



Architectural Review Board Agenda

October 16, 2024 – 3:00 P.M.

ADMINISTRATIVE

The meeting was called to order by the Chair, Catarina Echols, at 3:03 pm.

1. Roll Call

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

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

Members Absent: Stephen Howle, Cameron Pfeiffer-Traylor, and Barja Wilson

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

2. Approval of Minutes from October 2, 2024

Annie Allen, Historic Development staff, stated that, due to staff turnover and the high volume of cases before the Board on both October 2 and October 16, staff had been unable to complete minutes of the October 2 meeting for the Board to review. Ms. Allen stated that the minutes would be distributed for review and approval once they were complete.

3. Approval of Mid-Month COAs granted by Staff

Cartledge Blackwell move to approve the mid-month COAs granted by Staff.

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

MID-MONTH APPROVALS

- Applicant:** Professional Roofing & Construction, LLC
Property Address: 1512 Dauphin Street
Issue Date: 09/24/2024
Project: Reroof in kind with shingles. Color: Charcoal
- Applicant:** Veronica Philon
Property Address: 204 S. Dearborn Street
Issue Date: 09/24/2024
Project: Reroof with shingles. Color to match existing.
- Applicant:** Maye Properties LLC
Property Address: 1662 Government Street

- Issue Date:** 09/25/2024
Project: Replace wood siding in kind, as needed.
4. **Applicant:** All Weather Roofing & Construction LLC
Property Address: 1154 Old Shell Road
Issue Date: 09/25/2024
Project: Reroof with shingles. Color: Pewter
5. **Applicant:** Tuff Shed Inc.
Property Address: 207 Rapier Avenue
Issue Date: 09/27/2024
Project: Construct a prefabricated 10'x8' shed which will sit on the ground, east of dwelling, at the rear of the property. The door and walls will be of engineered wood. Windows will be aluminum.
6. **Applicant:** Elizabeth Hunter
Property Address: 204 Roper Street
Issue Date: 10/01/2024
Project:
 1. Repaint front porch columns and pilasters to match existing.
 2. Repaint front door to match existing shutter color. Repaint trim around door to match existing.
 3. Repaint porch decking, steps, and knee walls in Narragansett Green by Benjamin Moore.
7. **Applicant:** Donald Brooks
Property Address: 1768 Dauphin Street
Issue Date: 10/02/2024
Project: Construct a 24'x32' carport at rear of lot. Materials will be 6' x 6' wood posts and roof truss system with a metal roof. Structure to sit on concrete pad. Posts will be painted to match the body color of the main structure.
8. **Applicant:** Cunningham Bounds LLC
Property Address: 204 S. Monterey Street
Issue Date: 10/02/2024
Project: Remove existing wood siding on all elevations of non-historic accessory building and replace with Hardie board siding to match existing siding in size and profile.
9. **Applicant:** Historic Design Company LLC
Property Address: 310 Marine Street
Issue Date: 10/04/2024
Project: Replace rotten siding boards and fence boards where needed to match existing.
10. **Applicant:** Complete Roofing LLC
Property Address: 75 S. Ann Street
Issue Date: 10/04/2024
Project: Replace asbestos tile roofing with shingles in Charcoal Black color.
11. **Applicant:** Vickie Croft
Property Address: 51 S. Julia Street
Issue Date: 10/04/2024
Project: Install an 11'-3"x30' inground fiberglass pool at the southeast corner of the lot. A concrete patio will surround the pool at a depth of 2ft on the west,

north, and east sides. On the south side of the pool, the concrete patio will measure 10ft deep.

APPLICATIONS

1. 2024-53-CA

Address: 256 S. Broad Street
Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Applicant / Agent: Bud Walker on behalf of Nick & Theresa Chamblee
Project: Construct pool house in rear yard.

2. 2024-54-CA

Address: 2255 Ashland Place Avenue
Historic District: Ashland Place
Applicant / Agent: Cochran Investments, Inc.
Project: Rebuild front steps; paint unpainted bricks.

3. 2024-55-CA

Address: 6 S. Franklin Street
Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street Commercial
Applicant / Agent: LeMoyné Properties, LLC
Project: Reconstruction of rear gallery, chimneys, front steps, and front balcony; installation of shutters; construction of comfort area at rear; installation of fencing and golf cart access gate.

4. 2024-56-CA

Address: 252 Rapier Avenue
Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Applicant / Agent: Richard Davis
Project: After-the-Fact: 1. Replace railing above front porch. 2. Replace window on second story façade with double doors that do not fit the opening.

5. 2024-57-CA

Address: 1662 Government Street
Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Applicant / Agent: Brandon Maye
Project: After-the-Fact: 1. Replace porch decking. 2. Replace all windows except beneath front porch with vinyl types. 3. Enclose front porch supports with 1"x8" wood to square.

6. 2024-58-CA

Address: 301 McDonald Avenue
Historic District: Leinkauf
Applicant / Agent: Quality Home Repair/Remodeling
Project: Replace 4 windows on north elevation with vinyl windows not matching the original openings.

7. 2024-47-CA

Address: 311 S. Ann Street
Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Applicant / Agent: Stephen Harris
Project: Replace double-leaf front door with single door and sidelights

OTHER BUSINESS

1. The next ARB meeting will be held on Wednesday, November 6, 2024.



Agenda Item #1

Application 2024-53-CA

DETAILS

Location:

256 S. Broad Street

Summary of Request:

Construct an accessory pool house

Applicant (as applicable):

Bud Walker

Property Owner:

Nick and Theresa Chamblee

Historic District:

Oakleigh Garden

Classification:

Non-contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The property under review is non-contributing; however, if resurveyed it would most likely be re-designated as contributing.
- The Mobile Historic Development Commission (MHDC) holds an architectural façade easement on the subject property. Approval for the subject project was granted by the MHDC’s Properties Committee on October 7, 2024.
- The proposed one-story accessory structure sits to the rear of the property and is subordinate to the main dwelling on the lot in massing and scale.
- Materials proposed for the structure are approved for new construction under the *Guidelines*.

Report Contents:

Property and Application History..... 2

Scope of Work..... 2

Applicable Standards 3

Staff Analysis 3

Attachments 4

PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

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

The structure at 256 S. Broad Street is a two-story frame dwelling with a full-width two-story gallery and late Italianate detailing across the east facing façade. According to Historic Development records, the house was constructed c. 1870-1880. In the 1950s and 1960s, a concrete commercial addition was constructed on the front of the structure, and asbestos shingle siding was applied over the original wood siding. At this time the two-story front porch was removed. The building fell into disrepair. In 1999, the property underwent an extensive rehabilitation and preservation campaign, during which the later additions and coverings were removed, and the building's exterior was restored to its original design as accurately as possible.

This property has appeared twice before the Architectural Review Board (ARB). In 1998 a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) was issued for rehabilitation work at the property. A second COA was issued in the same year to rebuild the front and rear porches.

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Construct a one-story pool house
 - a. The structure would measure 15'-0" wide by 41'-0" deep. It would sit west (to the rear) of the main structure, approximately 8'-0" off both the south and west property lines and approximately 7'-5" off the north property line.
 - b. The structure would measure 10'-0" high from finished floor to top of plate.
 - c. The structure would be topped by a gable roof, clad in architectural shingles.
 - d. The structure would sit on an 8" slab-on-grade foundation. A 12' horizontal cementitious trim board would run along the bottom of the wall at each elevation above the slab to simulate a raised foundation.
 - e. The structure would be clad in cementitious wood siding. Trim and fascia would also be cementitious wood.
 - f. A recessed front porch would span the gable end east façade. The porch would be supported by two 12" wood square posts. A circular louvered vent would be centered on the façade gable. A three-panel bifold door would be centered on the façade.
 - g. A single entry door would be located on the westernmost third of the north elevation. The door would be accessed by a concrete stoop, which would measure approximately 3'-6" wide by 4'-0" deep. A 36" shingled awning would project over the door opening.
 - h. Fenestration would include the following:
 - Six (6) vinyl-clad single-light, fixed windows measuring 4'-0" wide by 2'-0" high
 - One (1) wood three-panel, one-light glass bifold doors, measuring 5'-0" wide by 6'-8" high
 - One (1) wood frame single-light glass exterior door measuring 2'-8" wide by 6'-8" high
 - i. Elevations would appear as follows:
 - East façade (south to north)
Square post; three-panel bifold glass doors; square column
 - West elevation (north to south)
Concrete stoop; corner board; one (1) fixed window, centered on the elevation; corner board

North elevation (east to west)

Square post; corner board; two (2) fixed windows, regularly spaced along the east half of the elevation; one (1) single-light door; corner board

South elevation (west to east)

Corner board; one (1) fixed window, roughly centered on the west half of the elevation; two (2) fixed windows, regularly spaced along the east half of the elevation; corner board; square post

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

1. **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.
2. **9.2** Locate a new accessory structure in line with other visible accessory structures in the district.
 - These are traditionally located at the rear of a lot.

ACCEPTABLE ACCESSORY STRUCTURE MATERIALS

Materials that are compatible with the historic district in scale and character are acceptable.

These often include:

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

UNACCEPTABLE ACCESSORY STRUCTURE MATERIALS

Materials that are not compatible with the historic district in scale and character are unacceptable.

These often include:

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

STAFF ANALYSIS

The application under review seeks approval for the construction of an accessory pool house structure. The subject property is currently a non-contributing property within the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. It should be noted however, that if resurveyed, the property would most likely be re-designated as contributing. Additionally, the Mobile Historic Development Commission (MHDC) holds an easement on the property, requiring approval of any exterior changes by the MHDC. The project submitted in this application received the required approval by the Commission's Properties Committee on October 7, 2024.

In regard to scale, the *Guidelines* state that accessory structures be subordinate in size to the main structure. (9.1) The proposed building' footprint would measure approximately 615 sf, making it smaller than that of the primary dwelling on the lot which is approximately 900sf. Also subordinate is the one-story height of the pool house, compared to the existing two-story historic structure.

The proposed traditional placement of the structure at the rear of the lot complies with the *Guidelines'* placement directive. (9.2)

In addition to the above listed *Guidelines*, accessory structures are meant to adhere to guidelines for new residential construction in historic districts. (Chapter 6) Within this context, the proposed pool house complies with the relevant guidelines for building materials and finishes, roofs, doors and doorways, foundations, and windows. (6.39, 6.40, 6.41, 6.42, 6.43, 6.45)

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

A representative was not present to discuss the application, so the application was not heard.

BOARD DISCUSSION

See above.

FINDING FACTS

See above.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

See above.



Agenda Item #2

Applications 2024-54-CA

DETAILS

Location:

2255 Ashland Place Avenue

Summary of Request:

Rebuild front steps; paint unpainted brick

Applicant (as applicable):

Cochran Investments, Inc.

Property Owner:

John and Lillis Pipes

Historic District:

Ashland Place

Classification:

Noncontributing

Summary of Analysis:

- While the removal and relocation of existing porch features do not comply with the *Guidelines*, the proposed porch stair is based on original architectural drawings and satisfies the requirement that alterations be appropriate to the style, composition, and proportion of the structure.
- The *Guidelines* generally discourage painting unpainted historic brick.

Report Contents:

Property and Application History 2

Scope of Work 2

Applicable Standards 3

Staff Analysis 3

Attachments5

PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

Ashland Place Historic District was listed in the National Register in 1987 under Criteria A (community planning) and C (architectural significance). The neighborhood initially was platted in 1907 and centered around land once occupied by the Augusta Evans Wilson homestead. The neighborhood was an early streetcar suburb along the Springhill Avenue trolley line. The district is significant for its concentration of architectural types and styles popular between 1900 and 1955, including Georgian and Federal Revivals, Colonial and Classical Revivals, Craftsman, Mission Revival, and Tudor Revival.

The subject property was constructed c. 1967 and in 1987 was listed as noncontributing within the Ashland Place Historic District. It should be noted that the Georgian Revival residence is now 57 years old and considered eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. If the Ashland Place Historic District were resurveyed today, the subject property would likely be listed as contributing to the district. The Georgian Revival residence fits in well with the 20th-Century revival styles that characterize the Ashland Place neighborhood. The residence is also in excellent condition and retains its original character defining features.

The raised ranch-type dwelling features a symmetrical main block with an asymmetrical wing on its east side. The prominent wood cornice, neoclassical entry porch, 9-over-9 windows, and red brick cladding mark the residence as belonging to the Georgian Revival school within the broader Colonial Revival movement. The curved stairs on either side of the entry porch are less indicative of the Georgian Revival style and, with their decorative iron balustrades, appear to be a mid-20th-Century expression of the French Colonial architecture of the Gulf Coast Region. A drawing completed in 1967 for Isabel Pope, the original owner, depicts a residence that is remarkably similar to the existing dwelling. However, the c. 1967 drawing depicts a finished floor height that is approximately half that of the existing dwelling. The drawing also depicts a simpler single stair centered on the north elevation of the entry porch, rather than the mirror-image curved stairs that currently exist. It is possible that the two deviations from the original drawing are related. Site considerations may have required raising the finished floor level, and the original owner may have seen this as an opportunity to create a grander entry porch. At some point after construction, a covered breezeway between the residence and the rear detached garage was infilled to create additional living space. As there is no record of this alteration having appeared before the Architectural Review Board (ARB), it is assumed that it occurred prior to 1990.

This property previously appeared before the ARB in September 1990, when an application was presented to construct a 6' masonry wall enclosing the rear yard. The application was approved. The property appeared again in March 1991, when an application was presented for after-the-fact review of an increase in wall height, which the ARB also approved.

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Remove existing porch stairs and construct new single porch stair
 - a. Demolish existing porch stairs. Existing railing to be salvaged for reuse.
 - b. Construct new single stair.
 - New stair would be centered on the north elevation of the entry porch.
 - Stair would be graduated, so that the top step is narrower than the bottom step. The difference in width between adjacent steps would be uniform.
 - The width of the bottom step would not exceed the width of the entry porch.
 - While the c. 1967 drawing depicts only 3 steps, the increased floor height of the existing porch would require at least 6 steps. Step widths would be modified as necessary to achieve a similarly graduated stair with a bottom step that is not wider than the entry porch.
 - Portions of the salvaged wrought iron railing would be reinstalled on either side of the stair, in line with the railing placement shown in the c. 1967 drawing.
2. Paint exterior brick

- a. Brick would be painted Benjamin Moore HC-172, Revere Pewter.

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

1. **5.3** Preserve the key historic walls of a building.
 - Maintain significant historic façades in their original form.
 - Maintain historic façade elements.
2. **5.4** Preserve original building materials
 - Remove only those materials which are deteriorated and beyond reasonable repair.
 - Do not remove original materials that are in good condition.
3. **5.8** 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.
 - Unpainted 19th Century imported Philadelphia and locally manufactured brick may not be painted. In cases where historic brick has been previously painted, the paint color should be of a suitable color to match the age and architectural style of the structure.
4. **6.4** Preserve an original porch or gallery on a house.
5. **6.6** If replacement is required, design it to reflect the time period of the historic structure
 - Replace a historic porch element to match the original.
 - Use replacement materials and elements that are appropriate to the style, texture, finish, composition and proportion of the historic structure.
 - Do not completely replace an entire porch or element unless absolutely necessary. Only replace the element or portion of an element that requires replacement.
 - Do not relocate an original front stairway or steps.
 - Remove only those materials which are deteriorated and beyond reasonable repair.
 - Do not remove original materials that are in good condition.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The property under review is considered noncontributing to the Ashland Place Historic District. However, it should be noted that, were the district resurveyed today, the subject property would likely be considered contributing.

This application seeks approval to remove the existing porch stairs and replace them with a simpler single stair. In their request, the applicant expresses safety concerns in regard to the existing curved staircases. The applicant proposes replacing these stairs with a single broad stair centered on the north elevation of the entry porch. The application proposes adapting the original design for the porch stair, as seen in a c. 1967 architectural drawing, which featured a simple graduated brick stair in keeping with the restrained ornamentation of the Georgian Revival dwelling. The original design would need to be modified to fit the as-built residence, given the higher finished floor height of the extant dwelling compared to that shown in the c. 1967 drawing. The applicant has not provided details for modifications, but it appears that the proposed stair would require at least six steps instead of the three shown in the c. 1967 drawing.

The *Guidelines* strongly discourage replacing original porches or porch elements “unless absolutely necessary” and specifically warn against relocating a porch stair. If alterations are deemed necessary, the *Guidelines* state that replacement elements and materials should be “appropriate to the style, texture, finish, composition and proportion of the historic structure.” While the proposed work would violate both of the aforementioned directives, the new design would be wholly in keeping with the style of the historic structure. The applicant proposes a brick stair, which replicates existing materials, and would reuse portions of the existing wrought iron

railing to create the handrails at either end of the proposed stair. Moreover, the existence of the original drawing ensures that a graduated central stair on the north elevation of the entry porch is perfectly in keeping with the architect's original design intent. (5.4, 6.4, 6.6)

The application further proposes to paint the brick veneer. Red brick masonry is highly indicative of the Georgian Revival style. Painting the brick would, therefore, detract somewhat from the original design intent. The *Guidelines* are vague about the appropriate treatment for unpainted historic 20th-Century brick. The *Guidelines* state that one should "preserve masonry features that define the overall historic character" of the structure and do specify that historic 19th-century brick should not be painted. The *Guidelines* further indicate that painting historic brick that has been previously painted is allowable given the paint color is suitable to the "age and architectural style of the structure." While providing no explicit guidance on whether or not unpainted historic 20th-century brick may be painted, the *Guidelines* do indicate that paint can impact the architectural integrity of a historic brick building and that visual material characteristics, such as color and texture, should be considered when determining whether or not to paint historic brick. (5.3, 5.8)

It should be noted that, while vapor-permeable masonry paints are unlikely to damage 20th-century extruded brick, paint is not easily reversible. Sandblasting methods can irreparably damage the brick's protective fire skin. More gentle removal methods, such as chemical paint strippers and micro-abrasives, can be costly.¹

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Jared Cochran of Cochran investments was present to discuss the application. Mr. Cochran explained that the applicant wished to remove the existing porch stairs. The replacement stair would be constructed to match the stair shown on an original architectural drawing of the residence that had been found in the house. Mr. Jared also stated that the owner did not like the color of the red bricks and would like to paint the bricks a beige color.

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Cart Blackwell stated that he did not have an issue with painting the brick since several homes in the Ashland Place district had been painted. Mr. Blackwell stated that he would be concerned about changing the porch stair, since the existing configuration was 50 years old or older, if it were not for the existence of the original architectural drawing. Mr. Blackwell explained that the original drawings demonstrated that the proposed alteration was in the spirit of the original design.

Ms. Catarina Echols expressed concerns that painting the brick would introduce a new maintenance line item to an otherwise low-maintenance material. Ms. Echols also encouraged the applicant to be sure that the paint chosen was compatible with the substrate and did not clog weep holes.

Ms. Karrie Maurin expressed agreement with Mr. Blackwell's assessment. Ms. Maurin noted that the applicant had not provided a detail for the proposed new stair. Ms. Maurin specifically questioned whether the proposed stair would widen gradually from top to bottom, as shown in the drawings. Mr. Cochran stated that he would replicate the gradual widening of the stair from top to bottom. Mr. Cochran added that he planned to salvage the pickets from the existing wrought iron stair railings and use these to construct the new porch railings. He added that the existing railings were unsafe. Mr. Cochran stated that he did not believe

¹ Robert C. Mack, AIA, et. al., "Assessing Cleaning and Water-Repellent Treatments for Historic Masonry Buildings," *Preservation Briefs* 1 (Washington, DC: National Park Service, 2000).

there were enough salvageable bricks to construct the new stair. Instead, Mr. Cochran proposed using new brick which would likely not match the existing brick. Mr. Cochran stated that this was another reason, in addition to the owner's personal preference, for painting the brick exterior. Ms. Jennifer Roselius asked if he was proposing to paint only the stairs or the entire brick exterior. Mr. Cochran responded that the owner wished to paint all exterior brick.

Mr. Stephen McNair asked if the applicant was proposing altering the existing columns to match what is shown in the original drawing. Mr. Cochran stated that he was.

FINDING FACTS

Ms. Roselius moved that, based on the evidence presented in the application, the Board finds the facts in the Staff's report of the application, as written. Mr. Blackwell interjected that the facts should be amended to reflect the applicant's intent to remove the existing porch columns and install two sets of paired columns to match the configuration shown in the original drawings. Ms. Roselius agreed to this amendment.

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 #3

CERTIFIED RECORD 2024-55-CA

DETAILS

Location:
6 S. Franklin Street

Summary of Request:
Reconstruction of rear gallery, chimneys, front steps, and front balcony; demolition of an existing outbuilding and construction of a new outbuilding

Applicant (as applicable):
Mike Rogers

Property Owner:
Historic Mobile, LLC

Historic District:
Lower Dauphin Street Commercial

Classification:
Contributing

Summary of Analysis:
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	3
Staff Analysis	9
Attachments	11

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 appeared previously before the Architectural Review Board (ARB) in May 2024, when an application was presented to remove a 20th-century frame and metal enclosure of the rear double gallery, secure exposed openings, and perform emergency repairs to brickwork on the north and south elevations. The application was approved.

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Reconstruct steps on primary (east) façade
 - a. Four (4) bricks steps would access the entry door on the south end of the façade, flanked by masonry cheek walls.
 - b. Salvaged slate stair treads would be installed on the steps.
2. Install new wood framing and decking on second floor façade balcony. Repair existing iron balcony railing.
3. Reconstruct chimneys and parapet wall along the north elevation of the structure's main block.
 - a. Chimneys and parapet wall would be rebuilt using brick to match the existing.
 - b. Metal coping would be installed along parapet wall between chimneys.
 - c. Install copper flashing where chimney meets roof.
4. Repair and repoint brick where needed.
5. Install metal coping or brick cemented coping along top of walls.
6. Reroof with slate tiles and install copper flashing where appropriate.
7. Install new foundation vents to match existing.
8. Install wood paneled front entry door with multi-light transom and side-lights.
9. Install wood paneled doors in all existing door openings on south elevation to match existing.

10. Repair existing windows where possible. Where windows are missing or are unrepairable, new wood six-over-six sash windows would be installed to fit the openings and match existing windows.
11. Apply wood louvered shutters to all windows on the east façade and the south elevation.
12. Reconstruct two (2) rear double galleries along the south elevation of the rear wing.
 - a. On both the first and second stories, the easternmost gallery would be enclosed with operable louvered shutters which would sit atop a 3'-6" high wood railing set between square wood columns with Tuscan caps. The columns along the first story would be 10'- ¼ " wide, with the columns on the second story measuring 9'- ¼ " wide.
 - b. The gallery to the west would sit two (2) steps lower than the east gallery. The same wood railing would continue along the second story, between four (4) square columns which would match the profile of those on the east gallery, with a slimmer width. A pair of operable wood louvered shutters would sit atop the railing on the gallery's west elevation. The first-story would not be enclosed with a railing. A wood staircase with balustrade would be installed on the first-story to access the second-story gallery, rising from west to east.
8. Demolish rear outhouse addition and construct new outbuilding.
 - a. A new 10'-6" high one-story outbuilding would be constructed adjacent to the west end wall of the dwelling. It would be orientated to the south, with its rear north wall incorporated into a brick perimeter wall spanning the 9'-6" depth of the addition. The west facing façade would be clad in either brick or stucco.
 - b. This addition would measure 5'-4" wide by 9'-6" deep.
 - c. A shed roof clad in slate tiles would top the structure. Copper gutters would be applied along the roof eave.
 - d. Two (2) 2'-0" side by 6'-8" high entry doors would be equally spaced on the façade.
 - e. A 10'-5" high opening that would pass through the north wall would abut the addition on its west end.
9. Site improvements
 - a. Fencing and gates
 - 1) A 36" high iron fence would enclose the front yard. The fence would commence slightly west of the northeast corner of the façade and run east to the ROW, then run south along the east property line to the south property line, and turn west and run slightly west of the front plane, where it would abut the south elevation.
 - 2) An 8'-0" wood privacy fence would run along the south property line, beginning across from the southwest corner of the structure's main block and abutting the adjacent building at the southwest corner of the lot.
 - 3) A single swinging iron gate would be installed across the driveway to the south of the structure, at the east end of the proposed privacy fence. The gate would measure approximately 6'-0" high.
 - 4) A single swinging iron gate would be installed on the northwest end of the lot at the proposed golf-cart opening. The gate would measure approximately 5'-0" high.
 - 5) An iron double gate would be installed across the alley to the north of the dwelling, slightly west of the building's front plane. This gate would measure approximately 6'-0" high.
 - b. Paving
 - 1) Brick pavers, laid in a herringbone pattern, would be installed in the front yard, connecting the sidewalk to the front steps.
 - 2) Brick pavers, laid in a herringbone pattern, would be installed in the area south of the rear wing, creating a courtyard area.
 - 3) The driveway to the south of the dwelling, would be laid in pavers strips.
 - 4) The alley to the north of the structure would be laid in pavers or cobblestone.
 - c. Landscaping

- 1) Landscaping would be installed in the existing area between the sidewalk and the curb at S. Franklin St.
- 2) A row of plantings would be installed between the courtyard area and the privacy fence along the south property line; and along the west property line between the brick pavers and adjacent structure to the west.

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

1. **5.3** Preserve the key historic walls of a building.
 - Maintain significant historic façades in their original form.
 - Maintain historic façade elements.
 - Pay special attention to maintaining the historic appearance of building walls of corner buildings.
2. **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.
3. **5.6** Use original materials to replace damaged materials on primary surfaces where possible.
 - Use original materials to replace damaged building materials on a primary façade if possible. If the original material is wood clapboard, for example, then the replacement material should be a material that matches the original in finish, size and the amount of exposed lap. If the original material is not available from the site, use a replacement material that is visually comparable with the original material.
 - Replace only the amount of material required. If a few boards are damaged beyond repair, for example, then only they should be replaced, rather than the entire wall.
 - Do not replace building materials on the primary façade, such as wood siding and masonry, with alternative or imitation materials unless it cannot be avoided.
 - Wholesale replacement of exterior finishes is generally not allowed.
4. **5.7** When replacing materials on a non-primary façade or elevation, match the original material in composition, scale and finish.
 - Use original materials to replace damaged materials on a non-primary façade when possible.
 - The ARB will consider the use of green building materials, such as those made with renewable and local resources to replace damaged materials on a nonprimary façade if they do not impact the integrity of the building or its key features.
 - Use alternative or imitation materials that match the style and detail of the original material to replace damaged non-primary building materials.
 - Replace exterior finishes to match original in profile, dimension and materials.
5. **5.8** 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.
6. **5.10** Preserve the original form of a historic roof.
 - Maintain the original pitch.
 - Preserve decorative elements, including crests and chimneys.
7. **5.11** Preserve the original eave depth of a roof.
 - Maintain traditional overhangs because they contribute to the perception of a building's historic scale.
8. **5.12** Repair and maintain original roof materials rather than replace them, wherever possible.
 - Patch and replace damaged areas of an existing roof.

ACCEPTABLE ROOF REPLACEMENT MATERIALS

Materials that are the same as the original, or that appear similar in texture, pattern, finish and color range to the original are acceptable.

These often include:

- » Slate
- » Tile
- » Metal when consistent with the period and style of the building.
- » Dimensional shingles (asphalt, fiberglass, cement fiber, wood)
- » Built-up or membrane roof on gently sloping roofs (less than 3:12) where hidden from view
- » Lead
- » Copper
- » Other materials original to the building

UNACCEPTABLE ROOF REPLACEMENT MATERIALS

Materials that do not appear similar to the original in texture, pattern, finish and color range to the original are unacceptable.

These often include:

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

9. **5.15** Repair or replace a damaged historic door to maintain its general historic appearance.
 - » Replacements should reflect the age and style of the building.
 - » Use materials that are visually comparable to that of the original.
 - » Do not use solid core or flush doors.

ACCEPTABLE DOOR MATERIALS

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

These often include:

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

UNACCEPTABLE DOOR MATERIALS

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

These often include:

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

10. **5.17** Preserve historic stylistic and architectural details and ornamentation.
 - Preserve storefronts, cornices, turned columns, brackets, exposed rafter tails, jigsaw ornaments and other key architectural features that are in good condition.
 - Retain historic details and ornamentation intact.
 - Retain and treat exterior stylistic features and examples of skilled craftsmanship with sensitivity.
 - Repair historic details and ornamentation that are deteriorated.
 - Employ preventive maintenance measures such as rust removal, caulking and repainting.
 - Minimize damage to historic architectural details when repairs are necessary.

- Document the location of a historic feature that must be removed and repaired so it may be repositioned accurately.
 - Patch, piece-in, splice, consolidate or otherwise upgrade deteriorated features using recognized preservation methods.
 - Stabilize or fix isolated areas of damage using consolidants. Epoxies and resins may be considered for wood repair.
 - Protect significant features that are adjacent to the area being worked on.
11. **5.19** Where repair is impossible, replace details and ornamentation accurately.
- When replacing historic details, match the original in profile, dimension, and material.
 - A substitute material may be considered if it appears similar in character and finish to the original. A measured drawing may be required in these instances to recreate missing historic details from photographs.
 - Do not apply architectural details that were not part of the original structure. For example, decorative mill work should not be added to a building if it was not an original feature. Doing so would convey a false history.
12. **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.
13. **5.22** When a historic window is missing on a key character-defining wall, use a historically accurate replacement.
- Historically accurate light patterns shall be employed. Use photographic, physical, and/or documentary evidence for the design.
 - A new window shall be installed in such a manner as to fit within the original window opening and match in depth and filling of the reveal. A reveal is the part of the side of a window opening that is between the outer surface of the wall and the window.
 - A double-paned or clad wood window may be considered as a replacement alternative only if the replacement matches the configuration, dimensions, and profiles of original windows.
 - For increased efficiency, storm windows can be installed. A storm window shall fit within the window reveal and avoid damaging window casings. Operable storm windows are encouraged.

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)

14. **5.24** Replace shutters where they previously existed when possible.
- Replacement shutters should be visually compatible with those existing on the house.
 - Size new shutters to precisely fit the window opening.
 - Use operable shutters where feasible.

- Where shutters are fixed, use shutters that are hung on the window in a fashion that appears similar to operable shutters.
- An alternative material must match the appearance of historic shutters in texture, depth, and design.

ACCEPTABLE SHUTTER MATERIALS

Materials that are the same as the original, or that appear similar in texture, depth and design to the original are acceptable.

These often include:

- » Wood
- » Synthetic or composite shutters (with similar character to that of a wood shutter)

UNACCEPTABLE SHUTTER MATERIALS

Materials that do not appear similar to the original in texture, depth and design are unacceptable.

These often include:

- » Lightweight plastic

15. **6.6** If [porch] replacement is required, design it to reflect the time period of the historic structure.
 - Replace a historic porch element to match the original.
 - Use replacement materials and elements that are appropriate to the style, texture, finish, composition and proportion of the historic structure.
 - Where an original porch is missing entirely, base a replacement porch on physical or photographic evidence. If no evidence exists, draw from similar structures in the neighborhood.
 - Match the balustrade of a historic porch to the design and materials of the porch.
 - When reconstructing a porch, pay particular attention to matching the handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions and decorative details.
 - Do not completely replace an entire porch or element unless absolutely necessary. Only replace the element or portion of an element that requires replacement.
 - Do not use cast-iron columns or railing where no evidence exists that these elements were used historically.
 - Do not use a brick base for a wood column (exception is Craftsman styles).
 - Do not use a railing that is too elaborate for the building (of a different style).
 - Do not relocate an original front stairway or steps.
16. **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.
17. **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.
18. **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.
19. **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.

20. **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.
21. **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.
22. **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.
23. **10.2** Design a fence to be compatible with the architectural style of the house and existing fences in the neighborhood.
- Install a painted wood picket fence.
 - Install a simple wood or wire fence. Heights of wooden picket fences are ordinarily restricted to 36". Consideration for up to 48," depending on the location of the fence, shall be given. A variance might be required. Staff can advise and assist applicants with regard to a variance. If combined with a wall, the total vertical dimension of the wall and fence collectively should not exceed 36," or in some cases 48". For surface parking areas associated with commercial uses, size a perimeter parking area fence to not exceed 48" in height.
 - Install a cast-iron or other metal fence not exceeding 48" in height if located in the front yard.
 - Install a fence that uses alternative materials that have a very similar look and feel to wood, proven durability, matte finish and an accurate scale and proportion of components.
 - Face the finished side of a fence toward the public right-of-way.
 - Based on the chosen fence material, use proportions, heights, elements and levels of opacity similar to those of similar material and style seen in the historic district.
- REAR AND NON-CORNER SIDE FENCES (LOCATED BEHIND THE FRONT BUILDING PLANE)**
- Design a fence located behind the front building plane to not exceed 72" in height. If the subject property abuts a multi-family residential or commercial property, a fence up to 96" will be considered.

- An alternative fence material with proven durability, matte finish and an accurate scale and proportion of components is acceptable. A simple wood-and-wire fence is acceptable provided it is appropriate to the style of the house.
24. **10.3** Design a wall to be compatible with the architectural style of the house and existing walls in the district.
- When building a solid wall, use a finish and material that is similar in texture, mass and durability to historic walls in the neighborhood.

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

ACCEPTABLE WALL 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:

- » Brick
- » Stone
- » Stucco over masonry

UNACCEPTABLE WALL 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:

- » Unstuccoed concrete block

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 has commenced emergency repairs and other efforts to stabilize and secure the structure, work which, as mentioned above, was previously approved by the ARB. The applicant is applying for state and federal tax credits. The subject application requests approval to complete renovations and rehabilitation work.

The submitted plans demonstrate that all repairs to the exterior walls, roof, foundation are in-kind repairs which preserve the feature's original form and materials. Where repair is not possible, the applicant has proposed using

or reconstructing accurate replacements using approved materials that preserve the historic character specific to this structure such as wood, brick, stucco, iron, and slate. No new window or door openings are proposed for this project, and no existing openings would be filled in, retaining the historic fenestration pattern along the elevations. (5.3-5.24)

The proposed rear addition would roughly fit the footprint of an existing historic addition. This one-story structure, designated as a comfort area, demonstrates compliance with the *Guidelines'* directive that additions be subordinate to the historic structure with its placement and its inferior massing and scale. The planned use of either stucco or brick for exterior cladding, a slate tile for the shed roof, and paneled wood doors, are either matching and/or comparable to the historic structure, as directed by the *Guidelines*. (6.9 - 6.16)

The planned wood privacy fence, iron fence, brick wall, and three (3) iron gates are compatible with the architectural style of the house and comply with the *Guidelines'* directives regarding placement and height. The privacy fence along the south property line abuts a commercial property, which under the *Guidelines* allows for the proposed 8'-0" height. All proposed materials are approved for fence and gate construction in Mobile's historic districts. (10.2, 10.3) The inclusion of a driveway on the south side of the structure, and a walkway between the sidewalk and the building's front entry follow the *Guidelines'* call to visually minimize the impact of parking and to connect the sidewalk to the structure. The use of brick for paved areas is also appropriate according the *Guidelines*. The *Guidelines* further state to create a landscaped front yard, which is achieved in the submitted plans. (10.5, 10.7, 10.10)

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Douglas Kearley was present to discuss the application. He gave a progress report on completed stabilization and demo work previously approved by the Board, and briefly outlined the rehabilitation project, noting that there was just enough existing material at the building to be able to replicate missing fabric.

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Echols applauded the project's work so far.

Ms. Maurin and Ms. Roselius asked for clarification regarding the fencing and gate placement and design.

Mr. Kearley stated that the gate design will match the fencing and the 36" iron fence enclosing the front yard will transition to the higher privacy fence on the south elevation across from the west end of the main block of the house.

Ms. Roselius asked if the existing front door has sidelights. Mr. Kearley replied that they do.

Mr. McNair asked how many existing windows are salvageable. Mr. Kearley stated that the façade windows appear to be in good shape. That they are not original but are excellent replacements. He added that all windows will be wood to match original.

Ms. Davis asked Mr. Kearley to describe the proposed shutters. Mr. Kearley stated that they would match an existing historic shutter found at the property.

FINDING FACTS

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

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

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



Agenda Item #4

Application 2024-56-CA

DETAILS

Location:

252 Rapier Avenue

Summary of Request:

After-the-fact: 1. Replace window on second story façade with double doors that do not fit the opening.
2. Replace balustrade above front porch.

Applicant (as applicable):

Richard Davis

Property Owner:

Richard & Patricia Beckish

Historic District:

Oakleigh Garden

Classification:

Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- HDD Staff was notified by the public of work being carried out at the subject property.
- Material of replacement double doors is unknown.
- The balustrade above front porch is not original and did not receive a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA). It was added between 1989 and 2007.

Report Contents:

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

PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

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

The dwelling at 252 Rapier Avenue is a two-story frame American Foursquare plan with classical detailing. According to Historic Development records, the residence was constructed c. 1913 by Louis Lowenstein. Survey photos in the property reveal a minimally altered façade up until 1989. These photos show that previously, there was no balustrade along the roof of the one-story front porch, as there is presently. Photographic evidence reveals that the balustrade was added sometime between 1989 and 2007. Documented engagements with the Architectural Review Board began in 2010, with a Notice of Violation for an unapproved installation of a satellite dish on the front of the house. This action resulted in the denial of a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA). Other recorded COAs were staff level approvals of in-kind replacements between 2011 and 2017.

This property has appeared once before the Architectural Review Board (ARB). In 2010 an application to retain a previously installed satellite dish was denied. This decision was appealed by the property with City Council and the appeal was granted.

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Replace second-story window on north end of east facing façade with single-light double doors that do not fit the opening.
2. Replace balustrade along front porch roof. Replacement will match existing in materials, dimensions, and profile.

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

1. **5.3** Preserve the key historic walls of a building.
 - Maintain significant historic façades in their original form.
 - Maintain historic façade elements.
 - Pay special attention to maintaining the historic appearance of building walls of corner buildings.
2. **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.
3. **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

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)

4. **6.5** Repair a porch in a way that maintains the original character.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The dwelling at 252 Rapier Avenue is a contributing structure to the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. The application under review seeks after-the-fact approval to replace a window on the façade and replace an existing balustrade along the front porch roof.

In September 2024, the Historic Development office received a call from a member of the public regarding 252 Rapier, stating that a second story window on the north end of the façade was being removed, doors were being installed, and the balustrade along the porch roof was being replaced. After verifying that no Certificate of Appropriateness had been issued for work at this location, Staff made a visit to the property and issued a Stop Work Order. The contractor at the property was instructed to notify the owner to apply for a COA.

The *Guidelines* instruct that historic windows should only be replaced when they are beyond repair. (5.21) The *Guidelines* further specify, “A new window shall be installed in such a manner as to fit within the original window opening” and should match in light configuration, detail and material. (5.20) The windows on the façade appear to be the original windows or a match of the original. The newly installed double doors clearly do not fit the original window opening and disrupt the historic fenestration rhythm across the façade, which is contrary to the *Guidelines’* directive to maintain historic façades. (5.3) The applicant has not indicated the material of the replacement doors.

As discussed above, the balustrade is not original to the house at 252 Rapier. This addition to the façade was also carried out with no COA. The *Guidelines* direct that the original character of a porch be maintained. (6.5) The balustrade has been extant along the roof of the front porch since a least 2007, and most likely before. It is a feature that is commonly seen on similar style residences throughout the seven local historic districts. In fact, two neighboring properties have undergone similar alterations. Survey photos for 256 Rapier, two lots to the south, show a flat roof front porch with no balustrade along its roof in 1979. The subsequent photo in the file, from 1989, shows a balustrade as it exists today. Likewise, 250 Rapier originally had a one-bay gable roof front porch, centered on its façade. In 1992, a COA was granted, approving plans for a three-bay flat roof porch with a roof balustrade. Two houses boasting flat roof porches with roof balustrades that are either original to the design or a historic alteration are located around the corner at 1206 and 1212 Selma Street. The scale and design of the existing balustrade at 252 Rapier incorporates the classical detailing seen elsewhere on the façade and is compatible with other houses on the street.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Richard Davis was present to discuss the application. He stated that the existing window was in poor condition, and the owner asked him to replace it with a door. Mr. Davis also stated that he had been hired to replace an existing railing around the porch roof. Mr. Davis stated that he also replaced the porch roof, which was leaking.

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Catarina Echols asked Mr. Davis if he acquired a building permit. Mr. Davis replied that he did not.

Ms. Jennifer Roselius asked if the replacement door was wider than the original window opening. Mr. Davis replied that it was not and claimed the new door fit the existing window opening.

Ms. Abby Davis stated that the width of the door and the width of the remaining window opening on the south side of the façade were notably different. Ms. Davis pointed out to the applicant that the spacing between the new door and the center stained-glass window was visibly different from the spacing between the identical remaining window and the stained-glass window.

Ms. Karrie Maurin asked if the door was shorter than the original window, noting that the head height now does not match the remaining window opening. Mr. Davis stated that the door is shorter and that he filled in the gap with siding.

Ms. Roselius asked the applicant if the original window was retained. Mr. Davis stated that it was not.

Ms. Davis asked if the trim around the replacement door was different than that on the rest of the house. Mr. Davis replied that it was. Ms. Davis stated that trim and head height changes alter the character of the house.

Ms. Davis asked if the roof of the porch was capable of holding weight. Mr. Stephen McNair asked Staff about code regulations to create a second story deck on the roof the front porch. Ms. Meredith Wilson stated that the balustrade was added possibly in the 1990s and that the full-height triple-hung windows suggest the roof may have always been accessible. Ms. Wilson added that modern code regulations pertaining to using a porch roof as a deck were outside the expertise of the Historic Development Department.

Mr. Cart Blackwell opined that the size and spacing of openings are the most important elements of the subject application. Mr. Blackwell further stated that the *Guidelines* are very clear the importance of preserving original door and window openings. Ms. Catarina Echols stated that the style of the door was also not compatible with the style of the house.

Ms. Roselius reiterated that the opening for the door had clearly been widened. Ms. Roselius stated that, while the Board can approve an application to change a window to a door, the door must fit inside the window opening. Mr. Davis stated again that the door was not wider than the window. Ms. Davis interjected that the head height had clearly changed and that the Board could therefore not approve the alteration. Ms. Davis asked what the applicant would need to do to receive approval.

Ms. Echols detailed the application process for a Certificate of Appropriateness and a building permit. Ms. Echols further stated that the proposed changes, if done appropriately, could have been approved on the staff level. Ms. Echols suggested that Mr. Davis work with staff to determine a solution.

Ms. Davis made a motion to table the application so that the applicant could consult with staff. Mr. McNair seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.

FINDING FACTS

The application was tabled, and facts were not found.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

No decision was made on the application, as it was tabled.



Agenda Item #5

Application 2024-57-CA

DETAILS

Location:

1662 Government Street

Summary of Request:

After-the-Fact: 1. Replace porch decking. 2. Replace all windows except beneath front porch with vinyl types. 3. Remove porch trim, railings, and balusters. 4. Enclose front porch supports with 1"x8" wood to square.

Applicant (as applicable):

Brandon Maye

Property Owner:

same

Historic District:

Old Dauphin Way

Classification:

Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

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

Report Contents:

Property and Application History 2

Scope of Work 2

Applicable Standards 2

Staff Analysis 3

Attachments 4

PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

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

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

This property appeared before the Old Dauphin Way Review Board (ODWRB) twice. In September 1990, a COA (Certificate of Appropriateness) was granted to perform repairs on the garage. The ODWRB approved repair/replacement of the front porch decking with 1”x4” tongue-and-groove boards in October 1995.

SCOPE OF WORK

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

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

1. **5.4** Preserve original building materials.
 - Repair deteriorated building materials by patching, piecing-in, consolidating or otherwise reinforcing the materials.
 - Remove only those materials which are deteriorated and beyond reasonable repair.
2. **5.17** Preserve historic stylistic and architectural details and ornamentation.
 - Preserve storefronts, cornices, turned columns, brackets, exposed rafter tails, jigsaw ornaments, and other key architectural features that are in good condition.
 - Retain historic details and ornamentation intact.
 - Retain and treat exterior stylistic features and examples of skilled craftsmanship with sensitivity.
 - Repair historic details and ornamentation that are deteriorated.
3. **5.19** Where repair is impossible, replace details and ornamentation accurately.
 - When replacing historic materials, match the original in profile, dimension, and material.
 - A substitute material may be considered if it appears similar in character and finish to the original. A measured drawing may be required in these instances to recreate missing historic details from photographs.

4. **5.20** Preserve the functional historic and decorative features of a historic window.
 - Where historic (wooden or metal) windows are intact and in repairable condition, retain and repair them to match the existing as per location, light configuration, detail and material.
 - Preserve historic window features, including the frame, sash, muntins, mullions, glazing, sills, heads, jambs, moldings, operation, and groupings of windows.
 - Repair, rather than replace, frames and sashes, wherever possible.
 - For repair of window components, epoxies and related products may serve as effective solutions to material deterioration and operational malfunction.
5. **5.21** When historic windows are not in a repairable condition, match the replacement window design to the original.
 - In instances where there is a request to replace a building's windows, the new windows shall match the existing as per location, framing, and light configuration.
 - Use any salvageable window components on a primary elevation.
6. **5.22**

ACCEPTABLE WINDOW MATERIALS

Materials that are the same as the original, or that appear similar in texture, profile and finish to the original are acceptable. These often include:

 - Wood sash
 - Steel, if original to structure
 - Custom extruded aluminum
 - Aluminum clad wood
 - Windows approved by the National Park Service

UNACCEPTABLE WINDOW MATERIALS Materials that do not appear similar to the original in texture, profile and finish are unacceptable. These often include:

 - Vinyl
 - Mill-finished aluminum
 - Interior snap-in muntins (except when used in concert with exterior muntins and intervening dividers)
7. **6.5** Repair a porch in a way that maintains the original character.
8. **6.6** If replacement is required, design it to reflect the time period of the historic structure.
 - Replace a historic porch element to match the original.
 - Use replacement materials and elements that are appropriate to the style, texture, finish, composition, and proportion of the historic structure.
 - Match the balustrade of a house to the design and materials of the porch.
 - Do not completely replace an entire porch or element unless absolutely necessary. Only replace the element or portion of an element that requires replacement.

STAFF ANALYSIS

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

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

The *Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts (Guidelines)* instruct that historic building materials should be preserved through repair; only those materials not in reasonably repairable condition should be removed. (5.4, 5.20) The *Guidelines* further state, "Where historic (wooden or metal) windows are intact and in repairable condition, retain and repair them to match the existing as per location, light configuration, detail and material." (5.20) The condition of the front porch decking and the removed windows is not known and cannot be ascertained as there is no known documentation of such.

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

The *Guidelines* instruct that unrepairable historic windows should only be replaced with windows that match the design of the originals (5.21), and historic materials in general, should match the original in profile, dimension, and material. (5.19) "In instances where there is a request to replace a building's windows, the new windows shall match the existing as per location, framing, and light configuration." Vinyl windows are expressly considered unacceptable in Mobile's historic districts. (5.22) The replacement vinyl windows currently installed in fifteen (15) of the house's 31 windows do not match the existing, historic windows in light configuration, size, or material.

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

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Brandon Maye, the owner, was present to discuss the application. Mr. Maye stated that he had taken the proper steps to pull a building permit and met with Historic Development staff to discuss paint colors. Mr. Maye then stated that he must have missed a step. According to Mr. Maye, his construction team noticed several problems with the windows after work began; some windows were missing, while others had already been replaced. Mr. Maye stated that the remaining wood windows were in poor condition. According to Mr. Maye, his window installer contacted the City and was told any replacement windows would need to have a Design Pressure rating of 50. Mr. Maye stated he purchased windows and was about to begin installation when the Stop Work Order was issued. Mr. Maye decided to use vinyl windows instead of wood windows because he believed that the vinyl windows would last longer. Mr. Maye repeated that he had taken the proper steps by reaching out to the City.

In relation to the porch deck and column replacements, Mr. Maye stated that both the existing porch deck and columns were rotten. Mr. Maye stated that he decided to wrap the existing columns in 1" x 8" planks to improve the appearance of the porch. Mr. Maye then introduced his carpenter and window installer, Mr. Roger, who

could answer any Board questions about the windows. Mr. Roger did not sign in, and did not provide his name for the record. The carpenter did not address the Board.

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Abby Davis asked the window installer to explain which windows were original and which had been replaced. He stated that most had been replaced except for a few on the front. Ms. Davis asked for additional clarification about the transoms installed above the new windows. According to the window contractor, it was not possible to install a solid window without a transom and meet the DP-50 rating. The decision was then made to install a single-hung window with a transom above. Ms. Davis asked if the plan was to replace all of the windows. Mr. Maye stated that that was the original plan. Mr. Maye added that he planned to install picture windows with transoms in one area of the building that was intended to be office space.

Ms. Davis asked if the proposed windows were vinyl. The window installer stated that they were. He further explained that the wood window frames were still in place and that only the sashes had been replaced. Ms. Davis explained that vinyl windows are not an approved material in the local historic districts. Ms. Davis asked for confirmation from the Historic Development staff. Ms. Annie Allen stated that Ms. Davis was correct.

Ms. Davis asked what materials the existing windows had been. Mr. Maye stated that when he purchased the house there were existing original wood windows, aluminum replacement windows, and some missing windows. Ms. Davis asked if the existing replacement windows were aluminum or aluminum-clad wood. Mr. Maye stated that they were aluminum.

Mr. Cart Blackwell stated that regardless of what types of windows were present, vinyl replacement windows are not allowed on contributing buildings. Mr. Blackwell further noted that the transoms were inappropriate and altered the look, feel, and historic integrity of the house. The window installer interjected that the doors had existing transoms. Mr. Blackwell responded that the original windows did not.

Ms. Jennifer Roselius asked if the smaller replacement windows on the first floor of the back side of the house were the same size what had been existing. The window staller stated that they were the same size.

Ms. Davis asked if the applicant had looked for wood or aluminum-clad wood replacement windows that met the DP-50 rating. The window installer reiterated that the existing replacement windows had been aluminum and not aluminum-clad wood. Ms. Davis stated that she understood but that he was still required to go back with an approved material, which includes wood and aluminum-clad wood windows. The window installer repeated that the existing replacement windows were aluminum. Ms. Meredith Wilson interjected and explained that Ms. Davis was referring to the *Design Guidelines*, which require that replacement windows for a contributing building must be either wood or aluminum-clad wood.

Ms. Davis commended the applicant for taking on the project but added that the work had to be done in a way that maintained the architectural integrity of the building. Ms. Davis explained that all work must be done in compliance with the *Design Guidelines*, and that the windows specifically do not meet the *Guidelines*.

Mr. Maye asked if he could keep the vinyl windows on the sides and the back and only replace the ones on the front with a compliant window. Ms. Davis stated that the Board can consider that but that in general the *Guidelines* do not allow vinyl windows anywhere on a contributing structure. Ms. Davis further stated that the Board had allowed that compromise in the past given specific circumstances. Ms. Roselius interjected that in previous cases where the Board had allowed vinyl windows to remain on the sides and/or the rear, the

configuration of the vinyl windows had been in keeping with the style of the house. Ms. Roselius stated that was not the case in the situation currently before the Board.

Ms. Catarina Echols interjected and asked the staff for clarification on Mr. Maye's statement that he had consulted Historic Development staff on exterior painting. Ms. Allen explained that Mr. Maye came into the office and acquired a COA for exterior painting. After the COA had been issued, the office received a 311 complaint that much more work was going on than had been discussed in that meeting. Ms. Allen further stated that she had informed Mr. Maye in that meeting that any other exterior work would require an additional COA. Ms. Echols expressed concern that Mr. Maye had been able to pull a building permit for other exterior work without first acquiring a COA. Ms. Allen explained that at the time of her visit to the site, there was no existing building permit for any work on the exterior.

Ms. Roselius asked the applicant to clarify his statement that he pulled a building permit prior to beginning work. She asked if he had only received a permit for a portion of the work. Mr. Maye responded that he had a building permit from the first day of beginning work. Mr. Maye stated that after beginning work he met with the Historic Development staff to discuss paint colors. Ms. Allen interjected that the permitting department will not issue a building permit for any exterior work on a property within a local historic district without there first being a COA issued for that work. Ms. Allen further stated that no exterior building permit had been posted on site and no exterior building permit existed in the online system.

Mr. Maye stated that he had made a mistake because of his lack of knowledge about the historic district. He stated that he should have spoken with Historic Development about the replacement windows. Mr. Maye reiterated that he had called the City, which is how he learned replacement windows needed to be rated DP-50.

Ms. Echols summarized that there was no building permit and stated that she did not believe the Board could approve the work as presented to them. She reminded Mr. Maye that the house was not just in a historic district; it was on Government Street. Ms. Roselius interjected that there were several alterations the Board had yet to discuss, including changes to the porch trim and balustrade. Ms. Roselius repeated Ms. Echols' concern that the Board could not approve what was before them.

Mr. Maye asked again if the Board could accept the windows on the sides and the back. Mr. Blackwell responded that, due to the location on Government Street, the sides were highly visible. Mr. Blackwell stated that he could consider allowing the vinyl windows to remain on the rear if the applicant would agree to installing replacement windows matching the original in material, size, profile, and configuration on both sides of the dwelling. Mr. Blackwell seconded Ms. Roselius' concern that there were other alterations that the Board had yet to discuss. Ms. Davis agreed that the front and both sides were highly visible and that the windows themselves were a significant character defining feature for the house. Ms. Davis stated that when the Board had allowed vinyl windows to remain on side elevations in the past, the side elevations had not been highly visible. Ms. Roselius agreed with the possibility of working with the applicant to approve the alterations to the rear. Ms. Roselius recommended that the applicant work with staff to submit a new application.

Ms. Roselius asked if there was any evidence of what the porch had looked like before the alterations were made. Ms. Wilson responded that there were images of the original porch in the slideshow. Mr. Maye repeated that three or four of the columns were rotten, so he made the decision to wrap them with new wood. Ms. Davis stated that the resulting box columns were too heavy for the style of the house. Ms. Davis recommended that he look at what was there originally for guidance. Mr. Maye stated that the original posts were still in place and asked if the Board would like him to remove the box columns constructed around them. Ms. Echols stated that this would be a good first step and instructed him once again to work with staff. Ms. Echols also noted that the front door did not appear to be original. Ms. Wilson interjected that the front door was existing when Mr. Maye purchased the house.

Ms. Echols asked if the applicant would consent to work with staff. Ms. Allen interjected and asked that going forward the applicant submit professional design drawings detailing the proposed work. Ms. Allen stated that the applicant could consult staff during the design process but emphasized that the applicant would need to prepare a complete application including architectural drawings before resubmitting to the Board. Ms. Allen stated that he would need to provide information about how he intends to address the porch deck, columns, and decorative spindle-work trim and balustrade.

Ms. Roselius moved that, in the interest of time, the Board table the discussion. Ms. Roselius encouraged the applicant to follow up with staff quickly to get a new application submitted. Mr. Maye agreed.

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

FINDING FACTS

The application was tabled, and facts were not found.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

There was no decision on the application as it was tabled.



Agenda Item #6

Application 2024-58-CA

DETAILS

Location:

301 McDonald Avenue

Summary of Request:

Replace 4 windows on north elevation with vinyl windows not matching the originals in dimensions or light configuration.

Applicant (as applicable):

Rick Stojanik/ Quality Home Repair/Remodeling

Property Owner:

Patrick & Kelly McPhillips

Historic District:

Leinkauf

Classification:

Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The windows to be replaced are located on a street-facing elevation.
- The proposed new windows would not match the existing in light configuration, dimensions, or material, as required by 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 2

Attachments 3

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 two-story frame Colonial Revival style house at 301 McDonald Avenue was constructed in 1919. The house is depicted on the 1925 Sanborn map with its extant partial-width front porch and a partial-width rear porch that has since been enclosed as living space. The Sanborn map also shows a two-story frame garage near the center of the rear(east) property line; this structure appears to be extant.

Per the vertical files of the Historic Development Department, this property has appeared before the Architectural Review Board (ARB)once previously. The ARB approved the addition of a shed roof over the southern half of the east (rear) first floor elevation in August 1996.

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Remove and replace four wood windows on the north elevation with vinyl sashes with a four-over-one light configuration.
 - a. The existing western pair of windows measure 24" wide by 40" high and would be replaced with windows measuring 24" wide by 36" high.
 - b. The existing eastern pair of windows measure 30" wide by 40" high and would be replaced by windows measuring 24" wide by 36" high.
2. Reside the northern elevation in kind.

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

1. **5.4** Preserve original building materials.
 - Repair deteriorated building materials by patching, piecing-in, consolidating or otherwise reinforcing the materials.
 - Remove only those materials which are deteriorated and beyond reasonable repair.
2. **5.20** 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.
3. **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.
4. **5.22**

ACCEPTABLE WINDOW MATERIALS

Materials that are the same as the original, or that appear similar in texture, profile and finish to the original are acceptable. These often include:

- Wood sash

- Steel, if original to structure
- Custom extruded aluminum
- Aluminum clad wood
- Windows approved by the National Park Service

UNACCEPTABLE WINDOW MATERIALS

Materials that do not appear similar to the original in texture, profile and finish are unacceptable. These often include:

- Vinyl
- Mill-finished aluminum
- Interior snap-in muntins (except when used in concert with exterior muntins and intervening dividers)

STAFF ANALYSIS

The property under review is a contributing structure located at the southeast corner of McDonald Avenue and Church Street in the Leinkauf Historic District. The application seeks approval of the removal of four (4) historic wood windows located on the first-story level on the north elevation, a street-facing side, with slightly shorter windows to accommodate new kitchen cabinetry and counters on the interior. One pertinent factor in the consideration of this application is that the windows to be removed are located on a secondary elevation, though they would be visible from the narrow, one-way western end of Church Street.

The two sets of windows proposed for replacement are slightly different in light pattern and size. The existing windows have a six-over-one light pattern, whereas the proposed replacements are four-over-one. The existing easternmost windows measure 30" wide by 40" high. The proposed replacement windows would be 4" shorter and 6" narrower. The windows would maintain the existing lintel height with shortening on the bottom. The westernmost pair of windows are 24" wide and 40" high; the replacement windows would be of identical width but 4" shorter. The lintel height also would be retained here, with the shortening on the bottom. In order for the new windows to blend into the elevation, the entire north elevation would be resided in kind.

The *Guidelines* instruct that historic materials should be removed and replaced only when they are beyond reasonable repair, which has not been shown to be the circumstance in this case. (5.4) The *Guidelines* do not specifically address the presented circumstance, a proposal to replace the existing windows with shorter windows to accommodate new cabinetry and counters in a kitchen renovation. However, the *Guidelines* clearly state that when replacement windows are proposed, "the new windows shall match the existing as per location, framing, and light configuration." (5.21) The proposed replacement windows would be in the same location, but they would not match the existing in light configuration. Furthermore, vinyl is considered an unacceptable window material for contributing properties within Mobile's historic districts. (5.22)

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Rick Stojanik, the applicant, was present to discuss the application. Mr. Stojanik explained that the homeowner had hired him to renovate the existing kitchen and combine it with a small dining room. Mr. Stojanik stated that changes to the interior layout would result in lower kitchen cabinets being installed in front of the existing windows. Due to these changes, Mr. Stojanik proposed replacing the existing 6-over-1 wood windows with shorter 4-over-1 vinyl windows that would sit above the height of the interior countertops and backsplash. Mr. Stojanik stated that the new windows were otherwise identical to the existing. Mr. Stojanik further stated that he wanted to use the vinyl windows instead of new wood windows to save the homeowner money.

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Abby Davis stated that she did not see how the new windows could be considered identical to the existing. Specifically, Ms. Davis noted that the vinyl windows had a brick molding and that the faux muntins lacked the depth and detail of what was existing.

Ms. Catarina Echols asked why the applicant did not simply keep the existing windows and raised the head height so that the windowsill would be above the interior backsplash. Mr. Stojanik responded that the interior ceiling height was too low to raise the window head height enough to clear the backsplash.

Ms. Jennifer Roselius asked the applicant if he had considered simply running the interior cabinets across the windows in their existing location. Ms. Roselius pointed out that this would save the homeowner money. Ms. Davis interjected that she frequently designed this detail on purpose in new construction. Mr. Stojanik agreed that this could be a workable solution and withdrew the application.

FINDING FACTS

The application was withdrawn, and facts were not found.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

There was no decision on the application as it was withdrawn.



Agenda Item #7

Application 2024-47-CA

DETAILS

Location:

311 S. Ann Street

Summary of Request:

Replace original entry double doors with single front door and sidelights.

Applicant (as applicable):

Stephen Harris

Property Owner:

Same

Historic District:

Oakleigh Garden

Classification:

Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The materials for the proposed new door and sidelights would be compliant with the *Guidelines*.
- The proposed new door and sidelight arrangement would fit within the existing opening.
- The style of the proposed entry door arrangement would be generally appropriate for the age and style of the building, as directed by the *Guidelines*; however, the new style would project a more pronounced colonial revival aesthetic than the more restrained scheme of the existing fenestration pattern and other façade elements.

Report Contents:

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

PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

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

The structure at 311 S. Ann Street is a frame two-story American Foursquare dwelling with restrained classical detailing. It consists of a side-hall entrance and a one-story full-width front porch. Tax records and city directories point to a construction date of c. 1910. The 1925 Sanborn Insurance map shows a slight departure from the dwelling's current form on the rear portion of the house. The historic map shows a rear projection on the south end of the east (rear) elevation and a two-story rear porch. Historic Development records show that a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) was issued for the enclosure and enlargement of the two-story rear porch, which would account for the larger rectangular massing currently expressed in aerial photography.

According to Historic Development Department records, the property has previously appeared three times before the Architectural Review Board (ARB). In 2006, a COA was granted to reroof the house and the garage. In 1984, an application was approved to enclose and enlarge the two-story rear porch. In 1981, an application was approved to repaint the exterior of the dwelling.

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Replace existing front double doors with a new single door and sidelights.
 - a. The proposed door and sidelights would fit the existing front entry opening. The proposed door would measure 36" wide by 80" high, with flanking sidelights each measuring 8" wide by 32" high. The existing transom would be retained.
 - b. Both the door and sidelights would be wood. The door would consist of a nine-light configuration. Each sidelight would be single-pane leaded glass.

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

1. **5.14** Preserve the decorative and functional features of a primary door.
 - Original doors and openings, including their dimensions, should be retained along with any moldings, transoms or sidelight.
 - Maintain the original position and proportions of a historically significant door.
2. **5.15** Repair or replace a damaged historic door to maintain its general historic appearance.
 - Replacements should reflect the age and style of the building.
 - Use materials that are visually comparable to that of the original.
 - Do not use solid core or flush doors.

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

These often include:

- » Wood panel
- » Wood panel with glass lights
- » Leaded glass with lead cames

- » Metal with a painted finish
 - » Other materials original to the building
- UNACCEPTABLE DOOR MATERIALS Materials that do not appear similar to the original in texture and finish are unacceptable.
- These often include:
- » Unfinished Metal
 - » Fiberglass or synthetic
 - » Wood flush doors

STAFF ANALYSIS

The subject property is a contributing structure to the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. The application under review requests approval to remove the historic wood and glass double doors and replace them with a single multi-pane mahogany wood and glass door flanked by single-light sidelights.

The *Guidelines* call for the preservation of original doors and moldings, and stipulate that replacements of damaged doors should reflect the age and style of the building. (5.14, 5.15) The entry opening and double doors at 311 S. Ann Street appear to be original. Although the proposed replacement door and sidelights reflect a character that is generally appropriate to the period and style of the house and would fit the existing opening, it would create a more explicitly classical revival expression on the structure's façade than its current, more discreet interpretation. Likewise, the dissimilar single door with sidelight arrangement, along with the multi-light configuration on the proposed door, somewhat alters the original fenestration rhythm expressed on the façade. The adjacent property, 309 S. Ann is also an American Foursquare dwelling, constructed c. 1909, with a comparable fenestration pattern on the façade and an entry door arrangement similar to that proposed in the subject application. However, as discussed above, the details of the double columns and second floor porch balustrade of 309 S. Ann express a more overtly classical style than 311 S. Ann and that is better suited to the single door/sidelight arrangement.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Stephen Harris, the owner, was present to discuss the application. Mr. Harris stated that one of the glass lights in the home's double-leaf front door had broken. Instead of repairing the existing double door, Mr. Harris stated that he would like to replace it with a single door and sidelights. Mr. Harris stated that the double-leaf door was frequently difficult to operate and properly secure. Mr. Harris also stated that he preferred the look of the single door with sidelights and had seen several examples of this configuration on neighboring homes.

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Catarina Echols asked if the new door would be solid wood. Mr. Harris responded that the proposed door was solid mahogany.

Ms. Abby Davis asked if the applicant would consider a simpler door configuration with a single lite, which would be more similar to the existing doors, instead of the proposed Prairie-style door. Mr. Harris responded that he had had trouble locating any door that seemed appropriate.

Ms. Karrie Maurin asked if it would be possible to reuse one of the leaves of the existing double-leaf door. Mr. Harris responded that each leaf was only 30 inches wide. Mr. Harris expressed concerns about the functionality of such a narrow front door. Ms. Maurin agreed.

Ms. Jennifer Roselius stated that while the *Design Guidelines* dictate that primary doors and other original façade features be maintained, she was not strongly opposed to a single door and sidelights in this location. However, Ms. Roselius stated that she did have an issue with the specific door proposed in the application, since it seemed more in keeping with an Arts and Crafts style dwelling.

Mr. Harris asked if the Board would approve the application if he could find a door with a single glass lite. Ms. Davis stated that she would be more inclined to approve the application if it presented a door with a single glass lite above a single panel, instead of the two lower panels of the door currently proposed. Mr. Stephen McNair agreed.

Mr. Harris asked how he should proceed once he had located a more appropriate door. Ms. Davis asked if Mr. Harris intended to reuse the existing transom. Mr. Harris confirmed that the existing transom would remain. Ms. Davis stated that the Board could approve the single-door configuration with new sidelights and the existing transom and delegate approval of the specific door to Staff. Mr. Harris agreed.

FINDING FACTS

Ms. Davis moved that the Board amend the facts to state that the Board would approve only the single-door configuration with sidelights and existing transom and that applicant would submit for Staff-level review a simpler door with a single light over a single panel.

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

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