

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES

December 6, 2017 – 3:00 P.M.

Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Harris Oswalt, called the meeting to order at 3:10 p.m. Cart Blackwell, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
Members Present: Harris Oswalt, Robert Allen, Jim Wagoner, Catarina Echols, Carolyn Hasser.
Members Absent: Nick Holmes III, Craig Roberts, Robert Brown, Kim Harden, Steve Stone, David Barr and John Ruzic.
Staff Members Present: Cartledge Blackwell, Bridget Daniel, and Paige Largue.
2. Mrs. Hasser moved to approve the minutes from November 1st, 2017 and November 15th, 2017. The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.
3. Mrs. Hasser moved to approve the Midmonths. The motion received a second and was approved with one in opposition, Mr. Robert Allen.

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED

1. **Applicant: Richard Winter on behalf of Sheneva Johnson**
 - a. Property Address: 301 Breamwood Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/09/2017
 - c. Project: Reroof with architectural shingles in approved colors.
2. **Applicant: Richard Winter on behalf of Joseph Runkel**
 - a. Property Address: 59 N. Reed Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/09/2017
 - c. Project: Reroof with architectural shingles in approved color..
3. **Applicant: Robin Rockstall on behalf of the Catholic Archdiocese of Mobile**
 - a. Property Address: 356 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/09/2017
 - c. Project: Install metal fence and landscaping.
4. **Applicant: Robin Rockstall on behalf of the Catholic Archdiocese of Mobile**
 - a. Property Address: 208 Conti Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/09/2017
 - c. Project: Install brick coping wall with metal fence and landscaping.
5. **Applicant: Stacie Chittom of Morgan Signs on behalf of KJF/ Faris LLC**
 - a. Property Address: 659 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/09/2017
 - c. Project: Install wall plaque sign composed of painted metal composite on West elevation to be no larger than 8 sq. ft. below canopy with directional lighting pointed to sign.
6. **Applicant: Wayne McKathan**
 - a. Property Address: 508 Monroe Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/13/2017
 - c. Project: Replace deteriorated wood to match existing in dimension, profile and material when necessary such as rotten window sill. Repaint in the following color scheme: Body, "Carmelized Pears" (yellow); trim, white.
7. **Applicant: Carolyn Tucker**
 - a. Property Address: 414 Wisconsin Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/13/2017
 - c. Project: Reroof with architectural shingles in weatherwood.

- 8. Applicant: Sydney Betbeze on behalf of Restore Mobile**
- a. Property Address: 1105 Texas Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/14/2017
 - c. Project: Reroof main body of house with architectural shingles in approved colors. Reroof porch with standing seam metal and slightly alter slope.
- 9. Applicant: Taylor Atchison on behalf of Broad Street Lofts LLC**
- a. Property Address: 304 S. Broad Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/14/2017
 - c. Project: Construct wooden fencing and install on side and interior of lot. Fence will not exceed 6' in height.
- 10. Applicant: Carlton Dortch of Dortch, Figures and Sons Inc.**
- a. Property Address: 1014 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/15/2017
 - c. Project: Secure and mothball property. Paint boards as necessary.
- 11. Applicant: Carlton Dortch of Dortch, Figures and Sons Inc.**
- a. Property Address: 460 Dexter Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/15/2017
 - c. Project: Secure and mothball property. Paint boards as necessary.
- 12. Applicant: Yadzia Lugo of Liberty Roof Inc. on behalf of Michael and Melinda Oliver**
- a. Property Address: 354 McDonald Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/15/2017
 - c. Project: Reroof with architectural shingles in slate.
- 13. Applicant: William Finch**
- a. Property Address: 454 Marine Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/16/2017
 - c. Project: Remove dilapidated later porch addition located in rear West elevation to restore original roofline. On northern portion of West (rear) elevation alter non-original door to a window opening with two-over-two window. Replace existing window in aluminum clad or wood. Construct porch landing and steps and install new wooden door leading to porch. Feather in wood siding as necessary to match existing. On southernmost portion of West (rear) elevation move location of window North and install wood or aluminum clad window to match. Repair wood to match existing in dimension, profile and material. Repaint. Replace (3) jalousie windows on North and South elevations with two-over-two windows.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2017-58-CA: 101 Ryan Avenue

- a. Applicant: Robert McCown of McCown Design and Robert Dueitt of Robert Dueitt Construction on behalf of Dr. & Mrs. William J. Terry
- b. Project: Construct a rear addition.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

2. 2017-59-CA: 255 North Jackson Street

- a. Applicant: Robert McCown of McCown Design and Robert Dueitt of Robert Dueitt Construction on behalf of Mr. & Mrs. Pete Burns
- b. Project: Construct a rear addition.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

3. 2017-60-CA: 256 North Jackson Street

- a. Applicant: Bruce Knodel of Bruce D. Knodel Architect for Mr. & Mrs. Richard Rogers
- b. Project: Construct a single-family residence.

APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Discussion

Mr. Blackwell stated that the next meeting of the Architectural Review Board would be December 20th, 2017 and potentially include two applications.

Mr. Allen inquired as to a new zoning ordinance passed. Mr. Blackwell stated the legislation that passed at the state level allowed for more ease in acquiring blighted properties. Mrs. Hasser noted that the legislation lessened the title clearance time from four years to one year. Mr. Blackwell stated he would inquire further as to specifics as to whether the ordinance was the same as the one he and Mrs. Hasser thought it was.

Mr. Allen stated there had not been legal representation from the city for four meetings and asked if the Board still had legal representation. Mr. Blackwell stated the Board still had legal representation from the City. Mr. Allen noted there had been a couple of questions for legal in prior meetings which were unable to be answered.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF REPORT

2017-58-CA: 101 Ryan Avenue
Applicant: Robert McCown of McCown Design and Robert Dueitt of Robert Dueitt Construction on behalf of Dr. & Mrs. William J. Terry
Received: 11/13/17
Meeting: 12/6/17

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Ashland Place
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Construct an addition.

BUILDING HISTORY

This Arts and Crafts Movement informed “bungalow” dates from 1923. With its dominant porch featuring paneled and battered two-part porch piers, bracketed eaves, and all-encompassing roof forms, this house is a fine local example of an international architectural typology.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the change...will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the district...”

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on May 7, 2008. At that time, the Board approved the construction of an addition to an existing ancillary structure. The application up for review calls for the construction of an addition to the body of the house.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Design an addition to be compatible with the character of the property, neighborhood, and environment.”
 - 2. “Design the building components (roof foundation, doors, and windows) of the addition to be compatible with the historic architecture.”
 - 3. “Maintain the relationship of solids and voids (windows and doors) in an exterior wall as established by the historic building.”
 - 4. “Differentiate an addition from a historic structure using changes in material, color, and/or wall plane.”
 - 5. “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.”
 - 6. “Design a door and doorway to be compatible with the historic building.”

7. “Design the scale, proportion and character of a porch addition element, including columns, corner brackets, railings and pickets, to be compatible with the existing historic residential structure.”
8. “Size, place and space a window for (or impacted by)/ an addition to be in character with the original historic building.”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):

1. Construct a rear addition.
 - a. The addition will extend from/off of the Northwest corner of the house.
 - b. The addition will take the form of open and enclosed spaces.
 - c. Minus area affiliated with a storage area, the addition’s foundation treatment will match that found on the body of the house.
 - d. The addition’s walls will be clad with cement board siding of the same profile and dimension as the wooden siding found on the body of the house.
 - e. Nine-over-Nine (larger center panel for upper light with surrounding border lights) aluminum clad wood windows will be employed.
 - f. Gabled and shed roof forms will surmount the addition.
 - g. Asphalt shingles matching those employed on the body of the house will sheath the addition’s roof.
 - h. East Elevation (façade)
 - i. The slope of a North-oriented gable will be extended.
 - ii. A two-part columnar pier matching that found on the front porch will be constructed.
 - iii. A window will be removed.
 - iv. A door will be constructed in the location of the aforementioned window.
 - v. A flight of steps will access the door.
 - i. North (a side) Elevation
 - i. The addition’s North Elevation will be four parts in sequence.
 - ii. An easternmost porch area mentioned in C-1-h will be surmounted by a bracketed gable roof.
 - iii. Fenestration will remain in situ and looking onto the porch.
 - iv. A more eastern innermost section of the North Elevation will feature two nine-over-one windows.
 - v. Said intermediate section will be surmounted by shed roof.
 - vi. A continuation of said shed roof will extend over the North Elevation’s more westernmost inner portion.
 - vii. Two nine-over-one windows and a double-door will comprise the westernmost portion’s fenestration.
 - viii. The aforementioned doors will be vertical board in construction.
 - ix. The doors will be surmounted by bracketed awning sheathed with shingles matching those found on the principle roof forms.
 - x. The slope and overhang of a West or rear facing gable will comprise the North Elevation’s westernmost portion.
 - xi. The antipodia or checks of steps will advance from said porch.
 - j. West (rear) Elevation
 - i. A two bay porch will define the addition’s West Elevation.
 - ii. A small expanse of siding will be located at the porch’s northernmost portion.
 - iii. The porch will feature two-part columnar posts matching those found on the front porch.
 - iv. Clapboarded balustrades will extend between the porch posts.

- v. Framed porch screening will extend between the columnar post and within the porch fields.
- vi. The northernmost bay of the porch will feature a double door within the screening framework.
- vii. A flight of steps flanked by antipodia-like cheeks will advance beyond said porch entry.
- k. South (a side – Old Shell Road) Elevation
 - i. A chimney will punctuate the porch expanse defining the rear addition's South Elevation.
 - ii. Porch screening and a two part columnar porch pier will also inform said elevation.
 - iii. Clapboarded balustrades will extend between the porch posts.

CLARIFICATIONS/REQUESTS

1. What will be the fenestration on the impacted portions of the West (Rear) Elevation?
2. Clarify the design of door to be installed in location of a window on East Elevation?

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application calls for the construction of a rear addition. Said addition will only be minimally visible from the principle public view when seen head-on from Ryan Avenue. The addition will square out a side (North) elevation engaging one of two alleys which convene toward the rear of the property.

The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that additions should be so designed as to be compatible with the character of the property, neighborhood, and environment (See B-1.). The proposed addition is so situated and articulated as to be responsive to not only the configuration, proportions, and detailing of body of the existing historic dwelling, but also the larger district context. In concert with the Guidelines, the foundation treatment, window construction & light configuration, and overall detailing take direct queue from those components found on and defining the principle dwelling (See B-2.). The Guidelines go on to state that relationship of solids to voids should reflect the patterns established by the historic building (See B 3 & 8.). The body of the house employs fenestration patterns in singled, doubled, and trebled forms. Windows would be retained in the area impacted by the proposed side porch and light configurations matched throughout the whole of the addition. The regularized placement of windows within the walls plans on the proposed addition's main expanse (North or side Elevation) relates to patterns (regularized) found on the house. The singular sequencing serves also to differentiate, albeit sensitively, the proposed addition from the historic core of the house (See B-4). The addition will read to the sensitive eye as compatible with, but responsive to the existing. Changes in wall plan, perpendicular roof forms, and changes in roof plane also serve to distinguish the old from the new. The proposed roof forms feature elements and details drawn directly from the house (See B-5.). Given the placement of the addition, there is no principle entry. Such a condition would change the orientation of the house. A window proposed for replacement by a door would be of a design that compliments to the architectural vocabulary of the house in specific and general typology overall (See B-6.). Proposed side and rear porches draw from construction and articulation of the main house (See B-7.). The side porch would be an extension of an existing gable in terms of rough structure. Columnar supports on both of the proposed umbrages are inspired by those distinguishing the front porch. Clapboarded railings were often employed on Arts and Crafts dwellings, as was screening on rear porches.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-8), Staff does not believe this application would impair the architectural or the historical character of the property or surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of this application in full.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Robert Dueitt, Mr. Matt Arensberg, and Mr. Robert McCown, the owner's representatives, were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt welcomed the applicant's representatives and asked if they had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make. Mr. Dueitt responded that Mr. Blackwell had explained the application in full.

Mr. Oswalt then asked if any of his fellow Board members had any questions pertinent to the application which to ask Mr. Burns, Mr. Dueitt, Mr. Arensberg, or Mr. McCown.

Mrs. Echols asked if the existing windows would be repurposed on the addition. Mr. Dueitt responded all windows would be repurposed. Mr. McCown noted that the existing windows would be separated in the design.

No further discussion from the Board ensued.

Mr. Oswalt opened the application to public comment. With no one to speak either for or against the application, Mr. Oswalt closed the period of public comment.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Wagoner moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, as written.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Wagoner moved that, based upon the facts as approved by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the building and the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued.

The motion received a second and was approved unanimously.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration: December 6, 2018

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF REPORT

2017-59-CA: 253-255-302 North Jackson Street (302 specifically)
Applicant: Robert McCown of McCown Design and Robert Dueitt of Robert Dueitt Construction on behalf of Mr. & Mrs. Pete Burns
Received: 11/13/17
Meeting: 12/6/17

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: DeTonti Square
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: T-3
Project: Construct an addition.

BUILDING HISTORY

This property constitutes the largest parcel in the DeTonti Square National Register Historic District. Possessing buildings constructed from the 1950s-1990s, the larger site was once occupied by some of Mobile’s most architecturally significant residential structures of the Antebellum epoch. Some the current buildings were constructed out of materials salvaged from the aforementioned edifices. The largest building on the compound, 253 North Jackson Street (also listed as 300 State Street according to older MHDC files) features the brick, ironwork, and frontis piece of the Lyons House, the 1850s townhouse that formerly occupied said address. Both the design of 253 and 255 State Street are attributed to architect Harry Inge Johnstone for reason of architectural and temporal evidence.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the change...will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the district...”

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property has not appeared before the Board in recent years. The application up for review calls for the demolition of less architectural significant inner lot portions of the complex and the construction of a new addition and minor alterations to existing fabric.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Design an addition to be compatible with the character of the property, neighborhood, and environment.”
 - 2. “Design the building components (roof foundation, doors, and windows) of the addition to be compatible with the historic architecture.”
 - 3. “Maintain the relationship of solids and voids (windows and doors) in an exterior wall as established by the historic building.”
 - 4. “Differentiate an addition from a historic structure using changes in material, color, and/or wall plane.”
 - 5. “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.”

6. “Design a door and doorway to be compatible with the historic building.”
 7. “Design the scale, proportion and character of a porch addition element, including columns, corner brackets, railings and pickets, to be compatible with the existing historic residential structure.”
 8. “When considering demolitions of later non historic fabric engaged to historic building, the following criteria are taken into account, “architectural significance, condition of the structure, impact of demolition on the streetscape, and nature of proposed redevelopment.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
1. Demolish a non-historic addition.
 2. Construct a new addition.
 - a. The addition will be constructed out of brick.
 - b. The addition will feature six-over-six aluminum clad wood windows.
 - c. North Elevation
 - i. The North Elevation will not feature fenestration.
 - d. West Elevation
 - i. Two vehicular bays and two window bays will define the West Elevation.
 - ii. All four fenestrated bays will be surmounted by lintels.
 - iii. The vehicular bays will feature paneled vertical board doors.
 - iv. The windows will be six-over-six in light configuration.
 - e. South Elevation
 - i. The South Elevation will not feature fenestration.
 2. Conduct minor alterations to the body of the house.
 - a. East Elevation
 - i. The East Elevation will be defined by a two bay screen porch.
 - ii. One bay will feature a door and the second bay will be fixed.
 - iii. An intermediate upper rail-like device will inform both bays.
 - iv. The door bay will feature an expanse of cementitious siding above the opening.
 - b. South Elevation
 - i. Add a six-over-six window.
 - ii. Instate screening.

CLARIFICATIONS

1. What is the composition of the garage doors?

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the demolition of a later rear addition to a non-contributing building, construction of a new addition on the location of the aforementioned addition, and minor changes to portions to the body of the larger building.

When reviewing applications for demolition, the following considerations are taken into account: architectural significance of the construction; physical condition of the subject construction; impact of the demolition on the streetscape; and nature of any proposed redevelopment (See B-8.). With regard to architectural significance, the subject portion of the non-contributing building is not of the same material and design caliber of the larger structure and complex. While not in a bad state of repair, the overall design is not responsive to the historical landscape in terms of its outward appearance. The proposed demolition would not impact the principle Jackson Street frontage, but would impact at a pronounced

recess both the State Street and North Claiborne Streets. Additional built density and recaptured historical integrity would be gained/re-attained by way of the new construction. See the below as per the nature of the proposed new construction.

The proposed new construction would take the form of a garage addition to one of three buildings comprising a larger compound. In accord with the Design Review Guidelines, the proposed garage is designed as to be compatible with architectural character of the surrounding historic architecture (See B-1.). The responsive nature of the design is exhibited in terms of material, proportion, and design. The Design Review Guidelines state that fenestration patterns of additions should maintain a relationship of solids-to-voids as that exhibited by the body of the building (See B 2 & 3.). The proposed garage addition is engaged to a structure that does not possess a regularized sequence of fenestration. The solid to void ratio of the subject building responds to site conditions and interior plan. The principle frontage of the subject addition does feature two pairings of traditional fenestration that respond to other buildings on the complex and fenestration on traditional buildings that inform the larger district's period of major significance. The carriageway-like openings are double in nature as seen in traditional carriage houses in Mobile during the Antebellum era, the district's main period architectural and historical significance (See B-6.). The sash windows with surmounting lintels are a reflection of the historical window designs found in the area and on the property (See B-2.). As with most garages, there is no secondary fenestration. Again, the situation of the property is inner lot/block one. In addition to aforementioned compatibility concerns, the proposed addition is so designed as to be differentiated from the existing fabric, most notably in the roof form a parapet fronted construction (See B-4.). Parapets and low roof pitches inform other parts of the complex. The overall form is responsive too, yet respectfully distinctive from the existing so as "to read" as a later intervention to encountered conditions (See B 4 & 5.).

Proposed alterations to the body of the building largely concern a side porch. The Design Review Guidelines state that the scale, proportion and character of a porch addition element, including columns, corner brackets, railings and pickets, should be compatible with the existing historic residential structure (See B-7.). The proposed porch is designed to fulfill the aforementioned considerations. A window would also be added.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-7), Staff does not believe this application would impair the architectural and the historical character of the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of this application in full.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Robert Dueitt, Mr. Matt Arensberg, Mr. Robert McCown, the owner's representatives and Mr. Pete Burns, the owner, was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt welcomed Mr. Dueitt, Mr. McCown, Mr. Arensburg, the owner's representatives, and Mr. Burns, the owner, and asked if they had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make. Mr. Dueitt responded that Mr. Blackwell had explained the application in full.

Mr. Oswalt then asked if any of his fellow Board members had any questions pertinent to the application which to ask Mr. Burns, Mr. Dueitt, Mr. Arensberg, or Mr. McCown.

No discussion from the Board ensued.

Mr. Oswalt opened the application to public comment. Mrs. Johnna Rogers, a neighborhood resident spoke in favor of the application.

No further comments ensued from the audience. Mr. Oswalt closed the period of public comment.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Wagoner moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, as written.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Wagoner moved that, based upon the facts as approved by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the building and the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued.

The motion received a second and was approved unanimously.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration: December 6, 2018

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF REPORT

2017-60-CA: 256 North Jackson Street
Applicant: Bruce Knodel of Bruce D. Knodel Architect for Mr. & Mrs. Richard Rogers
Received: 11/13/17
Meeting: 12/6/17

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: DeTonti Square
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: T-3
Project: Construct a single family residence.

BUILDING HISTORY

This property is comprised of vacant lot at its westernmost portion (that abutting the North Jackson Street right of way) and a rear lot featuring an Antebellum dependency. According to the 1904 Sanborn Maps, a 1850s side hall with wing dwelling formerly occupied the former. Said house, which was documented as a part of the Historic American Building Survey (HABS), was known as the Riley House.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the change...will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the district...”

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The application up for review calls for the construction a single family residence on the western portion of the property.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “Maintain alignment of front setbacks.”
 - 2. “Maintain the rhythm of buildings and side yards.”
 - 3. “Design the massing of new construction to appear similar to that of historic buildings in the district.”
 - 4. “Design the scale of new construction to appear similar to that of historic buildings in the district.”
 - 5. “Design piers, a foundation, and foundation infill to be compatible with those of nearby historic properties.
 - 6. “Size foundations and floor heights to appear similar to those of nearby historic buildings.”
 - 7. “Use building height in front that is compatible with adjacent contributing properties.”
 - 8. “Design building elements on exterior buildings walls to be compatible with those on nearby historic buildings. These elements often include but are not limited to: balconies, chimneys, and dormers.”
 - 9. “Use exterior building materials and finishes that complement the character of the surrounding district.”
 - 10. “Locate and size a window to create a solid-to-void ratio similar to the ratios seen on

nearby historic windows.”

11. “Use traditional window casement and trim similar to those seen in nearby historic buildings.”
12. “Place and size a special feature, including a transom, sidelight or decorative framing element, to complement those seen in nearby historic buildings.
13. “Match the scale of a porch to the main building and reflect the scale of porches of nearby historic buildings.”
14. “Design a roof on new construction to be compatible with those on adjacent historic buildings.”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):

1. Construct a single family residence.
 - a. The house will be set back 12’ from the right of way.
 - b. The house will be two-and-one-half-story in height.
 - c. The house will be constructed out of brick.
 - d. The house will feature six-over-six aluminum clad wood windows.
 - e. The gabled and hipped roof structures will be sheathed in standing seam metal roof panels.
 - f. The first-story will feature 12’ 10” ceilings.
 - g. The second-story will feature 10’ 4 ½” ceilings.
 - h. West Elevation (façade)
 - i. A three bay porch will define the façade fronted by a three bay portico.
 - ii. Either Roman Doric or Tuscan columns will comprise the eight supports of the two-tiered tetrastyle portico.
 - iii. Wooden picketed railings will extend between the columns.
 - iv. A flight of brick steps with railings matching those enclosing the galleries will advance from the first-story’s southernmost bay. Newel posts will terminate the steps.
 - v. The first-story will feature a frontis piece comprised of a single glazed and paneled door, flanking shutters (when open covering side lights), and multi-light transom.
 - vi. Two six-over-six windows with flanking wooden shutters (operable) will be located to the side of the frontis piece.
 - vii. Three French doors with flanking shutters will be equidistantly spaced on the second-story.
 - viii. Parapet walls with surmounting chimney flues will comprise the termini of the façade.
 - i. South (a side) Elevation
 - i. The South Elevation will feature a westernmost two- and-one-half-story portion and an easternmost single-story portion.
 - ii. Single six-over-six windows define the westernmost portion of the raked and stepped parapet portion of the two-and-one-half story part of the house on both its first and second floors.
 - iii. An advanced shed roofed expanse will feature two staggered four-light windows.
 - iv. The gabled roofed rear portion of the two-and-one-half-story portion of the house will feature a six-over-six window on its first and second floors.
 - v. The single-story rearmost portion of the West Elevation will be fronted by a two bay gallery.
 - vi. The gallery will feature either Tuscan or Roman Doric columns and picketed railings.

- vii. A flight of wooden steps with terminal newels and picketed railing will afford access to the innermost porch bay.
- viii. A double French door with flanking sidelights and surmounting transom will be situated on access with the steps.
- ix. A six-over-six window will be located to one side of the aforementioned entrance.
- j. East (rear) Elevation
 - i. The East Elevation's first-story will be defined at its southernmost expanse by the terminal bay of the South Elevation's porch.
 - ii. Both the first and second-story gables will feature hipped cornice returns.
 - iii. Two six-over-six windows will be employed on the second-story.
 - iv. A louvered window will puncture the garret level.
- k. North (a side) Elevation
 - i. The North Elevation's will feature a two-and-one-half-story westernmost portion and a single-story easternmost portion.
 - ii. Two six-over-six windows will be located on the first-story of the westernmost parapeted end wall portion and a single louvered bay will be found in that portion's garret.
 - iii. A four-over-four window will be located on the first-story and a six-over-six window will be located on the second-story of the two-and-one-half-story rearmost portion of the multi-story body of the dwelling's North Elevation.
 - iv. A paired four-over-four windows will comprise the fenestration of the single-story portion of the North Elevation.
- 2. Conduct site improvements related to the new construction.
 - a. Adapt the fencing to afford placement and installation of front gate.
 - b. Install a driveway to be aligned with an existing curbcut.

CLARIFICATIONS/REQUESTS

1. What is the composition of the front walkway?
2. Clarify the placement and design of the gate within the existing front fence.
3. Clarify the surfacing and depth of the vehicular drive.
4. What is the height of the foundation?
5. Note on the façade (West Elevation) the presence of the stair wing indicated on plans on the South Elevation.
6. Provide a sample of the proposed brick.
7. Will a watertable be employed?
8. What is the color the standing seam metal roof?

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Consider employing two faux windows on the North (a side) Elevation's second-story.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The subject property, 256 North Jackson Street, is located in the western portion of the DeTonti Square Historic District. The application up for review involves the construction of single family residential infill in an inner lot situation informed by a contributing building to the South and a non-contributing building to the north (site being on west-facing portion of a block). When reviewing new construction, five principle criteria are taken into account. The aforementioned considerations are as follows: placement, massing, scale, façade element, and materials.

With regard to placement, two components are taken into account – setback from the street and distance between buildings. The Design Review Guidelines for New Residential Construction in Mobile’s Historic Districts state that new buildings should be responsive to and maintain the alignment of traditional façade lines (See B-1), as well as the rhythm of side & rear setbacks (See B-2.). In accord with Design Guidelines, the setbacks reflect the historical character of the contributing aspects of the built landscape. The proposed 12’ placement negotiates the placement of two buildings located to either side of it. To the South there stands 254 North Jackson Street. The front wall of the body of that historic house is located at an approximate 12’ setback. To the North there stands a non-contributing bunker-like building which occupies an approximate 12’ setback. The side setbacks are traditional in nature. It should be noted in relation to side setbacks that house adopts the typological form of the house that formerly occupied the site. The typology correlation will be further discussed in the portions of the analysis addressing massing and scale. Back to placement, the façade directly engages the street in terms of its orientation. The proposed front walk and the side drive would further stress the primacy of the street and reintroduce lost rhythmic sequence of elements respectful of traditional placement patterns.

The Design Review Guidelines state that mass - the relationship of the parts of the larger whole comprising a building - for new construction should be in keeping with arrangement and proportion of surrounding historic residences (B-3). The proposed dwelling adopts the form of a side hall with wing, a typology that once dominated the present day DeTonti Square National Register District and its immediate surroundings. Informed by a three bay block fronted by a gallery or galleries with a recessed wing to one or in cases both sides and the rear, there once numbered over six hundred of this dwelling type in Mobile. To date, there are less than forty. The majority of the surviving instances are found in DeTonti Square. The aforementioned number being seven total. As stated previously, one actually occupied the subject property until the 1950s. Instances of the side hall typology are even more numerous in extant numbers than there elaborated relation. There is thus considerable precedent of existing and lost buildings of the same overall form or massing. As with typological source of inspiration for the overall form and almost all historical examples of the area, the house will be elevated above the ground. Whether there is an expressed watertable in terms of a form of molding/advance in pla or a continuous wall surface has not been articulated. Both design solutions have precedent in the surrounding landscape and are in accord with the Design Review Guidelines (See B-5.). Also true to the prototypal form, a gallery (here two-tiered in layering and slightly inset within the façade) would front the three bay front of a dominant multi-story block with a side wing and a rear wing. The compartmentalization and correlation of parts of the larger whole that informs the proposed massing is inspired by the larger district and (as mentioned) historic site conditions.

Scale refers to a building’s size in relationship to other buildings. The Design Review Guidelines for New Residential Construction state that new construction should be in scale with nearby historic buildings (See B-4.). The Design Guidelines go even more specific by stating that foundation and ceiling heights should be similar to those found in nearby historic buildings (See B-6.). The overall height of the foundations, which requires clarification, appears in the scaled drawings to be comparable to the appropriate two-and-one-half to four foot height range characterizing the historic buildings in the area. The ceiling heights for the two principle floors are noted on the plans submitted. In concert with the surrounding historic buildings, the ceiling heights are superimposed in height. The proposed main floor features taller ceilings measuring in excess of twelve feet, a traditional ceiling height for the first floor of the Antebellum residences in the district, while the second-story features a proportioned drop in height to ten feet plus. The resulting height of the building overall is compatible to historic buildings in the area (See B- 7.). The proposed two-tiered gallery fronting the two-story block and the side gallery lining the secondary rear wing are scaled in accord with historic examples as well as to the overall massing and scale of the building (See B-13.).

With regard to building components, the Design Review Guidelines call for responsiveness or compatibility to design traditions (See B-8.). Innovation is not ruled out, but cohesiveness of response is the goal. As mentioned in a preceding analysis on massing, the vestigial form of the proposed house – the side hall with wing - has considerable precedent in larger context and site specific. Going further into building components such as a specific columnar order, railing construction, window construction, and window light configuration that inform the vast majority of the surrounding architectural and historical context (See B-9.). The proposed window spacing affords a traditional solid-to-void ratio (See B-10.) with regard to the principle elevation and dominant expanses of the side elevations. Two faux windows are recommended for consideration on the second-story of the North Elevation. All the proposed window designs are simply cased in terms their framing and fitting as is the dominant treatment for window surrounds in the area (See B-11.). Placement and employ of special features such as the frontis piece with its door, sidelights/shutters, & transom and parapets respond to tradition as well (See B-12.).

All of the materials are approved for usage on new construction in Mobile’s Historic Districts.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-14), Staff does not believe this application will impair either the architectural or the historical character of the building or the surrounding district. Pending the clarifications articulated above, staff recommends approval of this application in full.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Bruce Knodel, the owner’s representatives and Mrs. Johnna Rogers, the owner, were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt welcomed the Mr. Knodel and Mrs. Rogers and asked if they had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make. Mr. Knodel responded that Mr. Blackwell had explained the application in full.

Mr. Oswalt then asked if any of his fellow Board members had any questions pertinent to the application which to ask Mr. Knodel or Mrs. Rogers.

Mr. Wagoner asked for staff to include clarifications sent via email in the minutes. Mr. Blackwell articulated the clarifications: a brick walkway would extend between the front steps and the sidewalk; gates would align with vehicular and pedestrian access points; vehicular path would be composed of stone and gravel; foundation height would be four feet; side wing noted on the revised plans; and samples provided at the meeting showing the proposed painted brick. Ms. Rogers noted the brick will be painted “DeTonti White’ or color to match.

The following clarifications has been made via email prior to the meeting:

- 1) Iron balustrades drawing from the existing fence will be employed on the gallery.
- 2) Ceiling height is 11’10”.
- 3) A glass and paneled door will be located at the front entrance with no sidelights. Shutters will flank the door.
- 4) A brick and stone walkway will lead to the house.

- 5) An existing curbcut will be relocated and fence and gate will be adjusted to accommodate.
- 6) A semi-permeable drive will be installed.
- 7) The foundation will employ bricks and be 4' in height.
- 8) Brick will be painted Detonti Square white or similar.
- 9) Metal roof will be employed in bronze or similar color.

No further discussion from the Board ensued.

Mr. Oswalt opened the application to public comment.

Mr. Pete Burns, a neighborhood resident previously spoke in favor of the application previously. No other comments ensued from the audience. Mr. Oswalt closed the period of public comment.

FINDING OF FACT

Mrs. Hasser moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, as amended to include clarifications.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Wagoner moved that, based upon the facts as amended by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the building and the district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued.

The motion received a second and was approved unanimously.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration: December 6, 2018

