



# Architectural Review Board Minutes

## August 2, 2023 – 3:00 P.M.

### ADMINISTRATIVE

---

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m.

#### 1. Roll Call

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

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

**Members Absent:** Abby Davis and Barja Wilson

**Staff Members Present:** Annie Allen, Shayla Beaco, Christine Dawson, Marion McElroy, Bruce McGowin, Kim Thomas, and Meredith Wilson

#### 2. Adoption of ARB Procedures (“Rules and Regulations”)

Ms. Wanda Cochran, a member of the public, was present to discuss the adoption of ARB rules and regulations. She asked the Board not to adopt the rules and regulations, as they have not been disseminated or advertised to the residents of the historic districts. She added that there has not been adequate time for residents to review the rules and regulations to prepare comments.

Ms. Cochran stated that in the current rules and procedures for the Architectural Review Board, section 12 states changes and amendments must be adopted by a vote of the majority of the quorum at a special meeting called for the adoption for new rules or amended rules provided that notice is properly given. She added that this is not the appropriate forum to discuss adoption of new rules, and asked that the Board not adopt these rules today but will follow section 12 and schedule a special meeting.

Mr. Bruce McGowin, attorney for the ARB commented. He stated that the old rules are the rules for the prior ARB, which no longer exists. The new rules are almost entirely the same as the old rules. A small number of changes to match the new ordinance were made which generally include the number of Board members, appeals being heard by circuit court, and number and time limits on how many and how long a speaker can address the Board. If there are not rules and procedures in place, the Board cannot move forward with its job.

Ms. Cochran suggested that the ARB adopt the old ARB rules as interim rules until a special meeting has been scheduled and comments heard, or adopt a set of interim rules. This will give residents an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. McGowin noted that the state statute does not require a special meeting or public hearing in order to adopt new rules. He reiterated that new rules need to be in place to proceed, that it is his opinion that they need not be subject to a special meeting.

Ms. Jennifer Roselius stated that the adoption of rules and regulations was listed on the published agenda. She asked if the new rules and regulations were available to the public.

Mr. McGowin responded that they were available by request.

Ms. Roselius commented that the new rules and regulations were distributed to the Board in ample time for review. She further stated that she had not reviewed the old rules.

Ms. Cameron Pfeiffer-Traylor recommended a compromise which includes adoption of the rules today in order to move forward with the business of the Board, with a caveat that gives the public the ability to send in comments and thoughts concerning the new rules which could be considered for amendment at a later date.

Mr. Cart Blackwell moved to adopt the new rules and regulations with the caveat that within 30 days, staff and counsel will consult to develop a process to allow the public to submit comments regarding the new rules.

The motion was voted on and unanimously passed.

#### **Election of Chair and Vice-Chair**

Ms. Dawson presented an email from Board member Ms. Abby Davis in which Ms. Davis nominated Catarina Echols for the position of Board Chairwoman and Cart Blackwell for the position of Vice-Chair.

Mr. McNair moved to adopt said nominations.

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

#### **Adoption of resolution delegating to Staff approval authority for minor work**

Ms. Echols moved to adopt the resolution delegating to Staff approval authority for minor work.

Mr. Howle seconded the motion and was approved unanimously.

#### **Approval of Minutes from July 5, 2023**

Ms. Echols moved to delay approval of the minutes from the July 5, 2023 meeting, as no one present at the current meeting was present at the July 5<sup>th</sup> meeting to approve the minutes' accuracy. She suggested Board members listen to the recording of the July 5<sup>th</sup> meeting prior to the August 16<sup>th</sup> meeting, whereupon the minutes could be approved.

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

## Approval of Mid-Month COAs granted by Staff

Ms. Echols moved to approve the Mid-Month COAs granted by Staff.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Roselius and approved unanimously.

## MID-MONTH APPROVALS - APPROVED

---

- 1. Applicant:** JACO Capital Investments, LLC  
**Property Address:** 1055 Dauphin Street  
**Date of Approval:** 06/27/2023  
**Project:** Rebuild front porch per submitted plans.
- 2. Applicant:** Shepard Construction  
**Property Address:** 1105 Savannah Street  
**Date of Approval:** 06/28/2023  
**Project:** Termite damage repair: 1) Remove and replace in-kind exterior siding on front dormer. 2) The exterior siding (if removed) will be replaced with in-kind siding and painted to match original color.
- 3. Applicant:** Sign Medics LLC  
**Property Address:** 1500 Government Street  
**Date of Approval:** 06/28/2023 (temporary – expires 7/27/2023)  
**Project:** Install a temporary banner sign to the sign band above the storefront
  - a. The sign will consist of the business logo and the words "Sage Health"
  - b. The logo will measure 29" wide by 43" high (8.7sq ft). The characters will measure 136" wide by 23" high (21.7 sq. ft). The total square footage for all characters will be 30.4 square feet.
- 4. Applicant:** Jerome Hunter  
**Property Address:** 204 S Georgia Street  
**Date of Approval:** 06/29/2023  
**Project:** Repaint exterior of home (all colors Sherwin Williams): siding and trim - Pure White; door - Lotus Flower
- 5. Applicant:** All Weather Roofing and Construction LLC  
**Property Address:** 366 McDonald Avenue  
**Date of Approval:** 06/29/2023  
**Project:** Reroof with shingles. Color: Charcoal
- 6. Applicant:** Thomas Industries LLC  
**Property Address:** 360 Dauphin Street  
**Date of Approval:** 06/29/2023  
**Project:**
  1. Reroof in-kind the rear, flat TPO roof located to the rear and not visible from street or ground level.
  2. Temporarily remove existing rear deck to allow for roof replacement. Replace deck in original location and replace in-kind all rotten or damaged

decking.

- 7. Applicant:** Merceria Ludgood  
**Property Address:** 1058 Savannah Street  
**Date of Approval:** 06/29/2023  
**Project:** Construct a 6' wood privacy fence running the perimeter of the lot along the North, East, and West property lines.
- 8. Applicant:** Professional Roofing and Construction, LLC  
**Property Address:** 1558 Bruister Street  
**Date of Approval:** 07/03/2023  
**Project:** Reroof in-kind with architectural shingles. Color: Cobblestone Grey
- 9. Applicant:** Harvey Cleary  
**Property Address:** 100 Canal Street  
**Date of Approval:** 07/07/2023 (temporary – expires 1/7/2024)  
**Project:** Install temporary construction trailer with black EPDM roof, Smart panel siding, hollow metal doors, and glass windows.
- 10. Applicant:** Sign Medics, LLC  
**Property Address:** 1500 Government Street  
**Date of Approval:** 07/07/2023  
**Project:** Install 18'-7"x3'-2" acrylic backlit wall sign above storefront. "Sage Health"
- 11. Applicant:** Brian Doyle  
**Property Address:** 1752 Hunter Avenue  
**Date of Approval:** 07/10/2023  
**Project:** Replace in-kind approx. 25 linear feet of damaged concrete walkway running in north-south direction between public sidewalk and steps to residence.
- 12. Applicant:** James Harper  
**Property Address:** 201 Rapier Avenue  
**Date of Approval:** 07/10/2023  
**Project:** 1. Repaint exterior to match current colors. 2. Secure, repair, and/or replace in-kind all damaged or loose siding.
- 13. Applicant:** Kathleen Whiteley  
**Property Address:** 300 Rapier Avenue  
**Date of Approval:** 07/10/2023  
**Project:** Reroof in-kind with architectural shingles. Color to match existing.
- 14. Applicant:** Robert Dueitt Construction LLC  
**Property Address:** 104 South Georgia Avenue  
**Date of Approval:** 07/12/2023  
**Project:** In-kind replacement of rotten siding, railing and spindles

- 15. Applicant:** Wrico Signs  
**Property Address:** 2 Water Street  
**Date of Approval:** 07/13/2023  
**Project:** Install a sign at 2 Water Street on the Dauphin Street elevation adjacent to the east side of the entry door opening.  
a. Sign will be a double-faced hanging blade sign which will be mounted with an aluminum cabinet and mounting bracket.  
b. The sign will measure 1.9 wide by 1.6 high for a total of 6.08 square feet.  
c. The sign will read “Davis South Barnette & Practice: Advertising, Digital, Public Relations”. Letters will be non-illuminated white vinyl with orange vinyl ampersand. Background will be gray.
- 16. Applicant:** Liberty Roofing Company Inc.  
**Property Address:** 1402 Blacklawn  
**Date of Approval:** 07/17/2023  
**Project:** Reroof in-kind with Certain Teed architectural shingles. Colonial Slate
- 17. Property Address:** 553 Dauphin Street  
**Date of Approval:** 07/17/2023  
**Project:** Install windows and doors on façade (north elevation) first floor as shown on submitted plans.
- 18. Applicant:** Rashawn Figures  
**Property Address:** 809 Government Street  
**Date of Approval:** 07/17/2023  
**Project:** Construct 48-inch-tall aluminum fence along east property line between 809 and 805 Government Street

## APPLICATIONS

---

### 1. 2023-36-CA

**Address:** 500 Charles Street  
**Historic District:** Oakleigh Garden (local only)  
**Applicant / Agent:** Oakleigh Construction Co. LLC/ Foster Veazey  
**Project:** Fenestration changes on front and rear elevations; window repair; fence installation; repainting  
**APPROVED** - **CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

### 2. 2023-37-CA

**Address:** 280 Chatham Street  
**Historic District:** Oakleigh Garden  
**Applicant / Agent:** Geri Moulton/ Joe Vinson  
**Project:** After-the Fact: omission of columns at screened porch; variation of screening pattern from the approved; variation of door size on east elevation (façade)  
**APPROVED** - **CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

### 3. 2023-38-CA

**Address:** 10 Common Street  
**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way  
**Applicant / Agent:** Don Urquhart  
**Project:** Demolish deteriorated rear additions; construct similarly sized addition; site improvements including privacy fencing, walls, and landscaping

**DEFERRED TO NEXT MEETING AT REQUEST OF APPLICANT**

## OTHER BUSINESS

---

The next ARB meeting is scheduled for August 16, 2023.



# Agenda Item #1

## Application 2023-36-CA

### CERTIFIED RECORD

#### DETAILS

---

**Location:**

500 Charles Street

**Summary of Request:**

Fenestration changes on front and rear elevations; window repair; fence installation; driveway installation

**Applicant (as applicable):**

Foster Veazey/Oakleigh Construction, LLC

**Property Owner:**

Same

**Staff Reviewer:**

Annie Allen

**Historic District:**

Oakleigh Garden (local only)

**Classification:**

Contributing

**Summary of Analysis:**

- The application under review proposes the removal of two original door openings which contribute to the character and historic function of the structure.
- The removal of one existing window on the southern end of the rear façade would minimally impact the visual character of the building.
- The windows proposed to replace the door openings would match those existing in size and lite configuration.
- The proposed removal, repair and replacement of two existing windows on the north elevation are alterations which have been approved on the Staff level.
- The 6'-0" privacy fence and new concrete driveway comply with *Guidelines* in regard to placement, size and materials.

**Report Contents:**

Property and Application History ..... 2

Scope of Work..... 2

Applicable Standards ..... 2

Staff Analysis..... 4

Attachments ..... 5

## 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 19<sup>th</sup>- and 20<sup>th</sup>-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 property at 500 Charles Street is represented as a vacant corner lot on the 1878 Hopkins Map. The existing wood-frame cottage type dwelling is extant on the lot by the time of the 1904 Sanborn Map. According to MHDC records, the dwelling was constructed c. 1895. The single pile structure is rectangular in shape and sits on the lot in such a way that the long axis sits parallel to Charles Street. The façade consists of three original entry doors and one window. Documentary evidence shows that the pair of doors on the northern side of the elevation were historically covered by a single porch which spanned the width of the doors, and the third door to the south was sheltered by a second smaller porch. At some point between 1955 and 1980, these porches were replaced with a single porch spanning the length of all three door openings. Between 2014 and 2020, the house underwent repairs, during which time shutters were added to the windows.

MHDC records show that this property has never before appeared before the Architectural Review Board.

## SCOPE OF WORK

---

1. Remove two original outer entry doorways on the east façade of the house and replace with windows.
  - a. Door openings would be replaced with aluminum clad two-over-two windows to match existing windows in size and lite configuration.
2. Remove one original window located on the south end of the west elevation; close the resulting opening with wood siding to match the existing.
3. Remove, repair and reset two windows on the north elevation.
4. Install a 6'-0" privacy fence and gate.
  - a. The privacy fence would extend from the northwest corner of the structure and run westward for 9'-0". It would then run south along the west property line for 72'-0"; would run east to west for 29'-0" along the southern property line; and north to south for 26'-0" along the east property line, abutting the southeast corner of the house behind the front plane. A 10'-0" wide double gate would be installed on the east property line portion, across the driveway to the south of the dwelling.
5. Install a concrete driveway on the south end of the lot which would extend west from the existing curb cut on Charles Street.

## 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. 5.14 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 sidelights.
    - Maintain the original position and proportions of a historically significant door.
  3. 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.
4. 10.7 Minimize the visual impact of parking.
    - Locate a parking area at the rear or to the side of a site whenever possible.
    - Use landscaping to screen a parking area.
    - Minimize the widths of a paved area or a curb cut.
    - If a curb cut is no longer in use, repair the curb. In some areas, granite curbs may be required.
    - Do not use paving in the front yard for a parking area. Paving stones might be acceptable in certain instances.
    - Do not create a new driveway or garage that opens onto a primary street.

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

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

## STAFF ANALYSIS

---

The subject property is a contributing resource within the locally designated portion of the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. The application under review includes the proposed removal of two of three original entry door openings on the east-facing elevation, to be replaced with aluminum clad windows; the removal of an existing window on the rear of the house; the construction a 6'-0" privacy fence on the property; and installation of a new concrete driveway.

The *Guidelines* direct that significant historic façades and their elements be maintained in their original form and that original doors and openings be retained in their original position. (A. 1,2) The three (3) entry doors on the façade of the dwelling are original openings. Documentary evidence shows that the pair of doors on the northern side of the elevation were historically covered by a single porch which spanned the width of the doors, and the third door to the south was sheltered by a second smaller porch. At a later date these porches were replaced with a single porch spanning the length of all three door openings. This type of wood-framed, shallow and long structure with multiple entry doors and windows distributed in varying patterns across an elongated façade is a form which was commonly used for tenant housing in Mobile. There are few existing examples which date as early as the subject structure, as many are either no longer extant or have been altered. 206-216 Cuba Street, 1250 State Street, and 1202 Chinquapin Street are existing representations of the form. Another variation is the servants quarters building at Oakleigh, which had originally been built as military barracks for Union soldiers after the Civil War and was moved to its current location in the early twentieth century. All of these examples replicate a fenestration pattern similar to the one expressed at 500 Charles. Variations on this form were replicated throughout the years and can still be seen in Mobile, employing different materials such as brick and cinder block. The ratio of doors to windows on the façade is a character-defining feature of this structure type. The proposed removal of the two doors and replacement with windows would disrupt the historic façade of the dwelling. The proposed removal of the window on the rear (west) elevation is a minor fenestration change which would have minimal impact on the character of the structure.

The proposed 6'-0" wood privacy fence would be compatible with the architectural style of the house and with existing fences within the district. Its proposed placement (behind the front plane of the building) and height falls within the perimeters set out in the *Guidelines*. Likewise, the new concrete driveway would direct parking to a less visible location from the street as directed by the *Guidelines* (A.3, 4).

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Mr. Foster Veazey from Oakleigh Construction, LLC was present to discuss the application. He stated the biggest item of contention of this application is the deletion of the northernmost and southernmost doors on the façade. He added that many of the similar houses which were mentioned by Ms. Allen were designed for multiple occupancy, whereas the home at 500 Charles is a one bedroom, one bath single occupancy dwelling of approximately 1000 square feet. As such, the proposed project wishes to delete the two identified doors and replace them with two-over-two windows similar in design to the existing historic windows to retain the existing fenestration pattern.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Mr. McNair asked Staff is there is any reason to believe that the existing doors are original.

Ms. Allen replied that the door openings are original but the doors are not.

Mr. Veazey added that they are not original and one is actually a fiberglass door, and the southernmost door is closed off and non-functional.

Mr. McNair asked, that with the intent of the proposed new windows being to provide more natural light, if the

applicant had considered installing fixed doors with partial glazing into the original openings.

Mr. Veazey replied that he had not considered that as of yet, but it is an option. He added that the purpose of Oakleigh Construction is restoration and therefore, whether the openings on the façade are replaced with the proposed two-over-two windows or not, the doors will be replaced with something in some fashion that fits the time period.

Mr. McNair asked the applicant to provide the purpose for the removal of the rear window.

Mr. Veazey replied that the intent is to allow for a more functional galley kitchen.

Mr. McNair asked if it would disrupt the intended interior construction if fixed shutters were installed at the rear window opening, surrounded by siding, so that it reads as a historic window.

Mr. Veazey replied that this proposal would not disrupt the interior construction.

Ms. Pfeiffer- asked Staff if, considering the former multi-tenant nature of this form of structure, if there was any significant relationship between the placement of the front doors and the rear windows and the multi-tenant function of the structure, especially as it pertains to airflow, etc.

Ms. Allen responded that this type of fenestration relationship in a multi-tenant structure makes sense, but more research would have to be completed to confirm one. She noted that many times the ARB prioritizes the façade over rear elevation elements in order to find a negotiation with modern day living needs and retaining the historic integrity of a property.

Ms. Pfeiffer Tayler asked Mr. Veazey if he would be amenable to installing fixed doors with transoms on the façade.

Mr. Veazey replied that the preference from an aesthetic look, in regard to natural light, and cost sampling, would be to install two-over-two windows but is also willing to compromise and use doors.

Mr. McNair commented on the reason for the Board's suggestions, stating that the subject property is a contributing resource for the National Register district and when original openings are changed or compromised, the integrity of the structure and district can be threatened.

## **FINDING FACTS**

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

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

## **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Mr. Blackwell moved to approve the fence and driveway as proposed in the application and to amend the application to include installing an option of fixed doors with partial glazing and transoms on the façade, and installing fixed shutters in the place of the rear window, to be discussed with Staff to maintain compliance with the *Guidelines*.

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



# Agenda Item #2

## Application 2023-37-CA

### CERTIFIED RECORD

#### DETAILS

---

**Location:**

280 Chatham Street

**Summary of Request:**

After-the-Fact Approval: omission of columns at screened porch; variation of the screening material and pattern from the approved; variation of door size on east elevation (façade); omission of limestone door and window headers

**Applicant (as applicable):**

Geri Moulton

**Property Owner:**

Same

**Staff Reviewer:**

C. Dawson

**Historic District:**

Oakleigh Garden

**Classification:**

Non-Contributing

**Summary of Analysis:**

- The application under review seeks after-the-fact approval for the omission of porch columns, a variation in porch screening material and pattern, installation of smaller than specified doors, and omission of limestone door and window headers, as approved by the ARB in 2017.
- The variations and omissions in question are not in contravention to the *Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts*.

**Report Contents:**

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

## PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

---

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 19<sup>th</sup>- and 20<sup>th</sup>-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 subject property, 280 Chatham Street, was constructed in 2022. The block on which it sits originally was home to a single house, the one currently located to the immediate north of the subject house at 250 Chatham Street. That 1867 residence sat in the approximate center of the block until the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, when it was moved to its current location at the southwest corner of Chatham and Palmetto streets to allow for the development of the western edges of the block.

MHDC records show that this property has appeared twice previously before the ARB. The application proposing construction of the subject house initially appeared in July 2017 and was tabled for clarifications. Upon its second appearance in August 2017, the application was approved.

## SCOPE OF WORK

---

1. Maintain the existing, as-built conditions.
  - a. omission of Tuscan columns at north and south ends of east-facing screened porch
  - b. horizontally oriented screening pattern at porch
  - c. shorter than specified doors on eastern elevation (façade)
  - d. omission of limestone lintels above windows and doors
  - e. dark-colored porch screening (rather than approved copper screening)
2. Paint door headers (the wall between the doors and flat panel areas) in the south-center bay and door headers (area between the doors and transoms) in the center bay the same color as the doors and their trim to emulate taller doors.

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

---

1. New designs should relate to the fundamental characteristics of the historic houses on a block while also conveying the stylistic trends of today. (6.0)
2. ...contemporary design is encouraged, but not required, by the Architectural Review Board provided it is compatible with the historic district. The Architectural Review Board will pay particular attention to mass, scale, siting, and overall design, but all elements will be considered. (6.0)
3. New residential construction should be compatible with adjacent historic buildings in scale, massing, materials, color, and overall design. Elements of compatibility include siting, orientation, spacing, landscaping, and distance among adjacent buildings. A successful compatible design will also consider the distinctive architectural character of the street, the neighborhood, and the district. (6.0)
4. Design exterior building walls to reflect traditional development patterns of nearby historic buildings.
  - Use a ratio of solid to void that is similar in proportion to those of nearby historic buildings.
  - Reflect the rhythm of windows and doors in a similar fashion on all exterior building walls. The ARB will consider all building walls; however, building walls facing streets may face increased scrutiny. (6.38)
5. Design a door and doorway on new construction to be compatible with the historic district.

- Place and size a door to establish a solid-to-void ratio similar to that of nearby historic buildings.
  - Place and size a special feature, including a transom, sidelight, or decorative framing element, to complement those seen in nearby historic buildings. (6.41)
6. Design a porch to be compatible with the neighborhood.
- When designing a porch, consider porch location, proportion, rhythm, roof form, supports, steps, balustrades, and ornamentation relative to the main building and porches in the district.
  - Design the elements of a porch to be at a scale proportional to the main building. (6.42)
7. Locate and design windows to be compatible with those in the district.
- Use a traditional window casement and trim similar to those seen in nearby historic buildings. (6.45)

## STAFF ANALYSIS

---

This application proposes maintaining the as-built conditions of the new-construction house at 250 Chatham Street. These conditions include the omission of columns at the outer edges of the screened porch, the horizontally oriented screening pattern of the porch, 8' tall doors in the south-central and central bays of the east elevation (façade), and the omission of limestone headers over the south-central doors on the east elevation and over windows on the north, south, and west elevations. These treatments vary from the design approved by the Architectural Review Board in August 2017.

The scope of work approved at that time for the façade stated, “Unarticulated ante and Tuscan columns will define the porch.” The *Guidelines* recommend that porches in new construction be compatible with the neighborhood and that ornamentation should be considered “relative to the main building and porches in the district.” (A.6) The columns described in the 2017 scope of work and shown on the approved plans were compatible with the main building, but they were not discussed in either of the ARB meetings at which the application was considered or entertained in the staff reports as an integral element of the proposed design. Therefore, the columns initially proposed for the screened porch are neither required by the *Guidelines*, nor have they been considered an element of the design required for the house to be compatible with the surrounding district. (A.2, 3)

The *Guidelines* do not offer guidance regarding the screening of porches in new construction. The written scope of work for this project states only, “Copper framed and colored porch screening will be situated within the porch bay,” though the approved elevation shows five vertical screening panels on the porch’s east elevation. Chapter 6 instructs that existing historic porches should not be screened in a way that does not damage any historic elements (“If a porch is to be screened, do so in a manner that preserves the existing porch elements and does not damage them.” 6.4), but there is no mention of designs or materials suitable for new construction. Furthermore, the screen design and material were not discussed in the staff report or meeting minutes where the new construction application was on the ARB’s agenda. Therefore, while the vertically oriented, copper-colored screening initially proposed by the applicant and approved by the ARB would subjectively be more aesthetically pleasing than the extant, horizontally oriented, dark-colored screening, the as-built screening is not incompatible with the *Guidelines*.

Neither the scope of work nor the submitted plans approved for this property in 2017 noted the height of the proposed doors at the south-central and central bays of the house. A comparison of the extant house and the approved drawings makes evident that the extant doors are shorter than those actually installed. Consultation with the owner and her contractor revealed that, while 10'-tall doors initially were intended for these openings, 8'-tall doors were installed. As a result, the wall areas above the doors in both portions of the façade were treated with blank panels. The design intent of graceful walls of light composed of tall glass doors and transoms was not achieved as proposed. The *Guidelines* state, “Use a ratio of solid to void that is similar in proportion to those of nearby historic buildings.” (A.4) The *Guidelines* further advise, “Place and size a door to establish a solid-to-void ratio similar to that of nearby historic buildings. Place and size a special feature, including a transom, sidelight, or

decorative framing element, to complement those seen in nearby historic buildings.” (A.5) The extant doors and windows have been placed as approved by the ARB, and the solid-to-void ratio of the subject building is compatible with surrounding historic structures. While the height of the doors in two areas of the façade is smaller than was approved due to supply chain issues during construction, the applicant has proposed to mitigate the issue by painting the wall between the doors and flat panel areas in the south-central bay and between the doors and transoms in the center bay the same color as the doors and their trim to emulate taller doors. Whether the mitigation is implemented or not, the existing condition is not in contravention to the *Guidelines*.

In regard to the seven sets of French doors on the east elevation, the scope of work approved in 2017 states, “Limestone lintels will surmount the two doorways on the southernmost end.” The approved scope of work further states that the bank of three six-light windows on the south elevation, two pairs of eight-light windows at the west end of the north elevation would have limestone lintels. No limestone lintels are extant. The *Guidelines* advise that window trim should be similar to that seen in nearby historic buildings. (A.7) There are no nearby buildings exhibiting limestone lintels. Furthermore, the height of the lintels on the approved plans far exceeds the height of lintels on nearby properties. Therefore, the height of the approved lintels reflects the style of the new-construction house, but they are not in keeping with nearby historic properties. However, the existing stuccoed window and door headers approximate the approved limestone lintels. Although the material is not what was approved, the design intent is demonstrated in a manner that is inoffensive to the surrounding district.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Ms. Geri Moulton and Mr. Joe Vinson were present to discuss the application. Ms. Moulton stated that there was no intent to violate the previously approved design.

Mr. Joe Vinson stated that the doors that were on the original drawings were 10 foot doors with windows above. The room inside is not tall enough to fit this design. He added that he does not think painting is needed.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Ms. Echols stated that the anomalies that are extant at the property are not in violation of the *Guidelines*.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor asked if the proposal to paint the lintels is intended to emulate taller doors. She stated a concern that the proposed painting may add to the void with the dark color.

Ms. Dawson stated that Staff consulted with the designer to discuss a mitigation of this issue and collectively came the conclusion that painting the lintels would give the impression of a taller doors rather than a more intense void.

Ms. Roselius asked Staff if painting the doors is meant to emulate the height of the originally proposed doors or to match other elements on the elevation.

Ms. Dawson stated that there is not sufficient area to bring the height up to the originally proposed doors, therefore the intent is to elongate.

Ms. Roselius stated her opinion that, as constructed, the elevation embraces the integrity of the contemporary architecture.

Ms. Echols agreed with Ms. Roselius that painting the lintels was not necessary but that it was up to the applicant, as it would comply with the *Guidelines*.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor mentioned the upkeep that would be involved with painting the stucco lintel and reiterated that the choice to paint would be up the applicant’s preference.

**FINDING FACTS**

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

Mr. Blackwell 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 subject property or the district and should be granted a Certificate of Appropriateness.

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

Mr. McGowin requested that the Board go into executive session to discuss a matter of impending or presumed impending litigation. The Board unanimously agreed to go into executive session upon the departure of the public from the meeting room.

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:12.

*These minutes were approved by the Architectural Review Board on August 16, 2023.*



