. Aldrich. It is a frame two-story side hall townhouse plan. Probably originally fitted out in the Greek Revival style, the high-style Victorian façade and wing, with turned front porch columns, spindle brackets and frieze, was added near the turn of the 20th century (The National Register nomination dates this alteration to most likely c. 1898, citing records from this year indicating building activity at the property). Historic maps reveal the house has changed little in form since its construction.

The property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board.

SCOPE OF WORK

Reroof historic structure with Gavalume 26g Tuff Rib metal panels.

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

1. **5.13** Use new roof materials that convey a scale and texture similar to those used traditionally.

- Use materials that are consistent with the architectural style of the structure.

METAL ROOFS

- If installing a new metal roof, apply and detail it in a manner that is compatible with the historic character of the roof, period and style.
  - Use standing seam metal, metal shingles or five v-crimp.
  - Use metal with a matte, non-reflective finish.
  - Install the roof to have low profile seams.
  - Finish roof edges in a similar fashion to those seen traditionally.

  ACCEPTABLE ROOF REPLACEMENT MATERIALS Materials that are the same as the original, or that appear similar in texture, pattern, finish and color range to the original are acceptable. These often include:
  » Slate
  » Tile
  » Metal when consistent with the period and style of the building.
  » Dimensional shingles (asphalt, fiberglass, cement fiber, wood)
  » Built-up or membrane roof on gently sloping roofs (less than 3:12) where hidden from view » Lead » Copper
  » Other materials original to the building
  UNACCEPTABLE ROOF REPLACEMENT MATERIALS Materials that do not appear similar to the original in texture, pattern, finish and color range to the original are unacceptable. These often include:

» Corrugated fiberglass
» Asphalt roll roofing (unless obscured by parapet walls)
» Built-up membrane roof on steep sloping roofs (greater than 3:12)
» Panel and batten
» Brightly colored metal

STAFF ANALYSIS

The property under review is a contributing structure in the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The application seeks approval to replace the existing shingle roof with Galvalume 26g Tuff Rib metal panels.

In regard to replacing the roof of a historic structure with a new material, the *Guidelines* clearly state that the replacement roof material must be compatible with the architectural style of the structure. (5.13) Although metal has been approved as a replacement material for roofs throughout Mobile's historic districts, these are usually seen on more modest structures such as workman cottages and shotgun forms. The scale and stylistic features of 962 Dauphin Street express a more formal interpretation of Victorian architecture. A metal roof may prove too vernacular in form and incompatible with the more high-style elements of the structure and property. Additionally, the Mobile Historic Development Commission holds an easement on the property, requiring approval by the Commission's Properties Committee for all proposed alterations. In consideration of the subject alteration, the committee is of the opinion that a metal roof would be inappropriate for this property.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Robert Ovastrom and Mr. Chad Foster were present to represent the application. Mr. Ovastrom stated that a metal roof would have a longer life than a shingle roof.

Mr. Bruce McGowin informed the applicant and Board that a preservation easement which requires any changes to the outside of the property to be approved by the MHDC's Properties Committee was placed on the property in favor of the Mobile Historic Development Commission (MHDC) in 2001. He stated that until such approval was sought and acquired, a review of the subject application by the Board would be premature.

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Catarina Echols stated that what is being proposed is not appropriate, explaining that metal panels are not in keeping with the style of the house. She recommended the applicant consider metal shingles, which would be a more appropriate choice, adding that the issue lies with the style of the proposed metal roof, and not so much with the material.

Mr. McNair stated that the proposed roof is more industrial in style and added that the easement protects the building in perpetuity.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor commented that in general, metal roofs not appropriate for the level of style expressed on the subject structure. She added that if the MHDC does not approve the proposed new roof, then the ARB application cannot be considered.

Mr. Ovastrom asked if the property's commercial zoning makes difference. Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor responded that it does not.

The application was withdrawn.

Agenda Item #2
Certified Record 2024-13-CA

DETAILS

Location:
30 Hannon Avenue

Summary of Request:
Revise fenestration plan for south elevation and east entry door.

Applicant (as applicable):
Nicholas Cozart of Cozart Construction

Property Owner:
Hannah Wagner

Historic District:
Old Dauphin Way

Classification:
Contributing

Summary of Analysis (April 17th ARB meeting):

- The replacement of siding was done in accordance with the design *Guidelines*.
- The condition of the removed windows and doors is unknown, as the work was performed without an issued COA.
- The altered fenestration patterns on the north and south elevations are considered inappropriate and do not conform to the *Guidelines*.
- Replacement doors and windows are vinyl, with the exception of the new transom window on the south elevation.
- Vinyl is considered an unacceptable window and door material for Mobile's historic districts.

Updated Summary

- The applicant has submitted revised fenestration plans for the historic addition's south elevation, as requested by the ARB at the April 17th meeting.
- The revised fenestration plan includes one six-over-one aluminum clad sash and two (2) fixed dummy windows represented as closed louvered shutters of unspecified material.
- Although not shown on the plan, the applicant has submitted a cut sheet showing a more appropriate replacement entry door on the east elevation, also requested by the ARB.

Report Contents:

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 30 Hannon Avenue is a frame one-story Craftsman style bungalow with a gable roof which encompasses a full-width front porch supported by boxed columns sitting on a brick knee wall. The dwelling consists of an original rectangular block and a long narrow off-set addition which projects from the south end of the rear elevation. According to Historic Development records, the main block was constructed c. 1920. The addition appears to have been a separate dwelling that was moved to the property. The bungalow with the rear addition is represented on the 1956 Sanborn map and in a 1952 aerial photo. The addition is not present on the 1925 Sanborn map overlay. Therefore, the rear addition was either constructed or moved to this location between 1925 and 1952.

This property has appeared before the Architectural Review Board (ARB) once. In May 2016, a COA was granted to replace a shingle roof with a standing seam metal roof.

SCOPE OF WORK

All work pertains to the historic addition which projects from the rear of the original block of the house.

1. Remove and replace siding on all elevations with 6" wood siding.
2. Fenestration changes

   South Elevation

   a. Remove all windows on the south elevation (five windows) and replace with one four-light transom wood window measuring 40" wide by 12" high, located on the east end of the elevation.
   b. Prior to removal, the fenestration on the south elevation was as follows (from east to west):
      Small six-over-one window, a pair of six-over-one windows, a pair of six-over-one windows.

   North Elevation

   a. Remove all fenestration on north elevation and replace with new vinyl fenestration.
   b. The fenestration pattern on the north elevation that existed prior to the alterations under review is unknown.
   c. The current fenestration is as follows:
      One 1'-6" wide by 5'-0" high one-over-one window; one 1'-6" wide by 5'-0" high one-over-one window; one 2'-0" wide by 3'-0" high one-over-one window; one 6'-0" high sliding glass door.

   West Elevation

   a. Install one one-over-one window, centered on west elevation.
   b. The fenestration that existed prior to this installation is unknown.

   East Elevation

a. Remove entry door and replace with a new vinyl door to fit existing 2'-0" wide by 8'-0" high door opening.

Updated Scope of Work (August 2024)

1. Carry out corrective fenestration alterations.
   South Elevation
   a. Remove four-light transom previously installed on the east end of the elevation.
   b. Install two fixed dummy windows represented as closed louvered shutters, each measuring 3'-0" wide by 5'-0" high, one at each end of the elevation. The material for the dummy windows was not provided.
   c. Install one (1) 5'-0" high by 2'-8" wide six-over-one aluminum clad sash window in the east half of the elevation.
   d. The elevation would appear as follows (from west to east):
   Dummy window located on west end of the elevation; one six-over-one window and subsequent dummy window located on the east end of the elevation.

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

1. **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
2. **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
3. **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.

4. **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.
3. **5.22** When a historic window is missing on a key character-defining wall, use a historically accurate replacement.
   - Historically accurate light patterns shall be employed. Use photographic, physical, and/or documentary evidence for the design.
   - A new window shall be installed in such a manner as to fit within the original window opening and match in depth and filling of the reveal.
   - A double-paned or clad wood window may be considered as a replacement alternative only if the replacement matches the configuration, dimensions, and profiles of the original windows.

   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)

STAFF ANALYSIS

30 Hannon Avenue is a contributing resource within the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The application under review seeks after-the-fact approval for siding replacement and various fenestration alterations to a rear addition.

In December 2023, the Historic Development office received a COA application for exterior work at the subject property. The scope of work read, "Replace existing siding with dutch lap; fenestration changes, and rejoist foundation block work." Staff attempted to contact the applicant to obtain more detailed information in order to review the application and also visited the property to obtain photos for the Staff report. The site

visit revealed that work had already been executed, including re-siding and the removal of all previously extant fenestration on the rear addition. Staff proceeded to contact the city's permitting department as the unpermitted work also included electrical and mechanical. In January 2024, the following inspections failed: electrical, plumbing, and mechanical. Stop Work Orders and Notices of Violation were issued to the homeowner and placed at the property. In February, the workflow notes that subsequent plumbing and electrical inspections failed, and additional Stop Work Orders and Notices of Violations were issued. The failed electrical inspection details that work at the property had stopped, but permits were still needed. In February 21st, the applicant resubmitted an application for a COA to the Historic Development office with plans.

The new 6" replacement wood siding that was installed on the rear addition follows the *Guidelines'* call for replacement materials on non-primary elevations to match the original material in composition, scale, and finish. (5.7)

According to the *Guidelines*, replacement doors should align with the historic character of the building. Although a divided light or panel door would arguably be a more appropriate style, the single light replacement door on the east elevation of the addition (see Photo 3) is not located on a primary façade and somewhat echoes the prairie style divided light entry door on the main façade. However, vinyl is not listed as an acceptable material for historic buildings. Further, the sliding glass door on the north elevation is not compatible with the historic character of the property or district. (5.15)

The *Guidelines* state that intact historic windows should be retained and repaired, preserving elements such as light configuration, frames, sashes, muntins, etc. In cases where windows are not repairable, new windows should match the existing as per location, framing, and light configuration. Due to the fenestration changes having been completed prior to obtaining a COA, no window survey was completed. According to the applicant, the original windows are no longer extant. Therefore, their condition at the time of removal is unknown. The replacement windows do not comply with the *Guidelines'* directive to match the existing location, framing, and light configuration of the original windows. The removal of all windows on the south elevation, leaving a blank side wall with one small, high-wall window in the east corner is not an appropriate alteration. The removal of a traditional fenestration pattern and the established solid-to-void ratio creates an unsuitable contemporary expression on a historic elevation. Likewise, the north elevation, though less visible from the street, has been inappropriately rehabilitated using a contemporary fenestration arrangement such as the pairing of narrow one-over-one windows and the installation of a horizontal sliding glass door. In addition, vinyl is not an approved material for Mobile's historic districts. (5.20-5.22)

Analysis of updated Scope of Work

The newly submitted plans show alterations to the south elevation in response to the Board's suggestions at the April 17th ARB meeting to mitigate the unsuitable renovation carried out at the property. The suggestions included installing a more appropriate fenestration pattern on the most visible south elevation and replacing the entry door on the east elevation with one that is more compatible with both the main block of the house and the added wing.

The original windows on the south elevation had been removed and replaced with 6" wood siding and one four-light transom wood window measuring 40" wide by 12" high, located on the upper east end of the elevation. The new plans propose a more traditional fenestration pattern which includes the installation of two fixed dummy windows represented as closed louvered shutters, and one six-over-one aluminum clad sash window. The new elevation drawings do not reflect the suggested changes for the east elevation's

entry door. However, the applicant has submitted a manufacturer's cut sheet of a multi-light aluminum clad entry door.

The proposed fenestration alterations employ more appropriate window materials, design, size and profile across the south elevation, creating the appearance of a more traditional rhythm which better communicates with the historic addition and the original structure. (5.7, 5.20-22) Likewise, the proposed replacement entry door for the east elevation better reflects the age and style of the buildings, as directed in the *Guidelines*. (5.15) The shutter material needs to be specified prior to making a decision on the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Nick Cozart was present to discuss the application. He provided a summary of the changes that were made to the south elevation of the addition, incorporating the Board's suggestions from the April 17th meeting.

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Roselius stated that at the April meeting, it was discussed that an appropriate solution for the fenestration pattern on the south elevation would include two real and one faux window, which is the reversal of the proposed changes which were submitted. Mr. Cozart stated that what is shown is what his client wants. He added that he could ask his client if they are willing to change, but didn't think they would be willing.

Ms. Roselius explained that the reason for the Board's suggestion of such a pattern was to recreate the traditional fenestration pattern that has inappropriately been removed, adding that the submitted drawings place a dummy window on a bedroom wall where a real window should be. Mr. Cozart stated that there is window on the west wall of the bedroom.

Ms. Roselius further explained the Board's specific recommendations were an attempt to reestablish a regular rhythm on this visible elevation so that it is compatible with the main structure and with what is seen in the immediate vicinity, in effort to bring back the historic integrity of this part of the structure. Mr. Cozart responded that the integrity is there, noting the new siding that has been installed. He stated that this project has taken months with many delays in trying to do what the ARB requests on an elevation that cannot be seen from the street.

Ms. Annie Allen interjected that the progress of the project has been delayed because work was completed without acquiring and permits.

Ms. Echols stated that real windows should be installed where the floorplan allows for windows.

Mr. Cozart asked if he would need to return with an updated elevation. Ms. Echols responded that if the applicant follows what the Board suggests, then the updated elevation could be approved at the Staff level.

Ms. Roselius reiterated that the elevations should read as follows from west to east: real window; Dummy window; dummy window; real window.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor added that the placement needs to be symmetrical across the elevation.

Mr. Cozart agreed to the reconfiguration.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor stated that she understood Mr. Cozart's frustrations with the delays of the projects, but that this Board had nothing to do with that. She advised that in the future, Mr. Cozart review the minutes for guidance in what to do.

Ms. Roselius asked what material was proposed for the shutters. Mr. Cozart replied that they would be wood louvered shutters.

FINDING FACTS

Ms. Roselius 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.

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Ms. Roselius moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, and given the modifications to be made to the submitted plans with Staff approval, the application does not impair the architectural or historic character of the property or the district and should be granted a COA.

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

Agenda Item #3
Certified Record 2024-39-CA

DETAILS

Location:
218 St. Francis Street

Summary of Request:
Paint exterior brick and trim

Applicant (as applicable):
Justine Bixler

Property Owner:
United Way of Southwest Alabama, Inc.

Historic District:
Lower Dauphin Street Commercial

Classification:
Non-Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The proposed painting of the exterior brick veneer is not in conformance with the *Guidelines*.

Report Contents:

PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District was initially listed in the National Register in 1979 under Criteria A (historic significance) and C (architectural significance) for its local significance in the areas of commerce and architecture. The district is significant for its unique character stemming from the high concentration of closely spaced two- and three-story brick buildings and as Mobile's nineteenth century commercial thoroughfare. The district boundaries were expanded in 1982, 1995, 1998, and 2019.

The property at 218 St. Francis Street is a one-story brick veneer commercial building with a flat roof, four-bay façade, and recessed entrance on its south elevation. The National Register nomination gives the building a construction date of c. 1920. However, both documentary and stylistic evidence dispute this date. The 1924 Sanborn Map shows the current lot occupied by a two-story store on the west (northeast corner of St. Francis and N. Joachim) and a large two-story frame dwelling to the east. The two-story store building is also depicted on the 1955 overlay, with a large one-story building to its east (the frame dwelling is no longer extant in this overlay). Aerial photographs reveal a form similar to the extant building's footprint emerging in the 1960s. Further research is needed to determine more a more detailed evolution of the property.

This property has appeared before the Architectural Review Board (ARB) once. In 2020, the Board approved an application for a mural to be painted on the west elevation of the building.

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Paint exterior brick, masonry trim, and metal coping.
    a. Colors would be as follows *(Exterior Color Scheme 2 on submitted plans)*:
    Brick body – Sherwin Williams Westhighland White (7566)
    Decorative brick arches around windows, masonry arch around entrance, metal coping, and decorative brick cornice and dentil molding – Sherwin Williams Gray Matters (7066)

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

1. **7.29** Design changes to a non-historic commercial building to be compatible with the district.
    - Design an alteration to retain a placement and orientation that is compatible with the district.
    - Design an alteration to appear similar in massing and scale with historic commercial buildings in the district.
    - Use building elements that are of a similar profile and durability to those seen on historic buildings in the district.
    - Maintain a solid-to-void ratio on building walls that is similar to those seen on historic buildings in the district.
2. **7.42** Incorporate traditional façade elements in a new commercial structure.
    - Express a bulkhead, display window and transom in a new storefront design as illustrated in "Character-Defining Elements of a Historic Commercial Façade" on page 88.
    - Design storefront components and upper story windows to be similar in height, depth, profile and proportion to traditional downtown buildings.
    - When portions of a storefront are folding, ensure that all of the storefront components are still visible.

3. **7.45** Use building materials that are compatible with the surrounding context.
    - Use brick, true stucco or stone as the primary exterior building material.
4. **7.46** When using masonry, ensure that it appears similar in character to that seen historically.
    - Use brick with modular dimension similar to that used traditionally.
    - Consider using cast concrete details that are designed to be similar to stone trim elements.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The property under review is considered non-contributing to the Old Dauphin Way historic district.

The application seeks approval to paint the brick veneer and exterior trim of the historic (50+ years old) commercial building at 218 St. Francis Street. Painting historic brick generally should not be undertaken as bricks need to "breathe", and painting prevents them from doing so. Although the subject building is not currently contributing to the district as a historic property, it should be considered that, if the district was resurveyed, the building would most likely now be considered historically significant and contributing. The *Guidelines* regarding changes made to non-historic commercial buildings state that they must be compatible with the district, must incorporate traditional façade elements, and must incorporate materials compatible with the nearby context. Specific to masonry, the G*uidelines* direct that changes should appear similar in character to what is seen historically. Although painted trim is a traditional practice seen in the immediate area and in all of Mobile's historic districts, painting a brick façade is not a historically a common treatment.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Ben Cummings was present to discuss the application. He respectfully disagreed with the Staff's analysis, stating that the standards state that changes to non-historic buildings should be compatible with the surrounding district. He noted that he has counted 22 painted brick buildings in the vicinity of the subject property within the district and would therefore argue that painting the brick at 218 St. Francis does not impair the district. He continued that the Staff report stated that brick needs to breathe, and although this may be true for historic brick, the subject building is built of modern brick with weep holes in the walls. He stated that there are paints specifically formulate for use on brick and that this type of paint would be chosen for the project. He asked the Board to approve the application.

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. McNair asked Staff if the building was non-contributing. Ms. Allen stated that this was correct.

Ms. Roselius asked Mr. Cumming if the existing mural would be painted over. Mr. Cummings replied that it would not.

Mr. McNair asked Mr. Cummings if he had considered the product put out by Keim. Mr. Cummings asked if this was a limewash.

Ms. Meredith Wilson clarified that Keim makes a mineral coating which gives the appearance of paint but is not damaging to the brick. Mr. Cummings stated that he has not completed his research on types of paint but is open to recommendations.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor asked Mr. Cummings to expand on the history of the bricks. Mr. Cummings stated that the existing façade was constructed in the 1980s, and that there are two historic buildings behind it, creating an air gap in addition to the weeping holes.

Ms. Echols stated that this changes the perspective.

FINDING FACTS

Mr. McNair 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.

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. McNair moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, and given the modifications to be made to the submitted plans with Staff approval, the application does not impair the architectural or historic character of the property or the district and should be granted a COA.

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

Agenda Item #4
Certified Record 2024-40-CA

DETAILS

Location:
911 Dauphin Street

Summary of Request:
Install three-part brick, stucco, and iron gate along Conti Street side of property.

Applicant (as applicable):
K.I.M. Kearley

Property Owner:
Historic Restoration Society

Historic District:
Old Dauphin Way

Classification:
Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The height of the fence and gate are out of compliance with the *Guidelines*.
- The design is compatible with the architectural style of the historic building on the lot, which is a requirement of the *Guidelines*.

Report Contents:

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."

Construction of the three-story building at 911 Dauphin, originally the Protestant Children's Home, began in 1845 and was completed in 1846. It was designed and constructed by Henry Moffat of Philadelphia. The Greek Revival structure received a cast iron gallery sometime during the mid to late 19th century, and the two rear wings were constructed in 1924 and 1950, respectively. The property ceased operation as an orphanage in 1970 and was listed individually in the National Register in 1973. It is one of fewer than a dozen antebellum orphanages to survive in the Lower South. After being used by Mobile City College, Mobile Business College, and Mobile County Personnel Board, the property was rented to the Infant Mystics Society in 2015. After a period of vacancy, the building and surrounding complex was extensively restored and expanded beginning in 2017. During this campaign, two additions were constructed off the east elevation of the recessed service wing, a new float barn was constructed on the west end of the property, and new paving, walkways and other site improvements were undertaken. The subject building suffered a fire on October 8, 2020. In 2021, a cupola was constructed atop the original orphanage building.

The property has appeared before the Architectural Review Board (ARB) three (3) times. In 2021, plans to construct a copula were approved. In 2017 an application to renew a COA previously issued in 2015 was approved; this application included the construction of two additions to the main building, the construction of float barn on the west end of the complex, and various site improvements consisting of paving, walkways, and landscaping.

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Construct a three-part stucco, brick, and iron gate along the Conti Street side of the property.
    a. The gate would be roughly centered along the length of the existing aluminum fence near the south property line.
    b. The three-part gate would consist of a center architrave and columns flanked by two masonry pilasters. Each part would be connected by iron fencing and would measure 31'-0" in total length.
    c. The architrave would be constructed of stucco with decorative brick, both painted to match the property's primary building. It would rest upon two stucco columns with brick detailing. The architrave would be topped by a decorative gabled brick molding with poured concrete caps. Two (2) antique iron lanterns would rest atop the architrave at the east and west corners.
    d. The architrave would measure 14'-1 1/8" wide and 17'-1 5/8" high at the top of the lanterns.
    e. Each flanking stucco pilaster would measure 2'-1 1/8" wide and be set 6'-4 ½" out from the center architrave and columns. Each would be topped by an antique iron lantern, matching those on the architrave. The height to the top of the lantern would measure 14'- 4 5/8".
    f. 8'-0" high iron fencing would be installed between the pilasters and outer ends of the columns and architrave. A matching 8'-0" high iron gate would be centered under the architrave.
    g. All stucco and brick would be painted to match the color on the building at 911 Dauphin. The stucco would be painted Dover White, and the brick Whole Wheat.
    h. The existing aluminum fence would remain along the south lot line, abutting the gate on its east and west ends.

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

1. **10.2** Design a fence to be compatible with the architectural style of the house and existing fences in the neighborhood.
    - Install a painted wood picket fence.
    - Install a simple wood or wire fence. Heights of wooden picket fences are ordinarily restricted to 36". Consideration for up to 48," depending on the location of the fence, shall be given. A variance might be required. Staff can advise and assist applicants with regard to a variance. If combined with a wall, the total vertical dimension of the wall and fence collectively should not exceed 36," or in some cases 48".
    - For surface parking areas associated with commercial uses, size a perimeter parking area fence to not exceed 48" in height.
    - Install a cast-iron or other metal fence not exceeding 48" in height if located in the front yard.
    - Install a fence that uses alternative materials that have a very similar look and feel to wood, proven durability, matte finish and an accurate scale and proportion of components.
    - Face the finished side of a fence toward the public right-of-way.
    - Based on the chosen fence material, use proportions, heights, elements and levels of opacity similar to those of similar material and style seen in the historic district.

      REAR AND NON-CORNER SIDE FENCES (LOCATED BEHIND THE FRONT BUILDING PLANE)
    - Design a fence located behind the front building plane to not exceed 72" in height. If the subject property abuts a multi-family residential or commercial property, a fence up to 96" will be considered.
    - An alternative fence material with proven durability, matte finish and an accurate scale and proportion of components is acceptable. A simple wood-and-wire fence is acceptable provided it is appropriate to the style of the house.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The property at 911 Dauphin Street is a contributing structure to the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The application under review seeks approval for a three-part gate to be located on the rear side of the lot along Conti Street. According to the applicant, the purpose of the gate is to provide a decorative focal point for the south courtyard and existing fencing along the south property line.

The 8'-0" high iron fencing, along with the posts and architrave, which reach over 17' in height, are outside of the *Guidelines'* height allowances for fences in Mobile's historic districts. However, the *Guidelines* also state that a fence/gate design be compatible with the architectural style of the primary building on the property. The submitted design achieves this standard, and it could be argued that the dimensions of the fence/gate design are essential to bring the design into proportion with the large historic building on the lot and are thereby a component of its compatibility.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Ms. K.I.M. Kearley was present to discuss the application. She described the proposed project, explaining that the fence itself falls within the *Guidelines*' approved heights for fences but that the accents were what exceeded this height restriction. She added that the purpose for the fence is two-fold. One, to create a focal point on the south end of the property which echoes the elements of the building's south elevation, and two, to break up the stretch of aluminum fencing along the south property line.

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Roselius asked if the gate would be operable for vehicles. Ms. Kearley responded that it would be a pedestrian gate which would be opened only for ceremonial occasions.

Ms. Roselius commented that the gate's design was quite beautifu; and that although there were elements that technically stretched outside the dimensions approved by the *Guidelines*, the scale and proportion were in keeping with those of the building and lot.

FINDING FACTS

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

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

Agenda Item #5
Certified Record 2024-41-CA

DETAILS

Location:
918 Conti Street

Summary of Request:
Repair exterior of existing structure; construct a rear addition; construct a carport to the rear.

Applicant (as applicable):
Douglas Kearley on behalf of George and Dana Blankenship

Property Owner:
George and Dina Blankenship

Historic District:
Old Dauphin Way

Classification:
Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- Proposed repairs, replacements, and alterations to the original dwelling comply with the *Guidelines* and meet the requirements of Staff level review.
- Both the proposed rear addition and carport structure meet the *Guidelines'* standards in regards to placement, massing, materials, and design.

Report Contents:

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."

Based on historic tax records, the one-story, wood-frame cottage located at 918 Conti Street was constructed in 1901. The 1878 Hopkins atlas of Mobile shows the subject property and its neighbor with a similar cottage, 920 Conti, as one parcel occupied at that time by a house with an offset rear wing. Tax records show that the property was sold in 1860 by Edward B. Gale and his wife Faustina Bonifay Gale to Josephine Gordon. At some point between 1860 and 1900, the property (still one parcel) had been reacquired by Faustina Bonifay Gale, who sold it to her daughter-in-law Venetia S. Gale in 1900. The 1904 and 1906 Sanborn Fire Insurance (Sanborn) maps of the area reveal the two extant houses on individual lots. Each property included a one-story frame outbuilding located along their shared property line.

The property has appeared once previously before the Architectural Review Board (ARB). In September 2023, an application to move the dwellings at 918 and 920 Conti to a vacant lot on Hickory Street was denied.

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Repair and replace existing elements on exterior of house.
    a. Reroof with either a 5 V crimp metal roof or architectural shingles
    b. Repoint existing brick foundation piers.
    c. Install new framed wood diagonal screening panels between foundation piers.
    d. <u>South façade</u>
        1) Repair existing wood windows.
        2) Repair and refinish existing wood door and transom.
        3) Install a new flat sawn wood balustrade to enclose front porch.
        4) Install new wood skirt across the elevation.
        5) Install new masonry steps and cheek wall to access front porch on the end of the elevation.
    e. <u>East elevation</u>
        1) Remove existing wood siding and replace with cement fiber siding to match existing in size and reveal.
        2) Repair, sand, prime, and repaint existing windows along the elevation.
        3) Remove the historic window opening on the north end of the elevation. Wood siding would be feathered in to fill opening.

    f. <u>West elevation</u>
        1) Repair, scrap, sand, prime and paint existing wood siding.
        2) Repair, sand, prime, and repaint existing windows along the elevation.
        3) Remove non-historic window on the north end of the elevation. Wood siding would be feathered

in to fill opening.

2. Construct one-story rear addition.
    a. The proposed addition would measure 12’-0” deep with a width that matches that of the existing house and would include a den to the east and a rear screened porch to the west.
    b. The proposed addition would be topped by a gable roof which would sit 1’-0” lower than the main dwelling. The roof would be clad in either a 5 V crimp metal roof or architectural shingles.
    c. The new addition would be clad in smooth cement fiber clapboard siding to match existing wood siding in size and reveal.
    d. The proposed addition would sit on a foundation of brick piers matching the height of existing foundation piers. Framed wood diagonal screening panels would be place in between piers.
    e. The addition’s fenestration would include a pair of four-light aluminum clad French doors on the west elevation of the den to access the screened porch. Doors would each measure 2’-6” wide by 7’-0” high.
    f. A brick chimney, which would service a fireplace on the north wall of the den, would project from the rear (north) elevation. The chimney would measure 5’-0” wide and would project 16” from the elevation.
    g. The screened porch would be supported by an 8” square wood column with cap. A 3’-0” high wood railing would enclose the porch, as well as a stoop and five (5) wood steps rising from east to west on the rear elevation. Screening for the porch would be vinyl screen in black finished metal framing.
    h. Five wood steps would rise from east to west to a small square stoop, which would provide access to the adjoining breezeway from the rear porch.
    i. Elevations would appear as follows:
    North elevation: Corner board; chimney; steps and railing; column.
    East elevation: No fenestration is proposed for this elevation.
    West elevation: Porch railing; column; railing (French doors centered on west elevation of den)
3. Construct a carport structure north of the dwelling, connected to the house by a breezeway.
    a. The breezeway would measure 8’-0” deep and would be topped by a gable roof clad in either a 5 V crimp metal roof or architectural shingles. The breezeway would have an 11’-0” ceiling height and would connect the west (rear) end wall of the dwelling and a carport to the north.
    b. The carport structure would measure 21’-4” wide by 26’-8” deep and would include a 17’-0” deep open carport area and a 4’-4” deep enclosed storage room across the north end.
    c. The structure would be topped by a hipped roof clad in either a 5 V crimp metal roof or architectural shingles. The ceiling height would measure 9’-4” high.
    d. The carport area would be supported by eight (8) 8” square wood columns with caps, regularly spaced across the south, east, and west elevations.
    e. The enclosed storage area would be clad in smooth cement fiber siding and accessed on its south side by two flush 3’-0” wide by 6’-8” high painted hollow metal doors, one installed on the east and one on the west end of the elevation.
    f. All trim on the carport structure would be cement fiber.
4. Install a new concrete driveway.
    a. The proposed driveway would measure 9’-0” wide and would extend north from the existing curb cut located on the west side of the dwelling to the west side carport opening.

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. **6.19** 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.
10. **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.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The subject property is a contributing structure to the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The application under review proposes repairs and restoration to the original structure, the construction of a one-story addition on the north (rear) elevation, and the construction of carport.

The *Guidelines* call for an addition to an existing historic structure to be subordinate to and compatible with the main structure in placement, massing, scale, and rhythm. This application achieves these objectives with the placement of the one-story addition to the rear of the property, which does not disrupt the existing massing and scale of the property. The footprint, which would measure approximately 348 sf, would be roughly 26% of the footprint of the historic house. The roof proposed for the addition sits 1’-0” below the height of the existing roof. The breezeway and carport roofs are likewise lower than the original house roof. Foundation and ceiling heights proposed for the addition match those of the existing house. As directed by the *Guidelines*, the proposed addition is differentiated by the alternation in roof height. (6.9 - 6.12, 6.15)

All exterior materials intended for the addition match the original historic structure or are approvable materials for additions to historic structures. These materials include wood siding, cement fiber siding, aluminum-clad wood doors, and cement fiber trim, along with matching brick foundation piers and framed wood infill panels. (6.13, 6.16, 6.19, 6.20, 6.21)

The proposed repairs and restoration to the historic dwelling, along with the new driveway installation comply with the *Guidelines* and meet the requirements of Staff level review. (5.4, 5.6-5.8,5.13-5.15, 5.17-5.20, 6.5, 10.7)

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Douglas Kearley was present to represent the application. He gave a description of the project.

Ms. Alison Henry came forward to speak in favor of the project, stating that this property has been a source of great concern to the community, and it is good to see its rehabilitation in the hands of an architect with an eye for preservation.

No written public comments were received.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. McNair asked if the roof was to be v-crimp or if shingles would work. Mr. Kearley stated that his client preferred a metal roof.

Ms. Roselius asked if a metal roof would be consistent with the street. A member of the audience stated there is one existing house with a metal roof on the street.

FINDING FACTS

Mr. McNair 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.

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

Agenda Item # 6
Certified Record 2024-35-CA

DETAILS

Location:
105, 107, and 109 S. Jefferson Street

Summary of Request:
New construction: three (3) two-story townhouses

Applicant (as applicable):
Jeff Carter on behalf of Figures Investment, Inc.

Property Owner:
Figures Investment, Inc.

Historic District:
Church Street East

Classification:
Vacant

Summary of Analysis:

- The subject block has seen significant demolition.
- All proposed materials are approved under the *Guidelines*.
- The proposed design reflects certain elements of nearby historic structures.
- The proposed foundation is slab-on-grade.
- All exterior lighting would be recessed and is not visible on the submitted elevations.
- No landscape plan was provided.

Updated Summary

- The applicant has submitted revised drawings, as requested by the ARB at the July 17th meeting. Alterations were made to the west, east, and north elevations.
- Alterations were made to the roof height, finished floor height, fenestration arrangement, and cladding material.
- A second-story recessed porch was added to the rear elevation.
- The alterations provide an overall building design which is more compatible with the traditional architectural design, features, and proportions of surrounding historic buildings.

Report Contents:

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 properties at 105, 107, and 109 S. Jefferson are vacant lots and have not previously appeared before the ARB.

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Construct three (3) two-story townhouses.
    a. The proposed structure would be rectangular in shape and would measure 62'- 3" wide by 49'-0" deep. The height of the building to top of the roof would measure 28'-0", with second floor ceiling height from finished floor measuring 21'-0".
    b. The structure would be located on the lot such that the front wall plane would sit 9'-0" back from the west (front) property line. The north and south side yards would measure approximately 7'-7" and 15'-10", respectively.
    c. The façade would be articulated by three (3) gabled roof projections. The first story would be clad in a white brick veneer, the second story in stucco, painted white. A decorative brick string course comprising a soldier bond topped by a rowlock would run across all four elevations and serve to define the division between the first and second floors.
    d. The hipped roof and projection gables would be clad in a shingle to look like slate, or shingles in the weather wood color.
    e. The foundation would be slab on grade and would measure 1'-4" high.
    f. Fenestration: All windows would be aluminum clad and black in color. Each door would be a black iron six-light pane-and-panel design and would measure 3'-0" wide by 7'-0" high.
    g. Elevations would appear as follows.
        1) <u>West façade</u> (from north to south)
        Each townhouse would consist of two bays. The north entry bay would measure approximately 6'-0" wide, and the wider south bay would measure approximately 15'-0" wide, and project approximately 3'-8" forward of the north bay.
        North bay – The first floor would consist of a 3'-0" wide by 7'-0" high iron entry door topped by a 1'-6" one-light transom. Three (3) 5'-6" concrete steps would access each door. A 6'-0" wide black metal awning would stretch the full width of the bay above the entry door. The second floor would consist of as single round four-light window, 2'-0" in diameter, with a 4" wood trim, centered on the bay.
        South bay – The first floor would consist of three six-light casement windows measuring 9'-0" wide by 8'-8" high, centered on the bay. The second floor would consist of three two-over-two windows measuring 9'-0" wide by 5'-9" high, centered on the bay.
        2) <u>East (rear) elevation</u> (from south to north)

First floor – Door under awning, topped by transom and accessed by three (3) concrete steps measuring 5'-6" wide; paired two-over-two windows measuring 8'-0" wide by 6'-0" high; door under awning, topped by transom and accessed by three (3) concrete steps measuring 5'-6" wide; paired two-over-two windows measuring 8'-0" wide by 6'-0" high; paired) two-over-two windows measuring 8'-0" wide by 6'-0" high; door under awning, topped by transom and accessed by three (3) concrete steps measuring 5'-6" wide.
Second floor – Two (2) two-over-two windows measuring 3'-0" wide by 5'-9" high, each pair equally spaced on the south, center, and north bay.

3) North elevation (from east to west)
First floor – two pairs of six-light windows measuring 6'-0" side by 8'-6" high, regularly spaced along the east two-thirds of the elevation.
Second floor – Two (2) one-light fixed windows measuring 4'-0" wide by 1'-4" high, regularly spaced slightly west of center on the elevation.

4) South elevation (from west to east)
First floor – two pairs of six-light windows measuring 6'-0" wide by 8'-6" high, regularly spaced along the east two-thirds of the elevation.
Second floor – Two (2) one-light fixed windows measuring 4'-0" wide by 1'-4" high, regularly spaced slightly west of center on the elevation.

2. Proposed site improvements:
    a. Install a 10'-0" wide rock aggregate driveway south of the proposed structure, in line with existing curb cut. The driveway would extend east to the rear of the property.
    b. Install a rear paved parking area behind the structure. The paved area would encompass the entire open area behind the structure, measuring approximately 81'-6" wide by 37'-0" deep. Five (5) 10'-0" wide parking spaces orientated east to west would be located directly adjacent to the building's rear elevation.
    c. Three (3) walkways measuring 4'-6" (1) and 4'-11 ½" wide would connect the front door steps to the existing sidewalk. In addition, three (3) similar walkways would connect the back door steps to the rear parking area.

Updates to Scope of Work (August 2024)

2. Building would be clad all in brick (the plans state the brick would be white in color).
3. The height of the hipped roof would be lowered. The height of the building would be altered from 38'-0" to 29'-10".
4. The finished floor height has been raised from 1'-4" to 1'-10".
5. A brick rowlock water table would be applied to all elevations to simulate a raised foundation.
6. A second-story rear porch would be added to the most northern bay. It would be recessed under the roof and would be open to the east (rear) and north elevations. The porch would be supported by three (3) 8" wood columns painted white. A 3'-6" high wood balustrade (painted white) would enclose the porch on the east and north elevations.
7. Alterations to previous elevation drawings
    West façade
    The roof pitch of the three (3) gabled projections would be lowered. The height to the top of the gable would be altered from 27'- 5 ½" to 21'-0".
    East (rear) elevation
    First floor:
    a. The profile of the second-story porch would be visible on the north end of the elevation.
    b. A wall clad in cement fiber siding would be visible behind the porch.

c. An entry door (no dimensions or materials were provided) would access the porch from the second-story of the north townhouse.

Second floor:

a. A single fixed six-light widow would replace the paired two-over-two windows measuring 8'-0" wide by 6'-0" high furthest to the north along the elevation. The newly proposed window would measure 3'-0" wide. The height is not specified on the drawings; however, the window would extend from the water table to the same head height as the other first-story windows.

North elevation

First floor:

a. The side profile of the added second-story rear porch would be visible.
b. The two (2) one-light fixed windows measuring 4'-0" wide by 1'-4" high would be replaced with two (2) two-over-two aluminum clad windows in dark bronze. The window would measure 3'-0" wide by 5'-9" high.

Second floor

a. The pair of single fixed six-light windows on the west end of the elevation would be removed. A single six-light window which would measure 3'-0" wide by 8'-5" high would be installed closer to the west end wall of 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. **6.43** 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

10. **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.
11. **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
12. **10.5** Visually connect the street and building.
    - Maintain or install a walkway leading directly from the sidewalk to the main building entry.
13. **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.

14. **10.10** Provide a landscaped front yard for a residential property in a historic district.
    - Maintain a predominant appearance of a planted front yard/lawn.
    - Minimize paved areas in a front yard.
    - Consider using decorative modular pavers, grass and cellular paving systems in order to minimize the impact of hard surface paving where grass or other plant materials are not used.
    - In commercial areas, consider using landscaping to screen and soften the appearance of surface parking areas. Use an internal and perimeter landscaping treatment to screen a fenced or walled parking area.
    - Do not use landscaping to hide a design feature that is inconsistent with these Design Review Guidelines.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The subject properties are vacant lots in the Church Street East historic district. The application under review seeks approval for the construction of three two-story townhouses.

The *Guidelines* state that a new structure should maintain the alignment with the established range of front and side setbacks on the street. This block of S. Jefferson Street has witnessed widespread demolition resulting in the loss of all residential structures previously extant on both the east and west sides of the street. Therefore, there is no established range of setbacks. However, the proposed placement does fall into the setback ranges of existing historic residences along S. Jefferson, one block south below Church Street. Here, front setbacks range between approximately 4'-0" to 12"-0". Side setbacks are also similar to those proposed. Additionally, the proposed setbacks are comparable to those of the remaining historic structures on adjacent lots facing S. Bayou Street. (6.34, 6.35)

The massing of the proposed building – which according to the *Guidelines*, is established by the arrangement and proportion of a building's main block, wings, porches, roof, and foundation – is somewhat out of step with the rhythm of the massing of nearby buildings. The steeply pitched roof and the lower foundation height are visually out of proportion with neighboring historic two-story residences. The scale or size of the building appears compatible with the surrounding structures. (6.36, 6.37)

In regard to the new building's exterior walls and fenestration application, the solid to void pattern present on the façade serves to reflect the traditional patterns of nearby historic buildings. Likewise, the façade's rhythm of windows and doors echoes the fenestration pattern at nearby 803 Government in particular – also a multifamily residence. The use of a door and window pairing on the first floor and the grouping of three windows on the second floor resemble 803 Government's first floor façade and its three-part bay windows on the second floor. The longer multi-light windows planned for the first floor are suggestive of the multi-light sidelights at 106 and 110 S. Bayou, 805 Government, and of the storefront doors at 809 Government. In line with the *Guidelines*, the use of the round window above each entry door on the second floor at 105-109 S Jefferson reads as a modern interpretation of the quatrefoil element at 803 Government, along with the small one-over-one window used in 803's stair halls. Although the rear and side elevations of the proposed structure express a similar fenestration

pattern as those seen on nearby buildings, with multi-light windows and pane-and-panel doors, the walls themselves present as flat surfaces, lacking the dimensionality of the side and rear elevations of surrounding historic structures which consist of projections, recesses, and decorative lintels and sills. Also conspicuous is the lack of building elements, or suggestions of elements, that are seen on nearby buildings such as balconies, porches, columns, and chimneys.
The application of details such as lintels, awnings, a string course, and transoms would help to integrate the new construction design with the character of the district. (6.38, 3.41, 6.45)

The brick and stucco cladding planned for the exterior of the building are common materials traditionally used in the surrounding district and throughout Mobile. However, historically brick would not have been painted. The proposed white paint finish on the brick veneer is not a traditional use of the material or finish. (6.39)

According to the *Guidelines*, the shape, height, pitch and complexity of a new roof should be comparable to those of adjacent historic structures. Hipped roofs are traditionally used throughout the district and are present on adjacent structures such as those at 110 and 106 S. Bayou. The pitches of these historic roofs are lower than the one proposed for the subject building. The combination of a hipped roof with gabled projections can be seen at the previously mentioned 803 Government. However, the main roofline of this historic building has a slighter pitch which sits lower than the gabled projections. This arrangement may be a more appropriate option for the subject design. (6.40)

The submitted drawings express a 1'-4" slab-on-grade foundation. The *Guidelines* state that a raised foundation or simulated raised foundation are to be used for new residential construction in historic districts. The proposed foundation does not appear to conform to traditional residential building practices in the immediate vicinity. A modest modification in height and the application of a simulated water table to simulate a raised foundation would create a more compatible design. (6.43)

The drawings propose three concrete walkways projecting from the west elevation, each of which would lead from the front entry door to the existing sidewalk on S. Jefferson Street, complying with the *Guidelines'* requirement to visually connect a structure to the street. A 10'-0" wide driveway which would lead to a rear parking area is planned for the south end of the property. Both would be paved with rock aggregate. Directing parking to the side and rear of the site conforms with the *Guidelines'* standard to minimize the visual impact of parking. All exterior lighting would be recessed and are not visible on the submitted drawings. The *Guidelines* require a landscaped front yard for residential properties in historic districts. No landscape plan was provided. (10.5, 10.7, 10.10)

Updates to Staff Analysis
Overall, the resubmitted drawings bring the proposed elevations closer into harmony with the surrounding historic architecture. The lowered roof pitch is more compatible with those seen on surrounding historic buildings. The added porch contributes to a more traditional ratio of solids to voids, which is seen throughout the district. Likewise, the raised finished floor height and addition of the water table more appropriately echo the traditional features of neighboring buildings.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Rashawn Figures was present to represent the application. He stated that the new drawings depict the changes suggested by the Board.

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board had no questions or comments.

FINDING FACTS

Ms. Roselius 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.

Mr. McNair 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 does not impair the architectural or historic character of the property or the district and should be granted a COA.

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

The meeting was adjourned at 4:05 pm.

These minutes were approved by the ARB in their August 21, 2024 meeting.