



Architectural Review Board Agenda

January 15, 2025 – 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: Catarina Echols, Cartledge Blackwell, Abby Davis, Stephen Howle, Karrie Maurin, Stephen McNair, Cameron Pfeiffer-Traylor, and Jennifer Roselius

Members Absent: Barja Wilson

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

2. Approval of Minutes from December 4, 2024

Cartledge Blackwell moved to approve the minutes from the December 4, 2024, meeting.

The motion was seconded by Cameron Pfeiffer-Traylor and approved unanimously.

3. Approval of Mid-Month COAs granted by Staff

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

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

MID-MONTH APPROVALS - APPROVED

- Applicant:** Keisha Kaltenbach
Property Address: 1008 Elmira Street
Date of Approval: 11/28/2024
Project: Repair or replace siding in-kind where needed. Repair windows and doors in-kind to secure building. Repair/patch roof with in-kind materials where needed.
- Applicant:** Pigeons on the Roof LLC
Property Address: 305 S Ann St
Date of Approval: 11/29/2024
Project: Reroof in-kind with H architectural shingles. Color: Charcoal

3. **Applicant:** Chad Comingore
Property Address: 106 S Georgia Ave
Date of Approval: 11/29/2024
Project: Install a 6' arched black aluminum open fence and gate which will extend across the side yard.
1. The fence will project from the western end of the south elevation of the structure and extend across the southern side yard, abutting an existing wooden fence.
 2. The fence will consist of the following (from north to south):
2' of open aluminum fencing; 13' arched gate.
4. **Applicant:** Marie Dyson
Property Address: 203 S Dearborn St
Date of Approval: 11/30/2024
Project: Reroof in-kind with architectural shingles. Color: Charcoal
5. **Applicant:** Jeffrey Nicely
Property Address: 1012 Texas St
Date of Approval: 12/02/2024
Project:
1. Install a 36" wood spindle handrail on front porch. Paint white.
 2. Paint exterior. Color to be as follows:
Body -BLP Detonti Square Off White
Trim - Oakleigh Place Ivory
Doors - Ashland Place Green
6. **Applicant:** Integrity Roofing & Contracting LLC
Property Address: 251 Marine Street
Date of Approval: 12/02/2024
Project: Reroof with shingles. Color: Black
7. **Applicant:** Reyner Construction LLC
Property Address: 903 Palmetto Street
Date of Approval: 12/02/2024
Project:
1. Replace ten (10) vinyl windows with two-over-two aluminum-clad wood windows to fit original openings. Install wood trim to match original.
 2. Replace one (1) vinyl casement window with two-light aluminum-clad wood window to fit opening. Install wood trim to match original.
 3. Install one (1) two-light aluminum clad wood window in east facing gable. Window would measure 1'-6 2/3" W x 1' - 7" H

- 4. Remove inappropriate siding on façade and replace with wood lap siding to match existing. Paint to match existing.
 - 5. Repair rear exterior door in-kind.
8. **Applicant:** T–Roys Roof Services LLC
Property Address: 70 S Georgia Avenue
Date of Approval: 12/05/2024
Project: Reroof in-kind with shingles. Color: Weather Wood
9. **Applicant:** Guy Brothers Roofing, Inc
Property Address: 550 Congress St
Date of Approval: 12/06/2024
Project: Reroof in kind with 60 MIL TPO roof system.
10. **Applicant:** Tom Thomas
Property Address: 1744 Hunter Ave
Date of Approval: 12/06/2024
Project: Extend rear deck on west end of rear elevation per submitted plans. Deck size will increase from 13 ft. x 18 ft to 13 ft. x 26 ft. The existing 13 ft. x 18 ft. pergola will be extended to cover the new deck addition. Existing railings will be extended around the new deck addition. All materials will match existing.
11. **Applicant:** Ashley Hallford
Property Address: 757 Government St
Date of Approval: 12/06/2024
Project:
 - 1. Install a 3' x 4' aluminum wall mounted sign, centered on the north façade.
 - a. Sign will read "Deerfish Distillery: Distilling Co. Est. 2024" with company logo.
 - 2. Install a 2'-8" x 2'-8" aluminum freestanding sign at northwest corner of the lot.
 - a. Sign will read " Deerfish Distilling Co. 757 Government Street" with company logo.
12. **Applicant:** All Weather Roofing and Construction, LLC
Property Address: 212 Grand Blvd
Date of Approval: 12/09/2024
Project: Reroof with shingles. Color: Oyster Grey
13. **Applicant:** Rachele Reis
Property Address: 1419 Monroe Street
Date of Approval: 12/09/2024
Project: Reroof with shingles. Color: Oyster Grey
14. **Applicant:** Complete Roofing LLC (Escrow)
Property Address: 60 N Reed Avenue
Date of Approval: 12/09/2024

15. **Project:** Reroof with shingles. Color: Charcoal Black
Applicant: Rellim Contracting LLC
Property Address: 200 Government Street
Date of Approval: 12/09/2024
16. **Project:** Reroof with TPO roofing system.
Applicant: Pigeons on the Roof LLC
Property Address: 18 N Reed Ave
Date of Approval: 12/10/2024
17. **Project:** Reroof with shingles. Color: Old English Pewter
Applicant: Mobile Bay Roofing LLC
Property Address: 1117 Church Street
Date of Approval: 12/11/2024
18. **Project:** Reroof with shingles. Color: Burnt Sienna
Applicant: Raintight Roofing and Construction LLC
Property Address: 158 Congress St
Date of Approval: 12/11/2024
19. **Project:** Reroof with shingles. Color: Gray
Applicant: Pools on the Gulf LLC
Property Address: 1564 Old Shell Road
Date of Approval: 12/11/2024
Project: Construct a rectangular inground gunite swimming pool
1. The pool will sit approximately 30' northwest of the main residence and will measure 15'-0" wide by 30'-0" deep.
2. Paver decking will surround the pool on all four sides and will vary in width as follows:
West side: 3'-6"
East side: 27'-6"
North side: 4'-0"
South side: 7'-0"
20. **Applicant:** David Naman
Property Address: 167 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 12/17/2024
Project: 1. Repair existing façade cornice at both first and second floor levels.
2. Repaint cornice to match existing.
21. **Applicant:** David Naman
Property Address: 210 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 12/17/2024
Project: 1. Repair stucco in-kind on façade. Repaint.
Color: Valspar

Western Sandstone 1001-10A

2. Repaint windows to match existing.
Color: Old Mobile Green

22. **Applicant:** Chris Gilbert
Property Address: 100 Georgia Ave
Date of Approval: 12/17/2024
Project:
1. Install a 54 ft rain gutter along north elevation of residence.
 2. Exposed roof rafters will be trimmed slightly to install a fascia board along north elevation.
 3. Two new downspouts will be installed on the north side.
 4. New gutter will connect to existing.
 5. New gutter will be painted white to match trim.

23. **Applicant:** Lee Allen Pool Aid Services
Property Address: 63 Fearnway
Date of Approval: 12/18/2024
Project: Install a rectangular vinyl pool.
1. The pool will measure 14'-0" wide by 28'-0" deep and will be located 22'-0" west (rear) of the main residence.
 2. Masonry pavers or concrete patio will be installed adjacent to the north side of the pool. The patio will extend the length of the pool and extend 9'-0" to the north.
 3. A walkway of masonry pavers will connect the east end of the pool to the rear of the residence.

24. **Applicant:** Presley Roofing & Construction Inc
Property Address: 101 Levert Ave
Date of Approval: 12/18/2024
Project: Reroof detached garage with shingles. Color: Weather Wood

25. **Applicant:** Element 3 Engineering LLC
Property Address: 508 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 12/19/2024
Project:
1. Remove two (2) sets of double entry doors on south façade and replace with two (2) pairs of aluminum pane-and-panel doors, stained in dark wood color, that fit existing openings.
 2. Remove four (4) damaged non-original multi-light windows on the south façade and replace with aluminum single-pane windows that fit existing openings.
 3. Replace two (2) existing single-light transoms with aluminum single-light transoms that fit existing openings.

4. Repaint façade in the following Sherwin Williams colors:
 Main body - Oakleigh Ivory
 Trim – white
 Existing metal columns – black
26. **Applicant:** Nonyabidnez LLC
Property Address: 7 S. Joachim
Date of Approval: 12/31/2024
Project: Repair rotten wood trim and window lintels. Replace in kind where necessary. Paint wood and iron trim in existing colors.
27. **Applicant:** QPI Services Inc (GC)
Property Address: 356 Dunham
Date of Approval: 01/02/2025
Project:
 1. Reroof with shingles. Color: Weatherwood or Charcoal
 2. Repair or replace in-kind all rotten siding, trim, and decking.
 3. Level and stabilize foundation.
 4. Replace front door and transom with salvaged door and transom to fit the opening.
 5. Seal/secure rear elevation for future addition and/or rehab.
28. **Applicant:** QPI Services Inc (GC)
Property Address: 1008 Elmira Street
Date of Approval: 01/02/2025
Project:
 1. Reroof with shingles. Color: Weatherwood
 2. Stabilize foundation.
 3. Repair/replace in-kind rotten siding, trim, and decking.
 4. Remove existing aluminum windows. Reopen original window openings and rebuild casing and trim with salvaged/new wood to match original opening size and design. Close window openings with plywood boards in preparation for appropriate new windows.
 5. Remove existing non-historic entry doors. Replace with salvaged historic wood doors to fit existing openings.
29. **Applicant:** Pigeons on the Roof LLC
Property Address: 953 Selma Street
Date of Approval: 01/03/2025
Project: Replace existing asphalt shingle roof with architectural shingles. Color: Charcoal
30. **Applicant:** Kristin A. Granade
Property Address: 1004 Government Street
Date of Approval: 01/06/2025
Project: Stain existing privacy fence. Stain color to be BLP Mobile Paints Bellingrath Green.
31. **Applicant:** Pigeons on the Roof LLC

- Property Address:** 171 Hannon Street
Date of Approval: 01/06/2025
Project: Reroof with shingles. Color: Weather Wood
32. **Applicant:** Procision Restoration LLC
Property Address: 1259 Elmira Street
Date of Approval: 01/06/2025
Project:
1. Repair rotten siding to match existing.
 2. Repaint exterior using the following Sherwin Williams colors:
 - Body- Anew Gray
 - Trim – Alabaster
 - Porch decking - Rock Bottom
 - Porch ceiling - Byte Blue
 - Mullions - Fiery Brown

APPLICATIONS

1. 2025-01-CA

Address: 1059 Elmira Street
Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Applicant/Agent: John D. Thomas
Project: Remove north front portion of historic ancillary building. Construct a new façade.

APPROVED - **CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

2. 2025-02-CA

Address: 1573 Fearnway Street
Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Applicant/Agent: Ben Cummings on behalf of Brad and Linda Jensen
Project: Construct an addition on the southern half of the west elevation of the residence.

APPROVED - **CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

3. 2025-03-CA

Address: 1573 Fearnway Street
Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Applicant/Agent: Ben Cummings on behalf of Brad and Linda Jensen
Project: Demolish existing detached garage. Construct a new one-and-a-half story garage and carport structure.

APPROVED - **CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Informal consultation/input on wayfinding system sign design package. (Not for review or decision by ARB.)

2. The next ARB meeting will be held on Wednesday, February 5, 2025.



Agenda Item #1

Certified Record 2025-01-CA

DETAILS

Location:

1059 Elmira Street

Summary of Request:

Remove north portion of ancillary structure.
Construct new façade.

Applicant (as applicable):

John D. Thomas

Property Owner:

Same

Historic District:

Oakleigh Garden

Classification:

Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The application proposes partial demolition of an accessory structure that is not mentioned in the National Register district nomination and that postdates the primary dwelling by approximately 30 years.
- The majority of the structure will remain, and partial demolition will create a streetscape rhythm that is more in keeping with the neighborhood in general.
- The proposed new façade is in keeping with the overall style and character of the commercial accessory structure, though it does introduce some modern replacement materials.

Report Contents:

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

PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

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

The primary residence at 1059 Elmira Street is a folk-Victorian shotgun house with a rear wing. A similar single-story frame dwelling is shown on the 1904 and 1925 Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps. Both maps show a rectangular footprint with an inset porch at the southwest corner. By 1956, Sanborn Maps show that the rear porch had been enclosed and the existing rear wing constructed. City Directories and tax records indicate that the structure was constructed in 1892. The turned porch columns and simple carved wood brackets are typical of shotgun dwellings of this period.

The Sanborn Maps indicate that the large accessory structure at 1059 Elmira was constructed sometime between 1904 and 1925. The 1925 Sanborn Map shows a single-story rectangular frame structure with a zero-lot line setback identified as an automobile painting shop. At this time, the accessory structure was approximately the same size as the c. 1890 dwelling. By 1956, the accessory structure had been expanded into an L-shaped structure occupying most of the subject lot. While still of wood frame construction, the accessory structure was clad in metal siding. The structure has remained largely unchanged since 1956.

The subject property has appeared once before the Architectural Review Board. In September 2006, the Board approved the construction of a rear addition.

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Demolish portion of existing structure and construct new primary façade.
 - a. The front portion of the structure – measuring 20' wide by 37' deep – would be removed.
 - b. A new façade would be constructed at the north end of the remaining structure.
 - i. The proposed façade would feature a low parapet wall would follow the pitch of the gable roof on either side of a raised rectangular cap.
 - ii. Double-leaf board-and-batten barn-style doors would be centered in the new façade.
 - iii. A simple metal shed roof would shelter the doorway.
 - iv. The façade would be clad in 8" fiber cement horizontal lap siding.
 - v. Fiber cement corner boards and parapet coping would frame the façade.

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

1. **12.0** Demolition Guidelines
 - Consider the current significance of a structure previously determined to be historic.
 - Consider the condition of the structure in question. Demolition may be more appropriate when a building is deteriorated or in poor condition.
 - Consider whether the building is one of the last remaining positive examples of its kind in the neighborhood, county, or region.

- Consider the impact that demolition will have on surrounding structures, including neighboring properties, properties on the same block or across the street or properties throughout the individual historic district.
 - Consider whether the building is part of an ensemble of historic buildings that create a neighborhood.
 - Consider the future utilization of the site.
 - If a development is proposed to replace a demolished historic structure, determine that the proposed replacement structure is consistent with the guidelines for new construction in historic districts.
2. **5.3** Preserve the key historic walls of a building.
 - Maintain significant historic façades in their original form.
 - Maintain historic façade elements.
 - Pay special attention to maintaining the historic appearance of building walls of corner buildings.
 3. **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.
 4. **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.
 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 comes
- » 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. **5.19** Where repair is impossible, replace details and ornamentation accurately.
 - When replacing historic details, match the original in profile, dimension, and material.

- A substitute material may be considered if it appears similar in character and finish to the original. A measured drawing may be required in these instances to recreate missing historic details from photographs.
- Do not apply architectural details that were not part of the original structure. For example, decorative mill work should not be added to a building if it was not an original feature. Doing so would convey a false history.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The property under review is a contributing structure in the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. The subject application seeks approval to demolish a portion of a commercial accessory structure on the lot at 1059 Elmira Street. Following demolition, the application proposes constructing a new primary façade.

The *Guidelines* state that when demolition is contemplated, the current significance of the structure should be considered. While the primary dwelling at 1059 Elmira Street is listed as a contributing historic property, the National Register nomination makes no mention of the large commercial accessory structure on the lot. The front portion of the structure was constructed sometime between 1904 and 1925, but the largest portion of the structure dates to the period between 1925 and 1956. Both construction dates fall within the period of significance for the district, which spans from 1833 to 1958. The existing structure retains its overall form as it existed in 1956, and the existing metal siding may also date to this period. However, plywood sheathing on the primary façade is a later addition. All windows are covered with plywood, and large plywood sheets have replaced the original garage doors. A period-appropriate 6-light wood paneled door does remain. Since doors and windows are the most character-defining features of such a simple commercial structure, the lack of original fenestration severely undermines the architectural integrity of the subject property.

Per the *Guidelines*, “the condition of the structure in question” should be considered. “Demolition may be more appropriate when a building is deteriorated or in poor condition.” The property owner reports that the accessory structure has suffered significant termite damage that has rendered the front portion of the building unsafe for repairs.

Whether the building in question is “one of the last remaining positive examples of its kind in the neighborhood, county or region” should be factored into any decision to allow or disallow demolition in a historic district. The subject property is an outlier in the Oakleigh Garden Historic District, which is primarily residential. Several large masonry commercial buildings are located on the north edge of the district along Government Street. In the district interior, small corner shops were a common commercial development after 1900. Surviving examples of small commercial structures from this period include 916 Charleston Street, 1061 Elmira Street, and 964 Savannah Street, all of which are more intact and in better overall condition than the subject property.

Another consideration required by the *Guidelines* is the impact that a demolition would have on surrounding structures. In this case, the partial demolition will have no negative impact on neighboring structures. The existing structure currently the subject dwelling. Its zero-lot line setback also disrupts the rhythm of the street, visually dividing the block in two. Partial demolition of the front portion would create a 37-foot setback, which is much more in keeping with the overall development pattern of the street and will reestablish original viewsheds from the porch of the primary dwelling at 1059 Elmira Street.

When rehabilitating a historic structure, the *Guidelines* recommend maintaining historic significant facades in their original form. If demolition of the front portion of the subject property is deemed appropriate, there will be no remaining historic façade to preserve. The remaining portion of the building is a later rear addition and therefore never had a street-facing façade. In this instance, the *Guidelines* do not support replication of the existing façade as this would place a ca. 1925 façade on a ca. 1956 addition. As proposed, the new façade design, with its lack of ornamentation and simple board-and-batten doors, is in keeping with mid-20th-century commercial construction. The proposed parapet design represents a departure from the front gable of both the existing

façade and the primary dwelling. However, there is neighborhood precedent for parapet walls on commercial structures, most notably at Callaghan’s Irish Social Club (916 Charleston Street), which dates to roughly the same period as the ca. 1956 addition.

In reference to exterior cladding materials, the *Guidelines* prohibit replacing “building materials on the primary façade, such as wood siding and masonry, with alternative or imitation materials unless it cannot be avoided.” The *Guidelines* further state that, if repair of the original material is impossible, a “substitute material may be considered if it appears similar in character and finish to the original.” Therefore, while the *Guidelines* strongly discourage using fiber cement board on the primary façade of an existing structure, they do allow it where repair of the original material is not possible. The original wood siding on the c. 1925 structure is no longer extant, and the c. 1956 addition appears to have always been clad with corrugated metal sheets. A smooth fiber cement board that approximates the appearance of wood siding may therefore be appropriate, especially considering its use on an accessory structure that would sit behind the front plane of the primary dwelling.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. John Thomas was present to represent the application. He gave a brief summary of the project, adding that the removal of the projecting front of the ancillary structure will bring the setback more in line with the other structures on the street.

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

Karrie Maurin asked the applicant what type of metal the roof is proposed for the roof.

Mr. Thomas replied that it would be a standing seam.

Abby Davis asked why the 37 feet expanse was chosen for demolition.

Mr. Thomas replied that that length of the building is where the extreme damage and rot was present.

Ms. Roselius inquired about the proposed door material.

Mr. Thomas stated that the door would be wood, primed and painted.

FINDING FACTS

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

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Blackwell moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, 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. Howle seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.



Agenda Items #2

Certified Record 2025-02-CA

DETAILS

Location:

1573 Fearnway Street

Summary of Request:

Construct an addition on the southern half of the west elevation of the residence. Install awnings above three (3) windows on rear elevation.

Applicant (as applicable):

Ben Cummings

Property Owner:

Brad and Linda Jensen

Historic District:

Old Dauphin Way

Classification:

Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- One-story addition would be located to the side of the historic structure.
- Finished floor heights match those of the historic structure.
- Siding materials and roof design are compatible with those of the residence.
- Proposed awnings comply with the Guidelines and are located on a rear elevation, not visible from the street.

Report Contents:

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

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.”

Cross-gabled, English cottage revival, masonry residence in the Fearway neighborhood – undergone a couple of additions/changes to the rear

The property at 1573 Fearway Street, is a c. 1930 masonry Tudor Revival dwelling with intersecting gable roofs. The structure has undergone multiple additions and alterations, mainly to the rear. According to historic maps, the structure was initially rectangular in form. Originally a one-and-a-half story residence, the rear portion of the house was eventually raised to accommodate a full second story. Other alterations to the rear include a shed roof board and batten addition and screened in porch. A detached garage structure located southeast of the residence appears to be a later twentieth century addition.

This property has appeared once before the Architectural Review Board. In 2008, an application was approved to remove a rear deck and construct a screen porch; enlarge a board and batten rear addition; and construct an arbor connecting the house to the garage.

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Construct a single-story addition (closet) on the west end of the south elevation.
 - a. The proposed addition would be located behind an extant cross gable wing on the west end of the structure.
 - b. The addition would measure 8'-0" wide by 14'-0" deep, and would rise 7'-8" to the top of plate from finished floor.
 - c. The addition would be topped by a low sloping shed roof clad in T.P.O Membrane.
 - d. The proposed 3'-7 ½" high concrete raised foundation would be similar in height to the existing foundation and would be clad in stucco to match existing. A wood framed lattice access panel would be installed on the west and south foundation elevations to allow access to the crawl space.
 - e. The walls of the addition would be clad in Hardi-plank board and batten siding to match the existing board and batten along the rear elevation. The siding would be painted to match existing.
 - f. Fenestration would include one 2'-0" x 2'-0" two-over-two wood window, centered on the addition's south elevation.
2. Install three (3) timber framed awnings above three windows on the west half of the south (rear) elevation.
 - a. Each proposed awning would project 3'-0" from the west wall at a 45-degree angle and would be supported by 4x4 timber brackets.
 - b. 5 V-Crimp metal roofing would top the awnings.
 - c. All wood would be painted to match existing.

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. **6.21** 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.
- 9. **5.26** Use a material for an awning that is durable and weather resistant.
 - Use canvas or a similar woven, fabric material.
 - Use awning colors that blend with the colors of the structure.
 - Use wood or metal slat awnings if there is evidence that this awning type was used historically.

- Do not use awning materials without proven durability or that have a gloss finish unless such materials are original to the building.
10. **5.27** Install an awning to fit the opening.
- Use a shed type awning for a rectangular window or door opening.
 - Use curved or rounded awning forms over arched windows to match the curve of the opening.
 - Do not install a bubble or curved form awning on a rectangular opening.
 - Do not install awnings that cover or conceal significant architectural details such as the window or hood molding.
 - Do not install awnings so that they cover transom lights or decorative mill work.
 - If a new awning is installed where the original building did not have an awning, install the awning in a reversible manner that will not negatively impact the structure and appearance of the building.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The dwelling at 1573 Fearnway is a contributing resource to the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The application under review seeks approval to construct a single-story addition which would project from the south end of the west elevation.

The *Guidelines* call for the placement of an addition to an existing historic structure to appear subordinate to the main structure. The proposed single-story addition to the two-story home would be located on the west side elevation of the structure and would project from beneath the existing roof eave. Additionally, it would be located along the south end of the side elevation, towards the rear of the property, south of an extant projection further minimizing its visual impact from the street.

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, foundation expression, compatible roof design, and traditional fenestration patterns. (6.10,6.11, 6.14,6.15) The variation of siding material would serve to clearly differentiate the historic structure from the addition. (6.12) The deletion of two windows on the west elevation should be noted; however, due to the location of these windows, this alteration would have minimal impact on the historic character and rhythm of the structure.

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. (6.13, 6.21)

The proposed awnings are compliant with the applicable standards that address material, placement, and design. (5.26, 5.27)

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Ben Cummings was present to represent the application. He stated that the addition is a small closet; that it would be located in an area minimally visible to from the street and that the materials used on the exterior walls match that of the rear addition.

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 awnings would be removable without damaging the brick.

Mr. Cummings stated that they are permanent but are attached to the mortar, not the brick, so would be removable without causing damage.

Stephen McNair asked if there was a way to retain the exterior historic window in place with the addition.

Mr. Cummings replied that he would prefer to close the window for privacy issues, since the addition is a closet.

Ms. Roselius asked what would be done with the removed windows.

Mr. Cummings stated that the windows would be stored.

Ms. Davis asked why the applicant is choosing to use a TPO roofing system.

Mr. Cummings explained that the shed roof would be low-sloping and not visible.

Mr. McNair asked about the color of the exterior walls of the addition.

Mr. Cummings stated that the paint color would match the existing paint color on the house.

FINDING FACTS

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

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Blackwell moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, 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 Items #3

Certified Record 2025-03-CA

DETAILS

Location:

1573 Fearnway Street

Summary of Request:

Demolish non-historic garage and construct a new garage structure

Applicant (as applicable):

Ben Cummings

Property Owner:

Brad and Linda Jensen

Historic District:

Old Dauphin Way

Classification:

Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The existing garage was built in the late twentieth century and does not contribute to the historic integrity of the property.
- The proposed new garage/carport would be located to the rear of the main residence.
- The scale of the proposed structure is larger than typical historic accessory structures, yet employs techniques approved under the Guidelines to visually reduce its massing.
- All materials comply with the Guidelines.
- All proposed site improvements would be approvable administratively.

Report Contents:

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

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.”

Cross-gabled, English cottage revival, masonry residence in the Fearnway neighborhood – undergone a couple of additions/changes to the rear

The property at 1573 Fearnway Street, is a c. 1930 masonry Tudor Revival dwelling with intersecting gable roofs. The structure has undergone multiple additions and alterations, mainly to the rear. According to historic maps, the structure was initially rectangular in form. Originally a one-and-a-half story residence, the rear portion of the house was eventually raised to accommodate a full second story. Other alterations to the rear include a shed roof board and batten addition and screened in porch. A detached garage structure located southeast of the residence appears to be a later twentieth century addition.

This property has appeared once before the Architectural Review Board. In 2008, an application was approved to remove a rear deck and construct a screen porch; enlarge a board and batten rear addition; and construct an arbor connecting the house to the garage.

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Demolish existing non-historic garage.
2. Construct new enclosed garage structure flanked by carport areas to the north and south.
 - a. The proposed structure would be located to the west (rear) of the main structure. It would measure 34'-0" wide by 64'-0" deep. The structure would sit 17'-0" east of the west property line.
 - b. The enclosed garage portion would measure 34'-0" wide by 24'-0" deep. Each open carport area would measure 20'-0" deep.
 - c. The height of the enclosed garage would be 10'-0" at the side walls with a roof height of approximately 20'-4".
 - d. The garage and carports would rest on a concrete slab foundation.
 - e. The open carport areas would each be topped by a slightly sloping roof supported by four (4) paired 8x8 timber columns with timber wrap trim detail on the lower third of each pair. The column pairs would be evenly spaced across the north and south elevations. The height of the open carport areas would measure 8'-7" high at the outer ends and approximately 12'-0" high at the inside ends adjacent to the enclosed garage.
 - f. The garage structure would be covered by a gable roof, with shed roof projections covering the flanking carports. The roofing structure would be clad in Galvalume 5 V-crimp metal roofing.
 - g. The walls would be clad in a combination of board and batten cementitious siding on the top portion of the elevations, with cementitious clapboard siding covering the lower 4'-0" feet along the elevations.
 - h. The north and south elevations would mirror each other with one (1) 9'-0" wide by 7'-0" high upward action sectional garage door located on the west end of each elevation; and a pair of doors, each measuring 2'-6" wide by 6'-8" high located on the east end of the elevations.
 - i. The east and west elevations would mirror each other with two (2) six-over-six wood windows measuring 2'-8" wide by 5'-0", evenly spaced and centered on the elevations. A 2' x 2' two-over-two fixed window would be located in the gable.
 - j. Timber frame awnings would top the six-over-six windows. Each awning would project 3'-0" from the west wall at a 45-degree angle and would be supported by 4x4 timber brackets. 5 V-Crimp metal roofing would top the awnings.

3. Install site improvements
 - a. A new concrete driveway would be installed along the west side of the structure and would open up to a paved parking area to the rear of the dwelling.
 - b. A 5'-0" wide brick walkway would connect the house to the east side of the carport, jogging along the east side of the proposed parking area.

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

1. **12.0** Demolition Guidelines
 - Consider the current significance of a structure previously determined to be historic.
 - Consider the condition of the structure in question. Demolition may be more appropriate when a building is deteriorated or in poor condition.
 - Consider whether the building is one of the last remaining positive examples of its kind in the neighborhood, county, or region.
 - Consider the impact that demolition will have on surrounding structures, including neighboring properties, properties on the same block or across the street or properties throughout the individual historic district.
 - Consider whether the building is part of an ensemble of historic buildings that create a neighborhood.
 - Consider the future utilization of the site.
 - If a development is proposed to replace a demolished historic structure, determine that the proposed replacement structure is consistent with the guidelines for new construction in historic districts.
2. **9.1** Design an accessory structure to be subordinate in scale to that of the primary structure.
 - If a proposed accessory structure is larger than the size of typical historic accessory structures in the district, break up the mass of the larger structure into smaller modules that reflect traditional accessory structures.
3. **9.2** Locate a new accessory structure in line with other visible accessory structures in the district.
 - These are traditionally located at the rear of a lot.

ACCEPTABLE ACCESSORY STRUCTURE MATERIALS Materials that are compatible with the historic district in scale and character are acceptable.

These often include:

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

UNACCEPTABLE ACCESSORY STRUCTURE MATERIALS Materials that are not compatible with the historic district in scale and character are unacceptable.

These often include:

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

STAFF ANALYSIS

The dwelling at 1573 Fearnway is a contributing resource to the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The application under review seeks approval to demolish the existing garage located to the south (rear) of the historic structure and to construct a new freestanding garage and carport structure.

When demolition of a structure is proposed, the *Guidelines* direct that the condition and significance of that structure be considered along with the impact that the demolition will have on the street. The cinder block garage proposed for demolition at 1573 Fearnway is not historic and was likely constructed in the late twentieth century. It does not contribute to the historic or architectural character of the property and its deletion would not impair the integrity of the property. (12.0)

The *Guidelines* require new accessory structures to be subordinate in scale to that of the primary structure. At approximately 21'-0", the height of the proposed building is taller than most one-story accessory structures. The rear portion of the main residence has been raised to a full two-story height and measures over 24'-0" high, making the proposed garage/carport subordinate in height. Although the proposed garage/carport structure expresses a somewhat larger footprint than typical historic accessory structures in the surrounding area, its design breaks the structure into smaller scaled modules with the enclosed garage in the middle with flanking carports. This design technique, along with the spacing between the main residence and the garage/carport on the large lot serves to visually reduce the massing and create more compatible proportions. (9.1)

Accessory structures should be placed behind or to the side of the primary structure on a property and be composed of materials that are compatible with the primary structure and the district. (9.2) The proposed structure would be placed to the rear the existing house, in accordance with the *Guidelines*. The structure would employ materials considered approvable under the *Guidelines*. The metal roof may be considered incongruous with the primary historic structure.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Ben Cummings was present to discuss the application. He explained that the existing garage was not useful and the owner needed more storage space.

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Maurin asked what materials were proposed for the doors on the garage structure.

Mr. Cummings stated that the material had not yet been chosen.

Ms. Roselius asked about the height of the garage structure in relation to the existing dwelling.

Mr. Cummings stated that the proposed structure is slightly lower than the main dwelling, and that the lot sloped down, making the garage appear more inferior in height.

FINDING FACTS

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

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Blackwell moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, the application would not impair the architectural or historic character of the property or the district, and that the application should be granted a COA, with the caveat that the applicant seek Staff approval for the garage door and roof material.

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

The meeting was adjourned at 3:40pm.