



Architectural Review Board Minutes

May 15, 2024 – 3:00 P.M.

ADMINISTRATIVE

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

1. Roll Call

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

Members Present: Cartledge Blackwell, Catarina Echols, Stephen Howle, Karrie Maurin, and Cameron Pfeiffer-Traylor

Members Absent: Abby Davis, Stephen McNair, Jennifer Roselius, and Barja Wilson

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

2. Approval of Minutes from May 1, 2024

Cart. Blackwell stated that he wished to amend the wording of his motion to grant a COA for agenda item #1 to read, “the application does not impair the architectural or historic character of the district.”

Cameron Pfeiffer-Traylor moved to amend and approve the minutes from the May 1st, 2024 meeting, to include Mr. Blackwell’s amendment.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Blackwell and approved unanimously.

3. Approval of Mid-Month COAs granted by Staff

Karrie Maurin moved to approve the mid-month COAs granted by Staff.

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

MID-MONTH APPROVALS - APPROVED

1. **Applicant:** Mobile Bay Roofing LLC
Property Address: 963 Palmetto Street
Issue Date: 04/19/2024
Project: Reroof in-kind with shingles. Color: Drift Shake
2. **Applicant:** Pinebrook Properties
Property Address: 1616 Government Boulevard
Issue Date: 04/23/2024
Project: Install a logo and business name aluminum channel wall sign individually lit with halo lights. Total square footage will be 59.61sf. "Sabertooth Arms".
3. **Applicant:** Hurricane Roofing, LLC
Property Address: 108 S. Catherine Street
Issue Date: 04/23/2024
Project: Reroof in-kind with shingles. Color: Black
4. **Applicant:** Phoenix Restoration Services, Inc.
Property Address: 261 Rapier Avenue
Issue Date: 04/26/2024
Project:
 1. Remove 180 sf of existing fire-damaged siding on rear elevation.
 2. Seal area of removal with temporary Tyvek and plywood to secure the building until restoration work begins.
5. **Applicant:** Mahathalagalage, Nemindra
Property Address: 1256 Texas Street
Issue Date: 04/29/2024
Project: Repaint exterior in the following Sherwin Williams colors: Body- Clear to Sea (SW 8275); Trim - Pure White (SW 7005); Porch Deck - Tricorn Black (SW 6258)
6. **Applicant:** LG7 Real Estate, LLC
Property Address: 954 Selma Street
Issue Date: 05/01/2024
Project:
 1. Replace in-kind rotten wood on the front porch with new wood where needed.
 2. Repaint the exterior in BLP colors as follows: Body and trim/details: DeTonti Square Off White; Door: Government Street Olive
7. **Applicant:** NEW HAND SIGNS LLC
Property Address: 6 S. Conception Street
Issue Date: 05/01/2024
Project: Install painted lettering on existing awning to read "Old Familiar." Letters will be painted in a white oil base paint and measure 42sf in total.
8. **Applicant:** Adam Friedlander
Property Address: 400 Michigan Ave
Issue Date: 05/01/2024
Project: Reroof with shingles in Thunderstorm Gray

- 9. **Applicant:** Kelly Properties
Property Address: 211 Cedar Street
Issue Date: 05/03/2024
Project: Reroof with shingles. Color: Black
- 10. **Applicant:** Dennis Langan Construction & Remodeling, Inc.
Property Address: 1412 Brown Street
Issue Date: 05/03/2024
Project: Repaint exterior with BLP paints. Body: Celery Green; Trim: Cream; Porch Deck: Cream or Black
- 11. **Applicant:** Alliance Roofing, LLC
Property Address: 1411 Government Street
Issue Date: 05/03/2024
Project: Reroof in-kind with shingles. Color: Charcoal
- 12. **Applicant:** Charlotte Herrero
Property Address: 312 Chatham Steet
Issue Date: 05/03/2024
Project: Install a 6'-0" high stained wood privacy fence with 10'-wide automated electric gate at driveway. The fence will then run along the north property line for 2'-0", allowing for the neighbor's west end wall, then continue for 9'-0" north, abutting an existing fence on the northeast corner of the lot.
- 13. **Applicant:** Better Built, LLC
Property Address: 67 Etheridge Street
Issue Date: 05/06/2024
Project: Reroof with shingles. Color: Weatherwood

APPLICATIONS

1. 2024-20-CA

Address: 260 N. Joachim Street
Historic District: DeTonti Square
Applicant / Agent: Robert Dueitt Construction, LLC on behalf of Turner Foundation
Project: Replace all windows.

APPROVED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

2. 2024-21-CA

Address: 960 Dauphin Street
Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Applicant / Agent: Paul Davis on behalf of R & G Brown Properties, Inc.
Project: Replace damaged/missing siding. Replace windows and some doors. Repair existing porches, including installing new railings on second floor porch. Complete porch and deck on east elevation. Repaint.

APPROVED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

3. 2024-22-CA

Address: 1159 Old Shell Road
Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Applicant / Agent: Douglas Kearley on behalf of Luke Dunaway
Project: Restore bungalow style front porch columns and roof. Restore exterior of house. Construct an addition at the rear. Reroof house with dimensional shingles. Install gravel driveway utilizing existing curb cut.

APPROVED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

4. 2024-23-CA

Address: 160 S. Dearborn Street
Historic District: Church Street East
Applicant / Agent: Douglas Kearley on behalf of Chris and Jodi Turner
Project: Remove existing rear porch and construct a rear addition. Construct a 2-car, 1 1/2 -story carport. Site improvements.

APPROVED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

5. 2024-24-CA

Address: 406 Wisconsin Avenue
Historic District: Leinkauf
Applicant / Agent: Baumgardner House Raising, LLC/ BHL Federal on behalf of Essie Etheridge
Project: Demolish existing one-story frame single-family residence.
New Construction: Construct one-story frame single-family residence.; site Improvements.

TABLED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

6. 2024-25-CA

Address: 6 S. Franklin Street
Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street Commercial
Applicant / Agent: Mike Rogers
Project: Remove frame and metal enclosure of rear double gallery and secure exposed openings. Perform emergency repairs of north and south elevation brick walls.

APPROVED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

~~7. 2024-26-CA~~ **DEFERRED TO JUNE 5, 2024 AGENDA**

Address: 7 Hannon Avenue
Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Applicant / Agent: M & T Construction and Painting, LLC. on behalf of Abby Bradley
Project: Replace existing siding with fiber cement siding; window replacement

8. 2024-27-CA

Address: 251 Government
Historic District: Church Street East
Applicant / Agent: Wrico Signs, Inc. on behalf of 251 Government Street, LLC.
Project: Install signage in excess of permitted 64sf total.

APPROVED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

OTHER BUSINESS

The next ARB meeting will be held on June 5, 2024.

Architectural Review Board
May 15, 2024



Agenda Item #1

Certified Record 2024-20-CA

DETAILS

Location:

260 N. Joachim Street

Summary of Request:

Replace windows on all elevations except facade.

Applicant (as applicable):

Robert Dueitt Construction, LLC

Property Owner:

Turner Foundation

Historic District:

DeTonti Square

Classification:

Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The existing windows do not appear to be deteriorated beyond repair.
- The proposed replacement windows are of an approved alternative material.
- The proposed windows match the original in size and light configuration.

Report Contents:

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

PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

DeTonti Square Historic District was initially listed in the National Register in 1972 under Criterion A for social and urban planning significance and Criterion C for significant architecture. The district was one of two historic districts created by a municipal ordinance in 1962 in an effort to halt the rapid demolition of historic buildings near the city's central business district. The district, named for the French explorer Henri DeTonti, contains a few structures surviving from the 1830s, but the majority were built in the 1850s as residences of the wealthy and influential cotton factors, merchants, and planters.

The property at 260 N. Joachim Street was constructed in 1904 by Rose McKay Harris. The historic structure is a two-story wood-frame side-hall dwelling with a gable-on-hip roof. A two-story porch runs the full width of the primary (west) elevation. A fully pedimented gable roof projects over the two south bays of the second-story porch. The north end of the second-story porch is uncovered. The dwelling features decorative woodwork typical of the early 20th-Century Queen Anne style, including paired turned porch columns, an elaborate door surround, and bands of spindle work below the second-story porch cornice. The period-appropriate porch railings with delicate turned balusters were installed in 1989. The existing one-over-one wood sash windows are typical of the period and are believed to be original, with one exception, as are the triple-hung boxhead windows that open out onto the first-floor porch.

According to Historic Development Department files, this property appeared three times before the Architectural Review Board (ARB). In October 1987, the ARB approved an application to restore the porch to its historic appearance using photographic evidence, to install one new double-hung window on the south elevation to match the existing windows, and alterations to the rear porch to make it more closely match the restored front porch. In February 1989, the ARB once again approved the restoration of the front porch as well as the construction of a screened parking area on the adjacent lot to the north of the subject property. In March 2012, the ARB approved improvements to an ADA-accessible ramp, installation of new signage, repairs to the side drive, removal of an existing rear deck, and construction of a new rear stoop.

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Replace all windows on side and rear elevations.
 - Replacement windows would be aluminum clad one-over-one windows, which would match the existing windows in size, profile, and light configuration.

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

1. **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.
2. **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.
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.

ACCEPTABLE WINDOW 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

The subject property is a contributing property in the DeTonti Square Historic District. The application under review proposes the wholesale replacement of original windows on the north, south, and rear elevations. Original windows on the façade would remain extant.

When considering replacement of materials on a historic structure, the *Guidelines* recommend replacing only materials that are damaged or missing. They additionally state that on non-primary elevations, alternative materials that match the style and detail of the original may be used. In regard to windows specifically, the *Guidelines* direct to preserve and repair windows that are in repairable condition; when they are not repairable, the replacement window should match the original.

The applicant completed a window survey, assessing the condition of the windows intended for replacement on the non-primary elevations at 260 N Joachim. The survey and visual inspection reveal that the existing windows are not in a deteriorated or unrepairable state. The proposed replacement windows would be an aluminum-clad wood window, which is an acceptable window material under the *Guidelines*. Further, the replacement windows' one-over-one light configuration would match that of the existing windows. (5.6, 5.7, 5.20, 5.21)

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Robert Dueitt was present to discuss the application. He stated that the windows were allowing water into the home and are not energy efficient, noting that the replacement windows would be aluminum clad to match what is there in appearance and profile.

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Blackwell asked the applicant if the windows to be replaced are original with original glass. Mr. Dueitt replied that the glass is not original.

Mr. Blackwell asked if the window frames are old growth wood. Mr. Dueitt said that they are painted shut and the sashes are not operable.

Catarina Echols stated that windows that are painted shut can be resolved, and suggested moving windows that are in better condition towards the front of the house. Mr. Dueitt stated that removing lead paint is difficult under the current law. Ms. Echols replied that if the windows are not original, then the paint is most likely not lead paint.

FINDING FACTS

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

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Blackwell moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, and given the extensive repairs previously carried out on the windows, and providing that the façade windows will remain in place, the proposed window replacements do 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 #2

Certified Record 2024-21-CA

DETAILS

Location:

960 Dauphin Street

Summary of Request:

Replace damaged/missing siding. Replace windows and some doors. Repair existing porches, including installing new railing on second-floor porch. Complete porch and deck on east elevation. Repaint.

Applicant (as applicable):

Paul Davis

Property Owner:

R & G Brown Properties, Inc.

Historic District:

Old Dauphin Way

Classification:

Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The application proposes construction of a two-story side porch where a porch historically existed. While the porch layout and French doors are not entirely in keeping with the existing structure, the porch is subordinate to the historic front porch in both height and ornamentation, in accordance with the *Guidelines*.
- The application proposes wholesale window replacement. The proposed placement windows are in keeping with the *Guidelines*.
- elevation of the original structure.
- The proposed elimination of an existing door and doorway on the primary façade would undo building alterations that are likely 50 years or older.
- The addition of a new window and infill of some existing windows would alter the existing fenestration pattern.

Report Contents:

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

PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

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

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

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

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

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

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Remove and replace all 35 existing windows.
 - a. Windows would be removed and replaced in the following locations.

- i. 4 from primary (south) elevation
 - ii. 11 from east elevation
 - iii. 14 from west elevation
 - iv. 6 from north elevation
 - b. New replacement windows
 - i. Window material would be aluminum-clad wood. Window sash would be single-hung with a six-over-six lite configuration, simulated divided lites, and a shadow bar between double glazing. Muntins would be 7/8" with a simulated putty profile.
 - c. Existing jib doors below windows on primary (south) elevation are to remain.
- 2. Remove first-floor picture window on the north elevation of 20th-century rear addition and replace with paired sash windows.
 - a. Overall framed opening would increase from 6'4" square to 8'-3" wide by 7'-10" high.
 - b. New replacement windows:
 - i. Window material would be aluminum-clad wood. Window sash would be single-hung with a six-over-six lite configuration with simulated divided lite and a shadow bar between double glazing. Muntins would be 7/8" with a simulated putty profile.
- 3. Remove 6 windows and infill opening with cement fiber board.
 - a. Windows would be removed, and the openings infilled at the following locations.
 - i. West Elevation
 - 1. One first-floor window opening with no extant frame or sash
 - 2. One second-floor framed window opening with one-over-one sash
 - ii. North Elevation
 - 1. One first-floor framed window opening with no extant sash
 - 2. One first-floor casement window
 - iii. 20th-century rear addition, west elevation:
 - 1. Two small, fixed windows, one on the first floor and one on the second.
- 4. Create a new first-floor window opening on the east side elevation of the main dwelling.
 - a. New window opening would align with the first-floor windows on either side and the second-floor window immediately above. Opening would be the same dimensions as adjacent existing windows.
 - b. New window would be aluminum-clad wood. Window sash would be single-hung with a six-over-six lite configuration with simulated divided lite and a shadow bar between double glazing. Muntins would be 7/8" with a simulated putty profile.
- 5. Remove a small window and replace with a new door the second-floor landing of a proposed new stair on the north elevation of existing rear (north) addition.
 - a. Six-lite door would be aluminum-clad wood with simulated divided lites and spacer bars.
- 6. Construct a two-story covered porch on the east side of the rear service wing.
 - a. Covered porch would be 33'-2" wide (north-south) and 6'-8" deep (east-west).
 - b. While the previous porch was four bays wide, the application proposes extending the new porch to five bays.
 - c. The second-floor porch deck would shelter all five bays of first-floor porch. A metal shed roof would shelter the three bays of second-floor porch deck. Both end bays

- of the second-story porch would be uncovered. Four double-height columns would run from the first-floor porch deck all the way to the shed roof over the second-floor porch deck. One single-height column would support each end of the second-floor porch deck.
- d. The second-floor porch railing would consist of simple metal pickets and handrail. The railing would terminate in a simple wood end post with molded cap at the northeast and southeast corners. No railing is proposed for the first-floor porch.
 - e. A porch stair would span the entire width of the north end of the covered porch. It would consist of four wood steps with simple metal picket handrail.
7. Install eight sets of new French doors on the east elevation of the rear service wing: five on the first floor and three on the second.
 - a. Five sets of French doors would be evenly spaced across the five bays of the first-floor porch. A four-lite rectangular transom would sit atop each of the five sets of doors.
 - b. Three sets of French doors would be evenly spaced across the three center bays of the second-floor porch.
 - c. French doors would be aluminum-clad wood with simulated divided lites and spacer bars. Each door would have six lites.
 8. Construct a deck on the east side of the proposed two-story porch.
 - a. Deck would be 33'-2" wide (north-south) and 14'-8" deep (east-west).
 - b. Deck height would align with first finish floor level.
 9. Construct a wood stair and a second-story exterior landing at the west end of the north elevation of an existing rear addition.
 - a. Wood stairs would wrap northwest corner of the existing rear addition with a landing where it turns the corner. Stair would terminate in a landing at the second-story finish floor level.
 - b. Stair would feature a metal picket railing with metal handrail. Wood corner posts would be square with molded caps.
 10. Remove an existing concrete stoop from the south elevation of the rear service wing and alter an existing door opening to accommodate a new sash window.
 - a. Following removal of stoop, infill space between brick piers with new lattice to match existing.
 - b. Window would be installed in door opening.
 - i. Window material would be aluminum-clad wood. Window sash would be single-hung with a six-over-six lite configuration with simulated divided lite and a shadow bar between double glazing. Muntins would be 7/8" with a simulated putty profile.
 - c. Wood siding to match existing would be installed to infill opening below proposed window.
 11. Remove existing wood railings on the two-story front (south) porch and replace with new metal railings.
 - a. Metal railings would be simple aluminum picket railings painted black. 4x4" wood corner posts would also be painted black. Corner posts would have decorative end caps.
 12. Remove damaged wood siding on side and rear elevations and replace with fiber cement board with wood grain pattern.
 - a. Siding would only be removed if damaged.

- b. Fiber cement board would be feathered into existing wood siding in good condition and painted to match.
13. Remove existing brick infill between brick piers on south elevation and replace with new lattice to match existing.
 14. Repair or replace damaged lattice to match existing.
 - a. Work would occur where necessary on all elevations.

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

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

6. **5.20** Preserve the functional historic and decorative features of a historic window.
- Where historic (wooden or metal) windows are intact and in repairable condition, retain and repair them to match the existing as per location, light configuration, detail and material.
 - Preserve historic window features, including the frame, sash, muntins, mullions, glazing, sills, heads, jambs, moldings, operation, and groupings of windows.
 - Repair, rather than replace, frames and sashes, wherever possible.
 - For repair of window components, epoxies and related products may serve as effective solutions to material deterioration and operational malfunction.
7. **5.21** When historic windows are not in repairable condition, match the replacement window design to the original.
- In instances where there is a request to replace a building's windows, the new windows shall match the existing as per location, framing, and light configuration.
 - Use any salvageable window components on a primary elevation.
- 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)
8. **6.5** Repair a porch in a way that maintains the original character.

STAFF ANALYSIS

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

New Two-Story Side Porch and Deck

The *Guidelines* call for a new porch to be compatible with the neighborhood in placement, proportion, rhythm, materials, and ornamentation. (6.9, 6.11, 6.13) The Guidelines further stipulate

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

The tripartite configuration of the porch represents a departure from the temple-front-with-side-wing form of the original dwelling. The four double-height columns across the three central bays are similar in scale to the monumental front porch columns and simpler double-height columns still visible on the north elevation where a historic porch has been infilled. However, the single-height columns at either end of the proposed porch create two diminutive side wings that are not in keeping with the proportions of the original structure and are not typical of the original period of construction. Second-story gallery porches of this period typically remain the same height across the entire elevation, without the step down created at either end where the proposed porch roof does not extend fully across the second-floor porch deck.

The proposed porch utilizes a mix of materials, some of which replicate the existing construction materials of the historic property and some of which do not. The porch columns, deck, and railing end posts are all painted wood, which is the predominant materials used in the historic front porch. However, the proposed metal roof and metal railings are not part of the existing material palette at 960 Dauphin. Existing railings on the historic front porch are simple wood pickets, which the application proposes replacing with new metal railings. While this would create harmony between the new and historic porch structures, the *Guidelines* caution against replacing historic materials with unlike materials, especially on primary facades (5.6). While metal roofing is not found elsewhere at 960 Dauphin, there is precedent for employing a more utilitarian material, such as metal roofing, on secondary structures such as side or rear porches on dwellings of this period and style.

Changes to Fenestration Pattern

The application proposes some fenestration changes that would alter existing window placement and configuration. The most impactful fenestration change would be the addition of eight sets of French doors on the east elevation at a proposed two-story porch. Other fenestration changes include changing two existing door openings on the primary (south) façade into a window opening; creating a new window opening on the east side elevation; changing a window opening on the north elevation into a door; and removing and installing siding over select window openings on the east, west, and north elevations.

In addition to materials and lite patterns, the *Guidelines* stress the importance of maintaining the ratio of solid surfaces to voids and overall patterns of fenestration of contributing buildings. (5.3) Special care should be taken to retain historic fenestration patterns on highly visible elevations. Where changes to fenestration are deemed necessary, steps should be taken to mitigate the disruption to the historic window and door configuration.

Submitted plans propose installation of eight pairs of French doors leading onto the new two-story porch: five on the first floor and three on the second. On the first floor, each set of doors would feature a 4-lite transom. French doors are not typical of dwellings of this style and period, and the addition of so many side-by-side creates a higher ratio of voids to solid surfaces than seen currently at the subject property. While the proportions are not in keeping with the period and style of the dwelling, the materials – aluminum-clad wood and simulated divided lites with spacer bars – are in keeping with the *Guidelines*.

On the primary façade of the original structure, the application proposes replacing two of four door openings with windows to match adjacent windows in size, style, and lite configuration. Stylistic evidence suggests that the first-floor main entrance, with its elaborate door surround, was originally the only entrance located on the primary south façade. Original jib doors with box head windows above would have provided access to the second-floor porch. The existing paneled doors with transoms are likely a later alteration that indicates the single dwelling was at one point subdivided into additional residential or commercial units. The secondary entrance and small stoop to the west of the front porch also hints at a later subdivision of the building interior. However, the staff is unaware of any photographic documentation of the building façade without these existing doors and door opening. While it is likely that replacing two of these doors with sash windows would return these openings to an earlier configuration, this cannot be known for certain.

The application also proposes fenestrations changes to the side and rear elevations of the original structure. These include adding a window opening to the east elevation of the main structure and eliminating three existing openings: two on the west elevation and one on the north. On the east elevation, the proposed new window opening would align with adjacent windows on either side and immediately above. This would essentially replicate the second-floor fenestration pattern on the first floor. The addition of a window in this location would therefore would not greatly disrupt the rhythm of existing fenestration. The second-floor window proposed for removal on the west elevation is not aligned with any of the adjacent windows and features one-over-one sash instead of the typical six-over-six. This window is assumed to be a later addition. The first-floor window proposed for removal on the west elevation is likely original, given its size and placement. Its removal would also create an atypically high solid to void ration on the west elevation. If interior alterations necessitate removal of an operable window in this location, a blind window opening with fixed closed shutters – like those existing on the east elevation of the service wing – may be an acceptable compromise. The leaded glass window on the north elevation is a later addition, given its location in a wall enclosing a historic two-story porch. This elevation is not visible from the public right-of-way, and the proposed two-story porch would bisect this window opening if left in place.

The application further proposes alterations to several windows on the north elevation of the rear service wing and the north and west elevations of the 20th-century addition. Given their location, these alterations would be minimally visible from the public right-of-way, if visible at all. The two small casement windows proposed for removal on the north elevation of the rear service wing are not visible. According to submitted plans, the second-floor casement window would be replaced with a door. The proposed wood stair leading up to this new door would be situated directly in front of the first-floor casement window. Even if this window remained, it would be almost entirely screened from view. The application also proposes removal and infill of two similarly sized windows on the west elevation of the 20th-century rear addition. These windows are entirely screened from the public right-of-way. The application also proposes replacing a large, fixed picture window on the

north elevation of the rear addition with paired single-hung sash windows. The proposed replacement windows would require an opening slightly larger than the existing picture window. This opening would align with the paired second-floor windows above. As previously mentioned, this elevation is only visible from the rear yard of 960 Dauphin Street.

Window Replacement

The *Guidelines* recommend that historic windows that are intact and in repairable condition be retained and repaired, and those that are not repairable be replaced with new windows that are consistent with the existing in location, framing, and lite configuration. (5.20, 5.21) A window survey completed by the applicant indicates that the condition of existing windows varies from good to poor. According to the window survey, windows on the south elevations are in fair to good condition, with windows sheltered under the two-story porch in especially good condition. Window conditions are more varied on the side and rear elevations. Windows at the 20th-century rear addition are generally in the worst condition. Most of the conditions noted on the window survey are repairable, especially weathered glazing putty and cracked glass lites. The window survey also refers to “weather/termite damage” throughout, both of which are likely repairable using either epoxy patch repairs or wood dutchman repairs in the most severe instances. However, it is not known if termite activity is ongoing, which could make repair significantly more difficult in these locations.

When determining whether repair or replacement is more appropriate, the *Guidelines* state that both the severity, the location, and the relative visibility of the damage all be taken into account. It is especially important to retain and repair original features in highly visible areas. Replacement may also be more appropriate at more recent additions that are not themselves historic. The position of the house relative to the street and adjacent structures means that the south façade and east elevation are significantly more visible from the public right-of-way than either the west or the north elevations. An adjacent fence and residence at 962 Dauphin Street screen much of the west elevation from view, and the north elevation is only visible from the rear yards of 960 and 962 Dauphin Street. The construction date of the rear addition is unknown, but it likely occurred sometime between 1956 and 2003, when it is first visible on aerial images. Therefore, priority should be placed on retaining original features, such as existing wood windows, on the south and east elevations. One method of accomplishing this could be relocating any salvageable windows on the west elevation to window openings on the south or east. New replacement windows could then be concentrated on the less visible west elevation.

In keeping with the *Guidelines* recommendations for new windows installed in contributing properties, the proposed custom replacement windows would be made to fit the existing window openings. The windows would also replicate the six-over-six lite configuration of the existing windows using simulated divided lites and spacers set between the double glazing. The exterior muntin profiles would also mimic the appearance of a historic 7/8-inch muntin profile with glazing putty. Therefore, the proposed replacement windows would not significantly alter the location, framing, or lite configuration of existing windows. While the proposed windows would introduce modern replacement materials, the *Guidelines* specify that aluminum-clad wood windows are appropriate for contributing structures within the local historic districts.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Paul Davis, architect, and Mr. Robert Brown, the homeowner, were present to discuss the application.

Mr. Davis explained that, as there were no drawings or plans available of the project which was started at the subject property, the intent of the previous project was unclear. Some windows appear to be added, while others seem original. He stated that the goal for the current project is to bring the façade back to closely resemble the original.

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Dawson informed Mr. Davis and Mr. Brown that the Historic Development office has a copies of the previous plans.

Karrie Maurin asked what material is proposed for the replacement windows. Mr. Davis replied that they would be aluminum clad wood with matching profile and light configuration of the historic windows.

Ms. Echols asked if the applicant was trying to save as many original windows as possible. Mr. Davis replied that the intent was to save the front windows and replace those on the side and rear elevations, but that he is open to suggestions from the Board.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor and Mr. Blackwell voiced concerned with simulated divided light windows. Ms. Traylor explained that the *Guidelines* discourage replacing windows that can be repaired and that when replacement is necessary, a true divided light is preferable to simulated divided light from a critical mass perspective.

Ms. Echols suggested moving windows in best condition towards the front and more visible locations along the side elevations.

Mr. Howle asked the applicant if he was opposed to going back with a wood railing instead of metal. Mr. Davis replied that he was not, but that the existing railing did not appear original.

Mr. Howle asked Staff if there is evidence in the District of metal railings. Ms. Dawson replied that typically, no.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor asked for input from her fellow Board members regarding the scale of the double porches. Ms. Echols commented that it is a stylistic issue that did not create a problem for her. Mr. Blackwell stated that it was essentially an addition creating a solid wall where there was once an open gallery on the rear.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor recommended that the applicant consider that the second-floor porch roof does not extend over the deck, which will lead to the accumulation of water. She suggested that the pitch of the deck be addressed to move water away.

Mr. Blackwell added to Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor's observation, suggesting extending the second-floor porch roof to match the length of the deck.

Mr. Davis asked the Board for feedback regarding taking out the existing door on the second-floor porch on the façade and replacing it with a window. Ms. Echols stated that it would have been more common to have a window at this location rather than a door.

FINDING FACTS

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

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



Agenda Item #3

Certified Record 2024-22-CA

DETAILS

Location:

1159 Old Shell Road

Summary of Request:

Restore Craftsman-style front porch columns and roof. Restore exterior of house including siding, trim, cornice, and windows. Construct an addition at the rear. Reroof house with dimensional shingles. Install gravel driveway utilizing existing curb cut.

Applicant (as applicable):

Douglas Kearley

Property Owner:

Chris and Jodi Turner

Historic District:

Old Dauphin Way

Classification:

Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The front porch would be restored to match a previous, historic front porch.
- All proposed repairs and replacements to the existing structure would be in-kind.
- The placement, massing, and scale of the proposed addition aligns with the *Guidelines*.
- All materials proposed for the addition are approved by the *Guidelines* for additions to historic structures.

Report Contents:

Property and Application History 2

Scope of Work 2

Applicable Standards 3

Staff Analysis 5

Attachments7

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 1159 Old Shell Road was constructed in 1900 for Lorenzo Hardy, who acquired the lot in May 1900 and is first listed residing at what was then 129 Springhill Shell Road in 1901. The 1902 City Directory lists the address as 127 Old Shell Road, and the 1904 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map shows a frame dwelling with a similar footprint to the existing structure at this address. The overall form of the existing structure - with its complex roof structure, asymmetrical façade, and protruding end bay – is typical of a turn-of-the-century Queen Anne Style cottage. The form closely parallels that of the neighboring dwelling immediately to the east, suggesting the two may have once been identical sister houses. Originally 1159 Old Shell Road likely had a wood-frame porch with turned columns and decorative woodwork similar to that seen at 1157 Old Shell Road. This porch was removed at an unknown date and replaced with a Craftsman style brick porch with battered wood columns, as seen in a photograph taken in October 1983. Stylistic evidence suggests this alteration was made sometime between 1920 and 1930, though this has not been confirmed. The porch roof and battered columns were demolished without approval in 2008. At the time, the Historic Development Department (HDD) staff issued a stop work order. The brick stairs, platform, and column plinths remain intact.

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

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Restore the front porch.
 - a. Construct new front porch roof structure and cornice to match those photos in a 1983 photograph. The hipped roof would be clad in dimensional asphalt shingles.
 - b. Install three (3) new tapered columns with caps that resemble previous porch columns pictured in a 1983 photo. The new columns would sit on existing brick plinths.
 - c. Clean existing brick column plinths, knee wall, and steps.
 - d. Repoint brick foundation piers.
2. Conduct exterior restoration and repairs.
 - a. Repair/replace in-kind, sand, and repaint all wood clapboard siding, where needed.
 - b. Repair all existing wood windows.
 - c. Install a salvaged wood panel door and single-light transom to fit existing openings in front doorway.
 - d. Repair existing cornice where needed.
 - e. Repair existing wood shingles and wood louvered vent in front projecting gable.
 - f. Repair and repaint existing brick foundation piers and install new framed wood lattice infill screens.
 - g. Reroof existing roof in dimensional shingles.
3. Construct a rear addition.
 - a. Remove a projecting partial wall on the south end of the east elevation.
 - b. Construct an addition that would extend off the south (rear) elevation.

- c. The addition would extend 34'-0" feet across the existing south elevation which measures approximately 38'-11' wide. Depths would range between 6'-4" and 25'-4".
- d. Wood siding, corner boards and cornices would match the existing structure in materials and profile.
- e. Fenestration would consist of one-over-one aluminum-clad windows, each measuring 2'-8" wide by 5'-6" high, and a 3'-0" wide by 6'-8" high wood pane-and-panel entry door with single-light transom.
- f. The proposed foundation would sit on masonry piers with framed wood lattice infill screens, all to match those on the existing structure. The proposed foundation height of approximately 3'-4" would be equivalent to the historic dwelling.
- g. Finished floor to top of plate would measure 9'-4".
- h. The addition would be topped by a roof of alternating forms and would be clad in dimensional shingles.
- i. The addition would consist of (from west to east) a bedroom/sitting room portion, a small back porch, and a bath/closet portion. Each are described as follows:

Bedroom/sitting room

- The west elevation of the bedroom/sitting room portion of the addition would be set back approximately 4'-11 in from the southwest corner of the existing house. It would measure 14'-0" wide by 23'-4" deep.
- This portion would be topped by a hipped roof.

Covered walkway/porch

- The walkway would abut the east elevation of the bedroom/sitting and would measure 4'-0" wide by 8'-0" deep.
- The walkway would be topped by part of the L-shaped hipped roof on the elevation, which would be supported by an 8" square column.
- Five (5) wood steps would access the south end of the walkway. A wood handrail would flank the east side of the steps and run along the east side of the porch.
- A pane-and-panel door with single-light transom would access the rear (south) elevation of the house.

Bathroom/Closet

- The bathroom/closet portion would measure 16'-0" wide by 6'-4" deep and would be topped by the continuation of the L-shaped roof also covering the porch.

- j. Elevations would appear as follows:

West elevation

One-over-one window approximately centered on the elevation; corner board

South elevation

Corner board; a pair of one-over-one windows centered on the projected bay; corner board; pane-and-panel door; column; corner board

East elevation

Corner board; one-over-one window; column; corner board

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

1. **5.4** Preserve original building materials.
 - Repair deteriorated building materials by patching, piecing-in, consolidating or otherwise reinforcing the material.

- Remove only those materials which are deteriorated, and beyond reasonable repair.
 - Do not remove original materials that are in good condition.
2. **5.6** Use original materials to replace damaged materials on primary surfaces where possible.
 - Use original materials to replace damaged building materials on a primary façade if possible. If the original material is wood clapboard, for example, then the replacement material should be a material that matches the original in finish, size and the amount of exposed lap. If the original material is not available from the site, use a replacement material that is visually comparable with the original material.
 - Replace only the amount of material required. If a few boards are damaged beyond repair, for example, then only they should be replaced, rather than the entire wall.
 - Do not replace building materials on the primary façade, such as wood siding and masonry, with alternative or imitation materials unless it cannot be avoided.
 - Wholesale replacement of exterior finishes is generally not allowed.
 3. **5.7** When replacing materials on a non-primary façade or elevation, match the original material in composition, scale and finish.
 - Use original materials to replace damaged materials on a non-primary façade when possible.
 4. **5.17** Preserve historic stylistic and architectural details and ornamentation.
 - Repair historic details and ornamentation that are deteriorated.
 5. **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.
 6. **6.5** Repair a porch in a way that maintains the original character.
 7. **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.
 8. **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.
 9. **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.

10. **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.
11. **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.
12. **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.
13. **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
14. **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.
15. **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.
16. **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.
17. **6.21** Design a window on an addition to be compatible with the original historic building.
- Size, place and space a window for an addition to be in character with the original historic building.
 - If an aluminum window is used, use dimensions that are similar to the original windows of the house. An extruded custom aluminum window approved by the NPS or an aluminum clad wood window may be used, provided it has a profile, dimension and durability similar to a window in the historic building.

STAFF ANALYSIS

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

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 459 sf, would be roughly 28% of the footprint of the historic house. The roof proposed for the addition also sits subordinate to the height of the existing roof. Foundation and ceiling heights proposed for the addition match those of the existing house. (6.9 - 6.11, 6.15)

As directed by the *Guidelines*, the proposed addition is differentiated by the alternation in roofline and roof height. On the west elevation, the offset placement of the addition's west end wall and the retention of the original structure's south corner board on the east elevation would further distinguish the addition from the original structure. (6.12)

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, aluminum-clad wood windows, and wood trim, along with matching brick foundation piers and lattice infill panels. (6.13, 6.16, 6.19, 6.20, 6.21) Likewise, the alternating roof configuration planned for the addition complements the

original complex roof plan. The new roof would be clad in a matching material and would adopt the same slope as the existing roof. (6.14)

Repairs and replacement work proposed for the existing building include repairs to siding, windows, roof, foundation piers and infill. All proposed replacement materials would match existing. The proposed work to the front porch, which would include the construction of a new porch roof and cornice, installation of tapered columns, and cleaning the brick knee wall, steps, and column plinths, are efforts to restore a later added historic Craftsman style porch, which adhere to the *Guidelines'* directives to preserve and repair historic details and ornamentation, and to maintain the historic character of a porch. (5.4 – 5.7, 5.10, 5.11,5.17, 5.20)

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Douglas Kearley was present to discuss the application. He stated that the subject property was a twin with the house next door and that although the home originally had a Queen Anne style porch, this project would focus on rebuilding the later Craftsman porch in accordance with a historic photo, since portions of it remain.

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

There were no questions from the Board.

FINDING FACTS

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

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

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



Agenda Item #4

Certified Record 2024-23-CA

DETAILS

Location:

160 S. Dearborn Street

Summary of Request:

Remove existing rear porch, and construct an addition to include a bedroom, bath, closet and a new porch. Construct a 2-car, 1 1/2 -story carport with an office and half bath on the second floor. Construct new concrete driveway utilizing the existing curb cut.

Applicant (as applicable):

Douglas Kearley

Property Owner:

Chris Turner

Historic District:

Church Street East

Classification:

Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The existing rear porch is not original to the structure, nor is it historic.
- The proposed addition would sit to the west (rear) of the existing structure and maintain a subordinate character in placement, massing, and scale.
- The carport/office structure would sit on the northwest portion of the lot.
- The proposed addition and accessory structure would maintain acceptable setbacks.
- All proposed materials for both the addition and the carport/office either match the existing structure or are compliant alternatives.

Report Contents:

Property and Application History 2

Scope of Work 2

Applicable Standards 4

Staff Analysis 7

Attachments 9

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 property at 160 S. Dearborn Street is a one-story gable roof frame house with an asymmetrical front porch spanning the southern bay of the façade and accessed by concrete steps with flanking cheek walls. The structure exhibits restrained architectural features, the most significant of which is a single tapered column with base and corbelled capital which supports the front porch on its southeast corner. According to Historic Development Department vertical files, historic maps, and photos, the houses at 160 and 158 S. Dearborn were built at the same time, around 1938, on a lot that previously fronted Monroe Street and was occupied by a single frame house and a small masonry building. Other than a porch addition to the rear elevation in the 1980s, the house at 160 S. Dearborn has been altered very little from its original form over the years. Between 1979 and 1982, the western (rear) boundary of the property shifted west to encompass the adjacent lot at 654 Monroe Street. The structure extant at 654 Monroe at this time was relocated to the neighboring lot to the west. This lot, which had previously been 656 Monroe, was re-designated as 654 Monroe Street. This arrangement created a larger space to the rear of the dwellings at both 158 and 160 S. Dearborn Street. A COA to construct a shed and a rear porch addition at 160 S. Dearborn Street was issued in 1982.

This property has appeared twice before the Architectural Review Board. Approval to construct a shed, install a rear porch addition, and reroof the structure was given in 1982. In 2023 an application to demolish a non-historic ancillary building was approved.

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Remove existing rear porch.
2. Construct an addition to include a bedroom, bath, closet, and a new porch.
 - a. The proposed addition would measure 586sf and would include an enclosed bedroom/bathroom portion along with a screened porch which would sit south of the new enclosed living area.
 - b. The addition would be located to the west (rear) of the extant structure. It would be offset approximately 8'-4" to the north. The addition's north end wall would sit 6'-4" south of the north property line.

Enclosed area

- The enclosed area would measure 20'-0" wide and 22'-4" deep and would be topped by a gable roof with a slope and overhang to match that of the existing structure. The roof would be clad in asphalt shingles that match the existing roof.
- Finished floor to ceiling would measure 9'-1" high.
- A simulated raised foundation measuring approximately 2'-6" high would be distinguished by a stuccoed masonry curtain wall with metal vents, all of which correspond to the existing structure.

- The addition would be clad in wood drop siding to match existing.
- Fenestration would include three aluminum-clad four-over-four windows and one relocated existing wood pane-and-panel wood door, distributed as follows.
 - 1) One 2'-4" wide by 3'-4" high window would be centered on the east elevation of the addition.
 - 2) One 2'-8" wide by 5'-4" high window would be installed on the west elevation, approximately a fourth of the way along the elevation from north to south.
 - 3) One 2'-8" wide by 5'-4" high window and one relocated door would be installed on the south elevation under the porch. The window would be placed near the west end of the elevation and the door near the east end of the porch.
 - 4) One 30" wide by 24" high polymer louvered vent would be installed in the gable on the west elevation.

Porch

- The porch addition would measure 8'-0" wide by 14'-6" deep and would be topped by a cross gable roof which would be clad in asphalt shingles and supported by three (3) 8" square wood columns with caps. A portion of the porch would be under the addition's gable roof on the west end, supported by a fourth column.
- Ceiling height of the porch would match the addition's. A 10" frieze with drip cap would rest atop the columns on the west and south elevations.
- A 12" wide by 18" high polymer louvered vent would be installed in the gable on the south elevation.
- A 3'-0" high wood picket handrail would be installed between the columns, enclosing the porch.
- Four (4) 5'-4" wide treated wood steps would access the porch on its west elevation. A picket handrail would rise along the south side of the steps.

Elevations of the rear addition would appear as follows.

- North elevation: corner board; corner board (no fenestration is proposed for this elevation)
 - South elevation: side profile of steps and handrail; column; window; column; door; column
 - East elevation: window; corner board
 - West elevation: corner board; window; corner board, column; handrail; column
3. Construct a 2-car, one-and-a-half story carport with an office and half bath on the second floor.
 - a. The proposed carport would measure 513 sf (20'-0" wide by 25'-8" deep and would include an open carport area and an enclosed storage/stairwell area on the ground floor. The second floor would be an enclosed office area.
 - b. The carport structure would be located to the west (rear) of the existing house. It would sit 11'-0" west of the proposed addition's west end wall. The north end wall would sit 6'-4" south of the north property line, with the west end wall sitting 3'-0" east of the west property line.
 - c. The structure would be topped by a gable roof clad in asphalt shingles to match the existing structure.

- d. The enclosed portions of the carport/office structure would be clad in wood drop siding to match the existing house and proposed addition. An exception to this is the west elevation, which would require a Hardieplank UL 1-hour rated wall.

First floor

- The carport area on the south side would open to the south and would measure 20'-0" wide by 20'-0" deep. It would consist of a concrete slab and would be supported by six (6) 8" square wood columns with caps, with three (3) equally spaced along the east and west elevations.
- A 3'-0" deep sloped concrete apron would run along the south elevation.
- The enclosed portion of the first floor would measure 20'-0" wide by 5'-8" deep.
- Fenestration would consist of a pair of galvanized metal doors which would be centered on the south elevation of the enclosed portion. Each would measure 3'-0" wide by 6'-8" high. A cased opening, which would access the stairway leading to the second floor, would be located on the east end of the same elevation.

Elevations would appear as follows.

- North elevation: corner board; corner board (no fenestration is proposed for the first floor of this elevation)
- South elevation: column; pair of metal doors; cased opening; column
- East elevation: column; column; column; corner board; corner board
- West elevation: corner board; corner board, column; column; column

Second floor

- The second floor would consist of an enclosed area measuring 20'-0" wide by 25'-8" deep.
- Fenestration would consist of two pairs of four-over-four aluminum-clad windows. One pair would be centered on the north elevation; the second would be centered on the north.

Elevations would appear as follows.

- North elevation: corner board; pair of windows; corner board
- South elevation: corner board; pair of windows; corner board
- East elevation: corner board; corner board (no fenestration is proposed for the second floor of this elevation)
- West elevation: corner board; corner board (no fenestration is proposed for the second floor of this elevation)

4. Construct new concrete driveway utilizing the existing curb cut.
- The driveway would span the width of the carport (20'-0"), then narrow to match the width of the existing curb cut as it approaches the south right-of-way (ROW) line.
5. Install a 6'-0" high by 12'-0" wide wood gate.
- The gate would match the existing wood privacy fence in materials and height.
 - The gate would span the concrete driveway along the south ROW line.

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. **6.17** Design and place a new porch to maintain the visibility to and integrity of an original historic porch, as well as the overall historic building.
 - Do not expand an original historic front porch. Additions of new front porches or expansion of existing front porches are generally not appropriate.
 - Limit the height of a porch addition roofline so it does not interfere with second story elevations.
 - Replace a rear porch where a previously existing rear porch is lost or enclosed.
 - Design a rear porch so that its height and slopes are compatible with the original historic structure.
 9. **6.18** Design a new porch to be compatible with the existing historic building.
 - Design the scale, proportion and character of a porch addition element, including columns, corner brackets, railings and pickets, to be compatible with the existing historic residential structure.
 - Match the foundation height of a porch addition to that of the existing historic structure.
 - Design a porch addition roofline to be compatible with the existing historic structure. However, a porch addition roofline need not match exactly that of the existing historic building. For example, a porch addition may have a shed roof.
 - Use materials for a porch addition that are appropriate to the building.
 - Do not use a contemporary deck railing for a porch addition placed at a location visible from the public street.
 - Do not use cast concrete steps on façades or primary elevations.
 10. **6.19** Design piers, foundations and foundation infill on a new addition to be compatible with those on the historic building.
 - Match the foundation of an addition to that of the original.
 - Use a material that is similar to that of the historic foundation.
 - Match foundation height to that of the original historic building.
 - Use pier foundations if feasible and if consistent with the original building.
 - Do not use raw concrete block or wood posts on a foundation.
 11. **6.20** Use details that are similar in character to those on the historic structure. »
 - Match a detail on an addition to match the original historic structure in profile, dimension and material.
 - Use ornamentation on an addition that is less elaborate than that on the original structure.
 - Use a material for details on an addition that match those of the original in quality and feel.
 - Match the proportions of details on an addition to match the proportions used on the original historic structure.

12. **6.21** Design a window on an addition to be compatible with the original historic building.
- Size, place and space a window for an addition to be in character with the original historic building.
 - If an aluminum window is used, use dimensions that are similar to the original windows of the house. An extruded custom aluminum window approved by the NPS or an aluminum clad wood window may be used, provided it has a profile, dimension and durability similar to a window in the historic building.

12. **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.

13. **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)

14. **10.2** Design a fence to be compatible with the architectural style of the house and existing fences in the neighborhood.

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.

ACCEPTABLE FENCE MATERIALS Materials that have a similar character, durability and finish to those of fences of historic properties in the district are acceptable.

These often include:

- Wood picket
- Wood slat
- Wood lattice
- Iron or steel
- Historically appropriate wire fences
- Aluminum that appears similar to iron

UNACCEPTABLE FENCE MATERIALS Materials that do not have a similar character, durability and finish to those of fences of historic properties in the district are unacceptable.

These often include:

- Chain link
- Stockade
- Post and rail
- Masonite
- PVC
- Plywood or asbestos paneling
- Razor wire
- Barbed wire

15. **10.7** Minimize the visual impact of parking.

- Locate a parking area at the rear or to the side of a site whenever possible.
- Use landscaping to screen a parking area.
- Minimize the widths of a paved area or a curb cut.
- If a curb cut is no longer in use, repair the curb. In some areas, granite curbs may be required.
- Do not use paving in the front yard for a parking area. Paving stones might be acceptable in certain instances.
- Do not create a new driveway or garage that opens onto a primary street.

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

- Gravel or crushed stone
- Shell
- Brick
- Cobblestone
- Grasspave or grasscrete (mix of grass and hard surface paving material that provides a solid surface)

STAFF ANALYSIS

The subject property is a contributing structure to the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. The application under review proposes the removal of an existing rear porch, the construction of a one-story addition which would project from the existing west (rear) elevation, and the construction of a new two-story ancillary building.

Addition

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 586 square feet, would be approximately 52% of the footprint of the historic mass of the house, which is 1136sf. This footprint incorporates the existing rear porch which sits in the same location as the proposed addition. The roof proposed for the addition also sits subordinate to the height of the existing roof.

Foundation and ceiling heights proposed for the addition match those of the existing house. (6.9 - 6.11, 6.15)

As directed by the *Guidelines*, the proposed addition is differentiated by the alternation in roofline and roof height. The proposed offset placement to the north, along with its projecting footprint would further distinguish the addition from the original structure. (6.12)

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, aluminum-clad wood windows, and wood trim, along with matching masonry foundation and vents. (6.13, 6.19, 6.21)

Likewise, the incorporation of frieze boards, exposed rafters, matching roof pitch and overhang depths complement and mirror the original structure. (6.14, 6.20)

Carport/office structure

The proposed placement of the carport/office structure is in the same vicinity of a previous accessory structure which was constructed in 1982. The placement complies with the *Guidelines'* directive to place accessory buildings at the rear of the lot. (9.2) The proposed ancillary structure would measure 513 sf, significantly smaller in scale than the historic dwelling. A one-and-a-half story structure with a higher roof peak than the house by a very slim margin, the proposed carport/office would remain visually subordinate with its placement and orientation on the lot, along with its inferior scale (9.1).

Site improvements

The proposed concrete driveway would replace a previous driveway. Its location would lessen the visual impact of parking, as directed by the *Guidelines*. The proposed wood gate is likewise compliant and would match the dimensions and materials of the existing fence. (10.2, 10.7)

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Douglas Kearley was present to discuss the application. He stated that all materials for project would match existing.

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

There were no questions from the Board.

FINDING FACTS

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

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



Agenda Item #5 Certified Record 2024-24-CA

DETAILS

Location:

6 S. Franklin Street

Summary of Request:

Remove frame and metal enclosure of rear double gallery and secure exposed openings. Perform emergency repairs of north and south elevation brick walls.

Applicant (as applicable):

Mike Rogers

Property Owner:

Historic Mobile, LLC

Historic District:

Lower Dauphin Street Commercial

Classification:

Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The application seeks approval for the demolition of the enclosure of the rear wing galleries and implementation of other measures to stabilize the building prior to full rehabilitation.
- The submitted plans are in compliance with the *Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts*.

Report Contents:

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

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 subject property was constructed c. 1852 (though possibly as early as 1824) for Giovanni Giacomo Chighizola, an Italian immigrant born in 1789. Chighizola established himself as a merchant in Mobile. The property was sold out of the Chighizola family in 1880 and passed through several owners until it was purchased by Morris Hoffman, a furniture merchant, in 1938. The property was owned by the Hoffman family and used for storage until December 2023, when Historic Mobile purchased the property with the intent of selling it to a party who would rehabilitate it.

The house was constructed as a side-hall plan residence with two rooms on the first and second floors. More private rooms and servants' quarters were arrayed in an offset rear wing, and those rooms were accessed via open galleries on the south elevation of the wing. The building footprint shown on the 1878 Hopkins ward map of Mobile shows a main front structure with inset rear additions unfolding to the west. The rear wing was constructed as a series of rooms accessible by open galleries, rather than an enclosed hallway, and the roof steps down as the importance of the occupants decreases. The frame porches on the rear wing and a frame porch across the east elevation (façade) are very clearly depicted on the 1885, 1891, 1904, and 1924 and Sanborn maps. By the time the 1955 revision of the 1924 Sanborn map was prepared, the porches on the south elevation had been enclosed, and the house is shown as being used for furniture storage. Therefore, the existing corrugated metal and wood enclosure along the western half of the south elevation date to some point between 1924 and 1955, but likely around 1938 when the property changed hands. The full-width porch or balcony on the façade was still extant as of the 1955 Sanborn map but has since disappeared.

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

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Complete emergency repairs and stabilization.
 - a. Remove failing portions of north and south (side) walls and rebuild using existing bricks. Replace missing bricks in-kind. All masonry work will utilize an appropriate lime-based mortar mix.
 - b. Repoint areas where historic mortar has deteriorated, using an appropriate lime-based mortar.
 - c. Remove and replace damaged/deteriorated roofing, rafters, and decking. Extant slates will be stored for later reinstallation. Install a temporary peel-and-stick shingle roof for stabilization purposes until the slate roof is reinstalled in a future phase.
2. Remove rear double gallery enclosure.
 - a. The two-story frame and metal enclosure (including windows, door, later decking, and stairs) of the rear double gallery would be removed.

- b. The original porch roof (the overhang of the rear wing roof) would remain. The later porch addition framing, including the roof extension, would be removed.
- c. Secure the existing door and window openings along the south side of the building to preclude entry by animals or vagrants.
 - A temporary plywood enclosure wall would be erected at the perimeter of the original gallery.

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

1. 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. (5.4)
2. Preserve and restore the visibility of original historic materials.
 - Consider removing later covering materials that have not achieved historic significance.
 - Once a non-historic siding is removed, repair the original, underlying material.
 - Do not cover or obscure original building materials. (5.5)
3. 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. (5.6)
4. Preserve and repair original masonry materials.
 - Preserve masonry features that define the overall historic character, such as walls, cornices, pediments, steps and foundations.
 - Take particular care with historic masonry. Consult Staff for guidance when repairing and replacing mortar joints and masonry. (5.8)
5. Repair and maintain original roof materials rather than replace them, wherever possible.
 - Patch and replace damaged areas of an existing roof. (5.12)

STAFF ANALYSIS

The subject property is a contributing resource in the Lower Dauphin Street Commercial District and has sat derelict for at least five decades. The applicant wishes to rehabilitate the property, and the proposed work tasks are the first steps toward achieving that goal, as stabilization and emergency repairs are necessary.

Based on the ownership and use of the subject property, it is likely the wood framing and metal siding that enclose the rear gallery, were constructed between 1938 and 1955. As recognized by the Secretary of the Interior, changes to historic properties may merit preservation if they have achieved historic significance in their own right.¹ The application under review seeks to remove the c. 1938 enclosure in order to reveal the original double gallery along the south elevation in the process of a full rehabilitation. Despite its survival over the last 85 years, the enclosure was not well constructed, as the deterioration evident on the interior illustrates. The failures of the enclosure have led to damage and deterioration of the c. 1852 Chighizola House, consistent with the trapping of moisture. Further, the enclosure obscures the character-defining double gallery at the rear wing of the house. Therefore, in accordance with the *Guidelines*, the removal of the metal siding enclosure would reveal original building materials and bolster preservation efforts for the historic structure. (5.5)

The proposed removal of failing masonry on the north and south elevations, replacement of missing bricks on the south elevation, and repointing in areas where the lime-based mortar has degraded over the last 170 years would be in full compliance with the *Guidelines'* instructions to, "Use original materials to replace damaged building materials on a primary façade if possible" and, "Replace only the amount of material required." (5.6, 5.7) The applicant will save for reuse any bricks removed in the process of stabilization, and replacement bricks, if necessary, will match as closely as possible the existing bricks. (5.4, 5.8)

The deteriorated roof structure will be repaired, and extant slates will be saved for later use. The applicant proposes a temporary shingle roof while later phases of the rehabilitation are planned and executed. It is the applicant's intention to, "Repair and maintain original roof materials rather than replace them," as provided by the *Guidelines*. (5.12)

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Douglas Kearley was present to discuss the application. He stated that the roof is in bad shape, that there is no electricity or plumbing at the property, and noted that the metal infill at the service wing was added when the building was being used as a warehouse.

Mr. Fred Renfrey from the Downtown Mobile Alliance was also present to discuss the project. He described the rear enclosure, noting that it currently seems to be held up by chicken wire and tin, and added that it is compromising the roof. He stated that the application seeks approval for stabilization work to prepare for a rehabilitation initiative to be carried out in accordance with the *Guidelines* and the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.

No other members of the public came forward to speak in favor of or against the application. A written comment was received from Mr. Mike Rogers, speaking in favor of the application.

¹ Standard 4, Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties ("Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.")

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Blackwell noted that the infilled area is not original to the building and is jeopardizing the building.

Ms. Dawson added that although the alterations to the rear wing are considered historic, they are of inferior construction and detract from the original design with the rear open gallery wing.

FINDING FACTS

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

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

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



Agenda Item #6

Certified Record 2024-25-CA

DETAILS

Location:

406 Wisconsin Avenue

Summary of Request:

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

Applicant (as applicable):

Baumgardner House Raising, LLC/ BHL Federal

Property Owner:

Essie Etheridge

Historic District:

Leinkauf

Classification:

Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The existing house at 406 Wisconsin is a contributing structure to the district.
- The extant structure does not appear to be structurally compromised.
- The proposed new construction is of similar size and form of the existing.
- The proposed new construction design incorporates elements that echo those of the original structure.
- The materials proposed for the new structure are compliant with the Design Guidelines for new construction.

Report Contents:

Property and Application History 2

Scope of Work 2

Applicable Standards 3

Staff Analysis 7

Attachments9

PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

Leinkauf Historic District was initially listed in the National Register in 1987 under Criteria A and C for significant architecture and community planning; the district was expanded in 2009. The neighborhood was settled in the early 20th century as a streetcar suburb adjacent to Government Street and surrounding Leinkauf School (1904). Housing forms and styles in the district reflect the range of styles and forms popular from 1900 through 1955.

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

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

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Demolish existing house.
2. Construct a single family one-story residence.
 - a. The new structure would be oriented on the lot such that the front setback from the ROW on Wisconsin Avenue would measure 25'-2". Side yard setbacks on the north and south would measure 7'-2" and 14'-0" respectively.
 - b. The proposed one-story, three-bay dwelling would be rectangular in shape and would measure approximately 28'-10" wide by 44'-0" wide for a total of 1271 sf.
 - c. The structure would be topped by a hipped roof with a projecting bay on the front elevation also topped by a hipped roof. The roof structure would be clad in architectural shingles.
 - d. The house would sit on a 1'-6" high foundation of brick piers. Recessed wood lattice panels would be used for infill on the north, south, and west elevations. Recessed brick infill would be installed across the east (front) elevation.
 - e. Fenestration would be comprised of 13 one-over-one vinyl clad wood windows, and two steel paneled entry doors.
 - f. Plate height from the finished floor would measure 9'-0", with a roof ridge height of 16'-8 ½".
 - g. The house would be clad in fiber cement siding and trim.
 - h. A front porch would span the southern half of the east façade. It would measure 14'-7" wide by 5'-8" deep and be supported by two (2) wood battered columns sitting on brick plinths. A brick knee wall would enclose the porch. Approximately five (5) brick steps would access the front porch on its north end. Wood handrails and brick cheek walls would flank either side of the steps. The northern half of the façade would project slightly forward of the front porch by 1'-1" and would measure 14'-2" wide.
 - i. A small 5'-0" by 5'-0" rear recessed stoop would be located on the west (rear) elevation between approximately ½ and ⅔ along the elevation (from north to south). The porch would access a rear entry door which would measure 3'-0" wide by 6'-8" high.

j. Elevations would appear as follows:

East façade (from south to north)

Column; pair of one-over-one windows measuring 3'-0" wide by 5'-0" high; column; paneled door; corner board; pair of one-over-one windows measuring 3'-0" wide by 5'-0" high, centered on the projection; corner board

West elevation (from north to south)

Corner board; corner board; paneled door; corner board; one (1) one-over-one window measuring 3'-0" wide by 3'-0" high; corner board

North elevation (from east to west)

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

South elevation (from west to east)

Corner board; one pair of one-over-one windows measuring 3'-0" wide by 5'-0" high; one pair of one-over-one windows measuring 3'-0" wide by 5'-0" high, both regularly dispersed across the east half of the elevation; corner board; brick knee wall; brick plinth and wood column; side profile of brick cheek wall and wood handrail

3. Site improvements would include the following:

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

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

1. 12.0 Demolition Guidelines

- Consider the current significance of a structure previously determined to be historic.
- Consider the condition of the structure in question. Demolition may be more appropriate when a building is deteriorated or in poor condition.
- Consider whether the building is one of the last remaining positive examples of its kind in the neighborhood, county, or region.
- Consider the impact that demolition will have on surrounding structures, including neighboring properties, properties on the same block or across the street or properties throughout the individual historic district.
- Consider whether the building is part of an ensemble of historic buildings that create a neighborhood.
- Consider the future utilization of the site.
- If a development is proposed to replace a demolished historic structure, determine that the proposed replacement structure is consistent with the guidelines for new construction in historic districts.

2. **6.34** Maintain the visual line created by the fronts of buildings along a street.

- Where front yard setbacks are uniform, place a new structure in general alignment with its neighbors.

- Where front yard setbacks vary, place a new structure within the established range of front yard setbacks on a block.
3. **6.35** Maintain the side yard spacing pattern on the block.
 - Locate a structure to preserve the side yard spacing pattern on the block as seen from the street.
 - Provide sufficient side setbacks for property maintenance.
 - Provide sufficient side setbacks to allow needed parking to occur behind the front wall of the house.
 4. **6.36** Design the massing of new construction to appear similar to that of historic buildings in the district.
 - Choose the massing and shape of the new structure to maintain a rhythm of massing along the street.
 - Match the proportions of the front elevations of a new structure with those in the surrounding district.
 5. **6.37** Design the scale of new construction to appear similar to that of historic buildings in the district.
 - Use a building height in front that is compatible with adjacent contributing properties.
 - Size foundation and floor heights to appear similar to those of nearby historic buildings
 - Match the scale of a porch to the main building and reflect the scale of porches of nearby historic buildings.
 6. **6.38** Design exterior building walls to reflect traditional development patterns of nearby historic buildings.
 - Use a ratio of solid to void that is similar in proportion to those of nearby historic buildings.
 - Reflect the rhythm of windows and doors in a similar fashion on all exterior building walls. The ARB will consider all building walls; however, building walls facing streets may face increased scrutiny.
 - Use steps and balustrades in a similar fashion as nearby historic structures.
 - Design building elements on exterior building walls to be compatible with those on nearby historic buildings. These elements include, but are not limited to: • Balconies • Chimneys • Dormers
 7. **6.39** Use exterior materials and finishes that complement the character of the surrounding district.
 - Use material, ornamentation or a color scheme that blends with the historic district rather than making the building stand out.
 - If an alternative material is used that represents an evolution of a traditional material, suggest the finish of the original historic material from which it evolved.
 - Use a material with proven durability in the Mobile climate and that is similar in scale, character and finish to those used on nearby historic buildings.

ACCEPTABLE MATERIALS

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

- Stucco
- Brick
- Stone
- Wood (lap siding, shingles, board and batten)
- Concrete siding

- Cement fiber board siding
- Skim stucco coat

UNACCEPTABLE MATERIALS

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

- Metal siding
 - Vinyl siding
 - Unfinished concrete block
 - Plywood
 - Masonite
 - Vinyl coatings
 - Ceramic coatings
 - Exterior insulation and finishing system (EIFS) wall systems
8. **6.40** Design a roof on new construction to be compatible with those on adjacent historic buildings.
- Design the roof shape, height, pitch and overall complexity to be similar to those on nearby historic buildings.
 - Use materials that appear similar in character, scale, texture and color range to those on nearby historic buildings.
 - New materials that have proven durability may be used.

ACCEPTABLE ROOF MATERIALS

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

- Asphalt dimensional or multi-tab shingles
 - Wood shake or shingle
 - Standing seam metal
 - Metal shingles
 - 5-V crimp metal
 - Clay tile
 - Imitation clay tile or slate
9. **6.41** Design a new door and doorway on new construction to be compatible with the historic district.
- Place and size a door to establish a solid-to-void ratio similar to that of nearby historic buildings.
 - Place a door in a fashion that contributes to the traditional rhythm of the district as seen in nearby historic buildings.
 - Incorporate a door casement and trim similar to those seen on nearby historic buildings.
 - Place and size a special feature, including a transom, sidelight or decorative framing element, to complement those seen in nearby historic buildings.
 - Use a door material that blends well with surrounding historic buildings. Wood is preferred. Paneled doors with or without glass are generally appropriate.
10. **6.42** Design a porch to be compatible with the neighborhood.
- Include a front porch as part of new construction if it is contextual and feasible.
 - When designing a porch, consider porch location, proportion, rhythm, roof form, supports, steps, balustrades and ornamentation relative to the main building and porches in the district.
 - Design the elements of a porch to be at a scale proportional to the main building.

- Where a rhythm of porches exists on a street or block, design a porch that continues this historic rhythm.
 - Design a rear or side porch that is visible from the public right-of-way to be subordinate in character to the front porch.
11. **6.43** Design piers, a foundation and foundation infill to be compatible with those of nearby historic properties.
- Use raised, pier foundations.
 - If raised foundations are not feasible, use a simulated raised foundation.
 - Do not use slab-on-grade construction. This is not appropriate for Mobile’s historic neighborhoods. If a raised slab is required, use water tables, exaggerated bases, faux piers or other methods to simulate a raised foundation.
 - Do not use raw concrete block or exposed slabs.
 - If foundation infill must be used, ensure that it is compatible with the neighborhood.
 - If solid infill is used, recess it and screen it with landscaping.
 - If lattice is used, hang it below the floor framing and between the piers. Finish it with trim.
 - Do not secure lattice to the face of the building or foundation.
 - Do not use landscaping to disguise inappropriate foundation design.

ACCEPTABLE FOUNDATION MATERIALS

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

- Brick piers
- Brick infill
- Wood (vertical pickets)
- Framed lattice infill

UNACCEPTABLE FOUNDATION MATERIALS

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

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

12. **6.44** Use details and ornamentation that help new construction integrate with the historic buildings in the district.
- Use a decorative detail in a manner similar to those on nearby historic buildings. A modern interpretation of a historic detail or decoration is encouraged.
 - Do not use a decorative detail that overpowers or negatively impacts nearby historic buildings.
13. **6.45** Locate and design windows to be compatible with those in the district.
- Locate and size a window to create a solid-to-void ratio similar to the ratios seen on nearby historic buildings.
 - Locate a window to create a traditional rhythm and a proportion of openings similar to that seen in nearby historic buildings.
 - Use a traditional window casement and trim similar to those seen in nearby historic buildings.

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

ACCEPTABLE WINDOW MATERIALS

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

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

UNACCEPTABLE WINDOW MATERIALS

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

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

14. **10.5** Visually connect the street and building.

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

15. **10.7** Minimize the visual impact of parking.

- Locate a parking area at the rear or to the side of a site whenever possible.
- Use landscaping to screen a parking area.
- Minimize the widths of a paved area or a curb cut.
- If a curb cut is no longer in use, repair the curb. In some areas, granite curbs may be required.
- Do not use paving in the front yard for a parking area. Paving stones might be acceptable in certain instances.
- Do not create a new driveway or garage that opens onto a primary street.

ACCEPTABLE WALK AND PAVING MATERIALS

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

- Gravel or crushed stone
- Shell
- Brick
- Cobblestone
- Grasspave or grasscrete (mix of grass and hard surface paving material that provides a solid surface)

16. **10.10** Provide a landscaped front yard for a residential property in a historic district.

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

STAFF ANALYSIS

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

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

Per the *Guidelines*, "the condition of the structure in question" should be considered. "Demolition may be more appropriate when a building is deteriorated or in poor condition." In the case of the subject property the building has sustained some superficial deterioration including areas of rotten or missing siding, along with damaged roof rafters and mortar corrosion between brick courses on foundation piers. There is some visual evidence of sunken piers signifying settling of the structure over time, which is common for historic homes in this region. A structural assessment report was submitted with the application which notes areas of deficiencies. The noted items in the report are typical of an aging building and do not indicate that the building cannot be rehabilitated or that it is a public hazard.

Whether the building in question is "one of the last remaining positive examples of its kind in the neighborhood, county or region" should be factored into any decision to allow or disallow demolition in a historic district. As stated above, the Craftsman style was enthusiastically embraced in Mobile during the early 20th century, as the simple design and the climate was well suited to this architectural trend and to Mobile's post-war growth. The 1956 Sanborn map reveals that after the subdivision of this section of Wisconsin Street in 1922, nineteen single-family homes were built along both sides of the street between Eslava Street on the north and Ohio Street to the south. Almost all of these residences denote a form very similar to 406 Wisconsin. All of the homes are extant, with very little modifications, with the exception of 405 Wisconsin, which was replaced with a new home around 1990. The

demolition of the historic home at 406 Wisconsin would diminish the integrity of this minimally altered example of pre-World War II planned development in the Leinkauf Historic District.

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

The *Design Review Guidelines* provide directives for new construction within Mobile's historic districts. Front yard setbacks of a new residential structure should fall within the range established on the street. The new structure proposed for 406 Wisconsin would sit similarly on the lot as the existing house and the, With a proposed front setback of 25'-2" and side yard setbacks of 7'-2" and 14'-0", the proposed structure would sit similarly on the lot as the existing historic house and would also fall within the established range that occurs on surrounding lots. (6.34, 6.35)

The historic structures in the immediate vicinity of the subject property vary slightly in size and details, but are fairly consistently one-story structures, rectangular in shape, some with off-set front or side projections. The proposed design for the subject lot is somewhat consistent in massing, proportions, and height with neighboring historic structures. It does lack offset side walls along the elevations expressed on many of the surrounding buildings which create a pattern of projections and recesses. The contributing buildings in its immediate vicinity sit on raised foundations which appear to be comparable in height to that proposed for the subject project. The intended use of masonry piers and lattice infill is likewise compatible with the historic neighborhood. (6.36,6.37, 6.43).

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

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Stephen Weirup and Ms. Melissa Burnett from BHL Federal and homeowner Ms. Essie Etheridge were present to speak about the application.

Mr. Weirup discussed the Federal HRAP program and stated that upon learning that 406 Wisconsin was in a historic district, Ms. Burnett was placed in charge of updating submitted new construction plans to meet the standards.

Sharee Broussard from Leinkauf Historic District Neighborhood Association came forward to speak against the application. She informed the Board that the Leinkauf Historic District Neighborhood Association opposes the demolition of 406 Wisconsin, stating that the subject property is not a derelict structure. She asked the Board to deny the application.

No written comments were received.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Allen informed the Board that Ms. Burnett had worked hard to ensure that plans were adjusted to meet the *Guidelines*.

Ms. Dawson gave some background information as to why Section 106 review was not undertaken at this property, explaining that although the money for the program is coming from the federal government, this property is not located within the National Register district, but within a locally only designated portion of the Leinkauf Historic District.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor asked Mr. Weirup if the homeowner has a choice of either repair or demolition and new construction.

Mr. Weirup replied no, that the decision is based on the assessed value of the house compared to the cost of repair.

Ms. Traylor asked if there was a possibility that nothing would happen if the homeowner doesn't accept demolition.

Mr. Weirup replied that nothing was a possibility, adding that there is a chance ADECA or Horne would withdraw funding after some time.

Mr. McGowin asked Mr. Weirup if he knew when the funding expires.

Ms. Burnett replied that it doesn't expire but that it has been designated for new construction. The timeline is 120 days from the Notice to Proceed to complete the work.

Mr. Weirup added that the project is already behind its timeline.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor asked the homeowner if she would like to renovate if possible.

Ms. Etheridge replied that she would love to renovate the house, but that the house has sustained so much damage, and it is sinking. She noted the house across the street which is a newer house.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor described to Ms. Etheridge the domino effect of both demolitions and improvements within the historic districts, explaining that demolitions degrade the integrity of the district, whereas improvements increase property values and maintain the integrity of the area. She also stated that the level of settling at the subject property is fairly common for the area and is not at a point of requiring a teardown.

Ms. Etheridge responded that she understands and has seen a lot of Leinkauf torn down. She added that she loves her front porch, that is was one of the reasons why she bought the house, but that the house is not longer economically feasible for her and that she would like to find a way forward.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor replied that the Board would like to help her through this process.

Mr. Weirup stated that they would do whatever they can to make the new structure compatible with the district.

Mr. Howle stated that he had some questions about the structural assessment and the extent of the damage at the property.

Mr. Weirup stated that a representative from Cobalt, the authors of the assessment, was not present to answer questions outside of what is in the report.

Ms. Echols stated that cement fiber board and vinyl clad windows are not compliant materials. She discussed the importance of the front porch like the one on the existing house and asked if there was a possibility of reusing materials from current house on potential new construction.

Mr. Weirup stated that material changes and reuse of existing materials would not cause delays in the project.

Ms. Echols reiterated that the homeowner expressed her love of the front porch and asked about recreating the existing porch on a new plan.

Ms. Maurin commented that the finished floor elevation needs to match those on the street.

Mr. Weirup stated that the elevation could be matched.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor commented that structural assessments look at things in a vacuum, citing the example that the settling of structures is typical for this type of property but doesn't mean the house is structurally unsound. She added that the mention of knob and tube wiring is immaterial as is most likely no longer in use and has just been left in the attic. She also addressed the mention of cracks in plaster, which are also typical in this type of home, and is a superficial issue, not structural.

Mr. Weirup stated that their concern is for the piers that are out of plumb and not as safe as they could be. He then asked Mr. Blackwell if the Board would like to see anything in particular regarding porch design.

Mr. Blackwell commented that most houses in this area had full-width front porches.

Ms. Maurin added that the roof plate height of the new construction should match that of the existing.

Ms. Burnett stated the porch was designed as it was to keep in budget.

Mr. Weirup stated that the homeowner is displaced, and the best solution is reconstruction.

Mr. Blackwell commented that the proposed design does not meet requirements of the *Guidelines*.

Ms. Echols proposed keeping the façade and building a new structure behind.

Mr. Blackwell moved to table the application, with the provision that the applicant engage in further discussion with Staff.

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



Agenda Item #8

Certified Record 2024-27-CA

DETAILS

Location:

251 Government Street

Summary of Request:

Install a 20.17 sf storefront sign on north elevation

Applicant (as applicable):

Wrico Signs, Inc.

Property Owner:

251 Government Street, LLC

Historic District:

Church Street East

Classification:

Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- Including the proposed sign, the total sign square footage at 251 Government Street would exceed the 64 square feet allowed in the *Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts*.
- All other aspects of the new storefront sign conform to the *Guidelines*.

Report Contents:

Property and Application History 2

Scope of Work 2

Applicable Standards 3

Staff Analysis 3

Attachments5

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 property at 251 Government Street, currently known as the Admiral Hotel, was constructed between 1939 and 1940. The 12-story commercial building is rendered in a simplified classical style typical of the inter-war period and Great Depression era. Classical details include the tripartite building composition with a simple triangular pediment over the recessed center portion. The structure is primarily clad in red brick with limestone cladding at the first and second floors along Government Street and Joachim Street. At the two uppermost stories, limestone window surrounds, sill course, lintel course, and cornice provide restrained detailing to the otherwise plain façade.

The property operated as the Admiral Semmes Hotel continually between 1940 and its closure 1978. Following significant damage to the structure during Hurricane Frederic in 1979, plans were scrapped to redevelop the property as a retirement community. The property was then vacant for 6 years before undergoing a significant interior renovation and reopening as the Radisson Admiral Semmes Hotel in 1985. The property has since undergone renovations following changes in ownership in 2014 and 2022.

According to Historic Development Department files, this property appeared ten times before the Architectural Review Board (ARB). In 1984, the ARB approved installation of new sidewalks in July, lighting changes in August, and installation of parking signs in December. In August 1986, the ARB approved alterations to parking signage. In March 1991, the ARB denied installation of aluminum or vinyl awnings as inappropriate but did approve installation of new canvas awnings on the existing frames. In September 1991, the ARB denied an application to install an internally lit sign in excess of the size limit of 64 square-feet then in place. The applicant subsequently received a Sign Variance from the Board of Zoning Adjustment in November 1992, and a new application for a 65-square-foot sign with individual backlit letters received staff-level approval in June 1993. In November 2003, the ARB approved installation of two raceway mounted channel letter signs, noting that the proposed signs fell within the limits allowed by the Board of Zoning Adjustment in 1993. In April 2007, the ARB approved placement of antennae and repeaters on the roof. In April 2010, approval was granted for landscape improvements, including resurfacing the parking lot and installing an aluminum fence and gates. Most recently, in March 2015, the ARB approved installation of the existing 156-square-foot vertical signage on the south elevation, ground-level fenestration changes, installation of lighting under balconies, and replacement of awnings at the ground floor and upper levels.

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Remove existing double-sided vertical signs on Government Street and Joachim Street.
 - b. The two signs measure 2' in width by 10' in height.
 - c. The total square footage of both signs amount to 80 square feet.
2. The two wall-mounted building signs and large vertical "interstate" sign on the south elevation would remain.

- a. Building signs on north and east elevations each measure 2' square, for a total area of 8 square feet.
 - b. Vertical sign on south elevation measures 3'8" in width and 85' in height, for a total area of 156 square feet.
 - c. These signs together amount to 164 square feet.
3. Install one single-faced storefront sign on the north elevation of the property facing Government Street.
- a. The storefront sign would measure 1'-11" high, 11' wide, and 4" deep and would be made of welded aluminum painted gloss black (21.08 sf).
 - b. The storefront sign would be suspended from the underside of the iron canopy structure that extends over the public pedestrian sidewalk. The storefront sign would be centered over the main Government Street entrance doors.
 - c. The sign text would consist of the business name (The Admiral Hotel). Letters would be aluminum with either a polished or brushed anodized finish in a gold color.

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

1. Design a new sign to be compatible with the character of a building and the district. (11.3)
2. New signs are restricted to a maximum of 64 square feet.
 - Directional signage is not counted toward the total square footage allotment. (11.5)
3. Place a sign to be compatible with those in the district.
 - Mount a sign to fit within existing architectural features. (11.6)
4. Use a sign material that is compatible with the materials of the building on which it is placed and the district. New materials that achieve the effect of traditional materials and lighting solutions will be considered on a case by case basis.
 - Do not use highly reflective materials for a sign. All plastic faced box signs are not allowed.
 - Design a sign to be subordinate to the building façade. (11.7)
5. ACCEPTABLE SIGN MATERIALS

Sign materials that are similar in character, performance, and durability to historic commercial signage in the district are acceptable. These often include:

 - Painted or carved wood
 - Individual wood or cast metal letters or symbols
 - Stone, such as slate, marble, or sandstone
 - Painted, gilded, or sandblasted glass
 - Metal, provided it is appropriate to the architectural character of the building

UNACCEPTABLE SIGN MATERIALS

Sign materials that are not similar in character, permanence and durability to historic commercial signage in the district are unacceptable. These often include:

- Whole plastic face
- Metal inappropriate for the architectural character of the building (11.9)

STAFF ANALYSIS

The application involves the installation of a storefront sign with an area of approximately 21 square feet on a contributing property located on Government Street in the Old Dauphin Way District. The application also proposes removal of two existing vertical signs from the Government Street and Joachim Street elevations which together amount to approximately 80 square feet of signage.

The proposed signage alterations would bring the total sign square footage to approximately 164 square feet, or 100 feet over the 64 square feet allowed in the *Guidelines* (11.5). However, it should be noted that the application would reduce the total square footage, which is currently around 244 square feet. The majority of this total square footage is due to the 156-square-foot sign on the building's south elevation, which the ARB approved in March 2015. At that time, the ARB's approval was made contingent on the owner receiving a variance from the Board of Zoning Adjustment for the large vertical signage. This variance was approved at the regular Board of Zoning Adjustment's regular monthly meeting on July 6, 2015.

The proposed signage would be constructed of a material compatible with the historic building, and the intended placement suspended from the balcony and facing Government Street is also appropriate to the character of the building as instructed by the *Guidelines* (11.6, 11.7). The lettering will not be lit.

The *Guidelines* instruct that signage should be designed "to be compatible with the character of a building and the district." (11.3) Although the size of the proposed signage would place the total signage square footage in excess of that allowed by the *Guidelines*, the proposed removal of two existing signs would bring the total square footage of signs down by about 60 square feet. The proposed alterations would have little to no impact on the pedestrian experience of signage at this property along Government and Joachim Streets.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Adam DeVaney was present to discuss the application. He explained that the project includes eliminating two blade signs and replacing them with one storefront sign which he believes is more historically accurate.

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board had no questions or comments.

FINDING FACTS

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

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:30.

These minutes were approved by the ARB in their June 5, 2024 meeting.