



# Architectural Review Board Minutes

April 17, 2024 – 3:00 P.M.

## ADMINISTRATIVE

---

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

### 1. Roll Call

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

**Members Present:** Cartledge Blackwell, Abby Davis, Catarina Echols, Jennifer Roselius, and Barja Wilson

**Members Absent:** Stephen Howle, Karrie Maurin, Stephen McNair, and Cameron Pfeiffer-Traylor

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

### 2. Approval of Minutes from March 20, 2024

Ms. Roselius moved to approve the minutes from the March 20, 2024 meeting.

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

### 3. Approval of Mid-Month COAs granted by Staff

Mr. Blackwell moved to approve the mid-month COAs granted by Staff.

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

## MID-MONTH APPROVALS - APPROVED

---

- Applicant:** American Roofing and Contracting LLC  
**Property Address:** 1757 Government Street  
**Issue Date:** 02/26/2024  
**Project:** Re-install the same roof tiles over ice and water shield.
- Applicant:** Robert Dueitt Construction LLC  
**Property Address:** 1109 Oak Street  
**Issue Date:** 02/27/2024  
**Project:**
  1. Replace rotten siding with in-kind material.
  2. In-kind repair to windows where needed.
  3. Repaint exterior.
- Applicant:** Raheem Mikal  
**Property Address:** 508 Aurelia Street  
**Issue Date:** 02/28/2024

- Project:**
1. Repair windows where needed with in-kind materials (wood and glass).
  2. Repair siding where needed to match existing (wood horizontal or vertical where needed).
  3. Repair porch structure with in-kind materials (wood).
  4. Reroof structure with shingles. color: black.
  5. Repaint the exterior with appropriate color.
4. **Applicant:** Guy Brothers Roofing Inc.  
**Property Address:** 1576 Dauphin Street  
**Issue Date:** 02/29/2024  
**Project:** Remove existing asbestos tile roofing. Reroof with shingles.
5. **Applicant:** Sign Medics LLC  
**Property Address:** 1500 Government Street  
**Issue Date:** 02/29/2024  
**Project:** Install an approximate 16 square feet wall sign on the south facing façade of the building. The proposed logo sign will be backlit by white LED. The sign will be the company’s sage leaf logo.
6. **Applicant:** Kelly Properties  
**Property Address:** 211 S. Cedar Street  
**Issue Date:** 03/01/2024  
**Project:**
1. Repaint exterior of structure in the same or owner will choose a color from Mobile Paint's historic collection, or an appropriate alternative.
  2. Repair rotten cornice where needed with matching materials
  3. In-kind repair to stucco where needed.
7. **Applicant:** Central Services LLC  
**Property Address:** 150 S. Dearborn Street  
**Issue Date:** 03/04/2024  
**Project:**
1. Repair siding where needed with materials to match existing.
  2. Repaint exterior. Siding: SW Ellie Gray; Trim - SW Mount Etna
8. **Applicant:** Howard Lamar Elliott d/b/a Howard Lamar  
**Property Address:** 205 Church Street  
**Issue Date:** 03/04/2024  
**Project:** Reroof in-kind with shingles. Color: Weathered Grey
9. **Applicant:** Fortified Exteriors LLC  
**Property Address:** 1410 Old Shell Road  
**Issue Date:** 03/04/2024  
**Project:** Reroof in-kind with shingles. Color: Colonial Slate
10. **Applicant:** Kimberly Williams  
**Property Address:** 1562 Monroe Street  
**Issue Date:** 03/05/2024  
**Project:**
1. Repaint exterior of house: Body – Grey; Trim and porch deck - white
  2. Replace rotten wood on rear elevation where needed with wood to match existing.
11. **Applicant:** Bienville Construction Services LLC  
**Property Address:** 106 S. Broad Street  
**Issue Date:** 03/05/2024  
**Project:**
1. Remove existing, non-historic porte-cochere on north elevation.
  2. Remove T1-11 infill at porte-cochere location. Replace powder-coated metal roll-up door (previously existing).
  3. Install an 8’ wooden privacy fence along north property line and in line

with rear (west) elevation of the building.

- 12. Applicant:** Steven Warren  
**Property Address:** 857 Elmira Street  
**Issue Date:** 03/05/2024  
**Project:**  
1. Repaint exterior. Color: Cream  
2. Reroof in-kind with shingles. Color: Black  
3. Replace rotten and damaged siding where needed with matching materials.
- 13. Applicant:** Oakleigh Construction, LLC  
**Property Address:** 103 N. Hallett Street  
**Issue Date:** 03/07/2024  
**Project:** Repaint exterior using the following BLP Mobile Paints colors: Body - DeTonti Square Off White; Trim- St. Anthony Street Grey
- 14. Applicant:** Bowen Realty, Inc.  
**Property Address:** 1702 Dauphin Street  
**Issue Date:** 03/07/2024  
**Project:** Install a free-standing 4'x3' double-faced sign in front of the structure.  
a. Sign will be of 3 MM Di bond and will mount between two wooden posts.  
b. Sign will include the company logo and will read "Bowen Realty, Inc., 1702".
- 15. Applicant:** Sandy McQueen  
**Property Address:** 350 Rapier Street  
**Issue Date:** 03/07/2024  
**Project:** Repairs and replacements to front porch using in-kind materials: replacement of the porch decking, replacement of the columns, repair of existing wood windows in-kind on north elevation and east façade, replacement of two doors on the façade to fit existing door openings (replacement door will be approved by Staff prior to installation), and reroofing the rear addition with shingles in black color.
- 16. Applicant:** Fortified Exteriors LLC  
**Property Address:** 1255 Texas Street  
**Issue Date:** 03/08/2024  
**Project:** Reroof in-kind with shingles. Color: Moire Black
- 17. Applicant:** Made You Look Properties, LLC  
**Property Address:** 502 George Street  
**Issue Date:** 03/11/2024  
**Project:**  
1. Replace siding to match existing material, design, and profile on all elevations where needed.  
2. Repaint to match existing or an approvable and appropriate color.
- 18. Applicant:** Trinity Lambeth  
**Property Address:** 15 S. Lafayette Street  
**Issue Date:** 03/11/2024  
**Project:**  
1. Replace in-kind fire-damaged siding on façade.  
2. Repaint to match existing where needed.
- 19. Applicant:** Coastal Pools  
**Property Address:** 57 S. Catherine Street  
**Issue Date:** 03/13/2024  
**Project:** Construct an L-shaped in-ground pool with concrete deck surround. The pool will measure 36' wide by 8' deep (with the 12' wide "L" portion on the south end) extending to 10' deep.

- 20. Applicant:** Taylor Made Services Roofing Inc.  
**Property Address:** 1578 Dauphin Street  
**Issue Date:** 03/13/2024  
**Project:** Reroof in-kind with shingles. Color: Silver Burch
- 21. Applicant:** Chad E. Foster  
**Property Address:** 13 S. Monterey Street  
**Issue Date:** 03/13/2024  
**Project:** Reroof in-kind with shingles. Color: Charcoal
- 22. Applicant:** Hand Quality Roofs LLC  
**Property Address:** 1054 Augusta Street  
**Issue Date:** 03/14/2024  
**Project:** Reroof in-kind with shingles. Color: Charcoal
- 23. Applicant:** JACO Capital Investments, LLC  
**Property Address:** 1055 Dauphin Street  
**Issue Date:** 03/14/2024  
**Project:**
  1. Replace all siding on side and rear elevations (east, west, and south) with matching material (due to deteriorated condition of existing wood lap siding). Tongue and groove siding on façade will not be removed.
  2. Repaint exterior in approved color.
- 24. Applicant:** Jerry Arnold  
**Property Address:** 558 Conti Street  
**Issue Date:** 03/14/2024  
**Project:**
  1. Repair concrete surround at existing door opening on metal garage building.
  2. Replace the existing garage door and louvered panels with one paneled metal garage door to fit existing opening.
  3. Door will be white to match existing.
- 25. Applicant:** Fortified Exteriors LLC  
**Property Address:** 15 Macy Place  
**Issue Date:** 03/15/2024  
**Project:** Reroof in-kind with shingles. Color: Cobblestone Gray
- 26. Applicant:** American Roofing and Construction LLC  
**Property Address:** 1004 Palmetto Street  
**Issue Date:** 03/15/2024  
**Project:** Reroof in-kind with shingles. Color: light gray
- 27. Applicant:** Robert Dueitt Construction, LLC  
**Property Address:** 260 N. Joachim Street  
**Issue Date:** 03/18/2024  
**Project:**
  1. Repair siding in-kind where needed.
  2. Replace rotten decking on porches with materials to match existing ones.
  3. Repaint to match existing where needed after repairs.
- 28. Applicant:** All Weather Roofing and Construction LLC  
**Property Address:** 121 N. Julia Street  
**Issue Date:** 03/18/2024  
**Project:** Reroof in-kind with shingles. Color: Weathered wood
- 29. Applicant:** Better Built Homes  
**Property Address:** 154 S. Monterey Street  
**Issue Date:** 03/19/2024

- Project:** Replace the existing driveway, located on the south end of the property, with a new concrete driveway measuring 10'-0" wide and 115'-0" long, following the footprint of the existing driveway.
- 30. Applicant:** The City of Mobile Architecture & Engineering Department  
**Property Address:** 401 Civic Center Drive  
**Issue Date:** 03/20/2024  
**Project:** Remove failing brick veneer from south elevation of theater building to prevent collapse and ameliorate public safety hazard.
- 31. Applicant:** Fortified Exteriors LLC  
**Property Address:** 1207 Government Street  
**Issue Date:** 03/21/2024  
**Project:** Reroof in-kind with shingles. Color: Driftwood
- 32. Applicant:** Pigeons on the Roof LLC  
**Property Address:** 1103 Montauk Avenue  
**Issue Date:** 03/22/2024  
**Project:** Reroof in-kind with shingles. Color: weathered wood.
- 33. Applicant:** James Wagoner  
**Property Address:** 1805 Government Street  
**Issue Date:** 03/26/2024  
**Project:**
  1. Repair and replace rotten siding with matching materials where needed.
  2. Repair and replace rotten front porch decking with matching materials.
  3. Repaint exterior of house to match existing.
  4. Reroof house with shingles. Color: Black
- 34. Applicant:** Presley Roofing and Construction, Inc.  
**Property Address:** 964 Church Street  
**Issue Date:** 03/27/2024  
**Project:** Reroof in-kind with shingles. Color: Olde English Pewter
- 35. Applicant:** Robert Dueitt Construction, LLC  
**Property Address:** 502 George Street  
**Issue Date:** 03/28/2024  
**Project:**
  1. Repair and repaint exterior siding in kind where needed.
  2. Repair and repaint wood windows in kind where needed.
- 36. Applicant:** All Weather Roofing and Construction, LLC  
**Property Address:** 275 Park Terrace  
**Issue Date:** 03/28/2024  
**Project:** Reroof in-kind with shingles. Color: Weathered wood
- 37. Applicant:** Alliance Roofing, LLC  
**Property Address:** 1319 Dauphin Street  
**Issue Date:** 04/02/2024  
**Project:** Reroof in-kind with shingles. Color: Pewter Gray
- 38. Applicant:** Lowes Home Center, LLC  
**Property Address:** 1404 Old Shell Road  
**Issue Date:** 04/02/2024  
**Project:**
  1. Remove aluminum six-over-six window located on the second floor of the rear elevation.
  2. Replace the existing window with aluminum-clad wood, double hung three-over-one window to fit the existing opening.
The new window will measure 3'1 1/2 " wide by 4' 3 1/2" high.

- 39. **Applicant:** Hand Quality Roofs, LLC  
**Property Address:** 17 Oakland Terrace  
**Issue Date:** 04/03/2024  
**Project:** Reroof in-kind with shingles. Color: Charcoal
- 40. **Applicant:** Franchise Management Services, Inc.  
**Property Address:** 1560 Monroe Street  
**Issue Date:** 04/04/2024  
**Project:** Reroof in-kind with shingles. Color: Charcoal

## APPLICATIONS

---

### 1. 2024-13-CA

**Address:** 30 Hannon Avenue  
**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way  
**Applicant / Agent:** Cozart Construction on behalf of Hannah Wagner  
**Project:** After-the-Fact Approval: Reframe rear addition, fenestration changes, and install drop siding.

**TABLED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

### 2. 2024-14-CA

**Address:** 407 Church Street  
**Historic District:** Church Street East  
**Applicant / Agent:** Bay Town Builders, LLC on behalf of Virginia Snider  
**Project:** Replace five (5) pairs of shutters with shutters made of synthetic material

**APPROVED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

### ~~3. 2024-15-CA~~ **WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT**

~~**Address:** 12 N. Lafayette Street  
**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way  
**Applicant / Agent:** Dortch Figures & Sons, Inc. on behalf of McGill-Toolen Catholic High School  
**Project:** Demolish two-story frame single-family residence~~

### 4. 2024-16-CA

**Address:** 1055 Dauphin Street  
**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way  
**Applicant / Agent:** JACO Capital Investments, LLC  
**Project:** Add side entrance and porch

**APPROVED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

## OTHER BUSINESS

---

The next ARB meeting is scheduled for May 1, 2024.



# Agenda Item #1

## Certified Record 2024-13-CA

### DETAILS

---

**Location:**

30 Hannon Avenue

**Summary of Request:**

After-the-Fact Approval: Reframe rear addition, fenestration changes, and install drop siding.

**Applicant (as applicable):**

Nicholas Cozart of Cozart Construction

**Property Owner:**

Hannah Wagner

**Historic District:**

Old Dauphin Way

**Classification:**

Contributing

**Summary of Analysis:**

- The replacement of siding was done in accordance with the design guidelines.
- The condition of the removed windows and doors is unknown, as the work was performed without an issued COA.
- The altered fenestration patterns on north and south elevations are considered minor and, thus, could have been approved on an administrative level.
- Replacement doors and windows are vinyl, with the exception of the new transom window on the south elevation.
- Vinyl is considered an unacceptable window and door material for Mobile’s historic districts.

**Report Contents:**

Property and Application History ..... 2

Scope of Work ..... 2

Applicable Standards ..... 3

Staff Analysis ..... 4

Attachments ..... 6

## 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 20<sup>th</sup>-century apartments.”

The property at 30 Hannon Avenue is a frame one-story Craftsman style bungalow with a gable roof which encompasses a full-width front porch supported by boxed columns sitting on a brick knee wall. The dwelling consists of an original rectangular block and a long narrow off-set addition which projects from the south end of the rear elevation. According to Historic Development records, the main block was constructed c. 1920. The addition appears to have been a separate dwelling that was moved to the property. The bungalow with the rear addition is represented on the 1956 Sanborn map and in a 1952 aerial photo. The addition is not present on the 1925 Sanborn map overlay. Therefore, the rear addition was either constructed or moved to this location between 1925 and 1952.

This property has appeared before the Architectural Review Board (ARB) once. In May 2016, a COA was granted to replace a shingle roof with a standing seam metal roof.

## SCOPE OF WORK

---

*All work pertains to the historic addition which projects from the rear of the original block of the house.*

1. Remove and replace siding on all elevations with 6” wood siding.
2. Fenestration changes

### South Elevation

- a. Remove all windows on the south elevation (five windows) and replace with one four-light transom wood window measuring 40” wide by 12” high, located on the east end of the elevation.
- b. Prior to removal, the fenestration on the south elevation was as follows (from east to west):  
Small six-over-one window, a pair of six-over-one windows, a pair of six-over-one windows.

### North Elevation

- a. Remove all fenestration on north elevation and replace with new vinyl fenestration.
- b. The fenestration pattern on the north elevation that existed prior to the alterations under review is unknown.
- c. The current fenestration is as follows:  
One 1’-6” wide by 5’-0” high one-over-one window; one 1’-6” wide by 5’-0” high one-over-one window; one 2’-0” wide by 3’-0” high one-over-one window; one 6’-0” high sliding glass door.

### West Elevation

- a. Install one one-over-one window, centered on west elevation.
- b. The fenestration that existed prior to this installation is unknown.

### East Elevation

- a. Remove entry door and replace with a new vinyl door to fit existing 2’-0” wide by 8’-0” high door opening.

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

---

1. **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
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 comes
- » Metal with a painted finish
- » Other materials original to the building

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

These often include:

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

3. **5.20** Preserve the functional historic and decorative features of a historic window.
  - Where historic (wooden or metal) windows are intact and in repairable condition, retain and repair them to match the existing as per location, light configuration, detail and material.
  - Preserve historic window features, including the frame, sash, muntins, mullions, glazing, sills, heads, jambs, moldings, operation, and groupings of windows.
  - Repair, rather than replace, frames and sashes, wherever possible.
  - For repair of window components, epoxies and related products may serve as effective solutions to material deterioration and operational malfunction.
4. **5.21** When historic windows are not in a repairable condition, match the replacement window design to the original.
  - In instances where there is a request to replace a building's windows, the new windows shall match the existing as per location, framing, and light configuration.
  - Use any salvageable window components on a primary elevation.
3. **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 double-paned or clad wood window may be considered as a replacement alternative only if the replacement matches the configuration, dimensions, and profiles of the original windows.

#### 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

---

30 Hannon Avenue is a contributing resource within the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The application under review seeks after-the-fact approval for siding replacement and various fenestration alterations to a rear addition.

In December 2023, the Historic Development office received a COA application for exterior work at the subject property. The scope of work read, "Replace existing siding with dutch lap; fenestration changes, and rejoin foundation block work." Staff attempted to contact the applicant to obtain more detailed information in order to review the application and also visited the property to obtain photos for the Staff report. The site visit revealed that work had already been executed, including re-siding and the removal of all previously extant fenestration on the rear addition. Staff proceeded to contact the city's permitting department as the unpermitted work also included electrical and mechanical. In January 2024, the following inspections failed: electrical, plumbing, and mechanical. Stop Work Orders and Notices of Violation were issued to the homeowner and placed at the property. In February, the workflow notes that subsequent plumbing and electrical inspections failed, and additional Stop Work Orders and Notices of Violations were issued. The failed electrical inspection details that work at the property had stopped, but permits were still needed. In February 21<sup>st</sup>, the applicant resubmitted an application for a COA to the Historic Development office with plans.

The new 6" replacement wood siding that was installed on the rear addition follows the *Guidelines'* call for replacement materials on non-primary elevations to match the original material in composition, scale, and finish. (5.7)

According to the *Guidelines*, replacement doors should align with the historic character of the building. Although a divided light or panel door would arguably be a more appropriate style, the single light replacement door on the east elevation of the addition (see Photo 3) is not located on a primary façade and somewhat echoes the prairie style divided light entry door on the main façade. However, vinyl is not listed as an acceptable material for historic buildings. Further, the sliding glass door on the north elevation is not compatible with the historic character of the property or district. (5.15)

The *Guidelines* state that intact historic windows should be retained and repaired, preserving elements such as light configuration, frames, sashes, muntins, etc. In cases where windows are not repairable, new windows should match the existing as per location, framing, and light configuration. Due to the fenestration changes having been completed prior to obtaining a COA, no window survey was completed. According to the applicant, the original windows are no longer extant. Therefore, their condition at the time of removal is unknown. The replacement windows do not comply with the *Guidelines'* directive to match the existing location, framing, and light

configuration of the original windows. The removal of all windows on the south elevation, leaving a blank side wall with one small, high-wall window in the east corner is not an appropriate alteration. The removal of a traditional fenestration pattern and the established solid-to-void ratio creates an unsuitable contemporary expression on a historic elevation. Likewise, the north elevation, though less visible from the street, has been inappropriately rehabilitated using a contemporary fenestration arrangement such as the pairing of narrow one-over-one windows and the installation of a horizontal sliding glass door. In addition, vinyl is not an approved material for Mobile's historic districts. (5.20-5.22)

## PUBLIC TESTIMONY

---

Mr. Nicholas Cozart was present to discuss the application. He offered context to project at 30 Hannon, stating that the rear addition was previously in poor shape and that the framing had been repaired and siding replaced with matching Dutch lap siding. He stated that the new style windows were a request by the owner, adding that the previous windows contained rot as did the foundation and roof.

No members of the public were present to comment on the application, and no written comments were received.

## BOARD DISCUSSION

---

Ms. Davis stated that in her opinion, the main issue is the fenestration changes. She explained that the rear building now has the appearance of a storage shed because the fenestration choices have changed the character of the building.

Mr. Cozart clarified that the lack of fenestration on the south elevation was client preference.

Ms. Davis explained that the current fenestration does not meet the *Guidelines*.

Mr. Cozart asked for a solution.

Ms. Davis offered the solution of installing windows that echo the original back onto the elevation.

Mr. Blackwell agreed with Ms. Davis, suggesting that blind windows or blank shutters along the side elevation may be an additional alternative.

Ms. Roselius asked Mr. Cozart if he had any documentation or photos of the described rot on the previous windows and doors.

Mr. Cozart responded that he did not.

Ms. Roselius advised that for future reference, documentation and necessary permits are required prior to beginning work, further suggesting that Mr. Cozart refer to the *Design Review Guidelines* regarding windows.

Ms. Davis suggested installing something that is larger on the south elevation and more in keeping with what is on the house and attempting a rhythm of fenestration across the elevation.

Mr. Cozart stated that he would talk to his client.

Ms. Roselius questioned why the client selected a sole transom for the south elevation.

Mr. Cozart said that the idea was to let light into the building without interfering with furniture placement.

Ms. Echols reiterated that this property is in a historic district, and explained that the addition previously communicated with the main dwelling through the fenestration pattern. She noted that the subject alteration is a completely different style which no longer reads as an integrated part of the property. She stated that she understands challenges in furniture placement, but explained that this is not the point, that the fenestration pattern needs to speak to the house. She also reminded Mr. Cozart that vinyl is not an accepted material in historic districts.

Ms. Davis agreed with Ms. Echols comments.

Ms. Roselius, speaking in reference to the possibility of dummy windows, asked Mr. Cozart if the interior renovations were complete.

Mr. Cozart responded that they are not.

Ms. Roselius, expanding on Ms. Davis' idea for a larger window in the bedroom, proposed installing a window in the middle of the elevation near the fridge/pantry area. She added that another concern on the north, less visible, elevation is the sliding glass door which is not appropriate for this type or age of building. She asked if the owner would consider replacing it with a double French door.

Mr. Cozart responded that he did not think so.

Ms. Davis stated that the addition resembles a shotgun form building which would have windows in every room.

Mr. Cozart proposed moving the windows on the north elevation to the more visible south elevation.

Ms. Davis replied that any windows needed to look like what was previously there, and discussed how the window on the south elevation are not appropriate.

Mr. Cozart suggested snap muntins.

Ms. Davis stated that snap muntins are not acceptable and reiterated that windows need to be appropriate replacements.

Mr. Blackwell concurred with his fellow board members that the more visible elevation should be the priority and reiterated that establishing an appropriate pattern is very important. He encouraged the applicant to meet with his client.

Ms. Davis and Mr. Blackwell advised Mr. Cozart to look to what was previously extant to guide him in his window selection and placement, with Ms. Davis adding that aluminum clad wood is an appropriate window material. They further suggested that two real and one dummy window would be an acceptable option, and encouraged Mr. Cozart to pay attention to head height.

Ms. Roselius concurred that a pattern of real window, dummy window, real window would be acceptable.

Ms. Dawson clarified to the Board and applicant the options for the application were denial, withdraw, or table.

Ms. Roselius made a motion to table the application.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Blackwell and it passed unanimously.



# Agenda Item #2

## Certified Record 2024-14-CA

### DETAILS

---

**Location:**

407 Church Street

**Summary of Request:**

Replace five pairs of shutters on west elevation with PVC composite shutters.

**Applicant (as applicable):**

Tuan Titlestad of Bay Town Builders, LLC  
on behalf of Virginia Snider

**Property Owner:**

Virginia Snider

**Historic District:**

Church Street East

**Classification:**

Contributing

**Summary of Analysis:**

- The existing shutters are in a state of disrepair.
- The PVC composite material is an alternative material which simulates the appearance of wood.
- The proposed shutters would be designed to match existing in design, dimensions, profile, and color, in accordance with the design guidelines.

**Report Contents:**

Property and Application History ..... 2

Scope of Work ..... 2

Applicable Standards ..... 2

Staff Analysis ..... 3

Attachments ..... 4

## PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

---

Church Street East Historic District was initially listed in the National Register in 1971 under Criteria A (historic significance) and C (architectural significance) for its local significance in the areas of architecture, education, and urban planning. The district is significant for its concentration of multiple 19<sup>th</sup> century architectural styles and because it encompasses the site of Mobile in the early 1700s. The district boundaries were expanded in 1984 and 2005.

The property at 407 Church Street, known as the Hamilton House, is a two-and-a-half story brick side-hall town house with off-set rear wing and double iron galleries. It was constructed by Thomas A. Hamilton in 1859, then later restored in 1967 by Dewey Crowder Associates, under the ownership of Mrs. Edwin K. Smith.

This property has never before appeared before the Architectural Review Board.

## SCOPE OF WORK

---

1. Install 5 pairs of new PVC composite shutters to match existing on west elevation of home.
  - a. Two pairs of shutters would be installed on the second floor. Three pairs would be installed on the first floor.
  - b. Shutters for the first-floor windows would measure 98" high, whereas shutters for the second-floor windows would measure 88"-0" high.
  - c. All other measurements would be as follows for both sets of shutters:  
The measurement from end to mid-rail would be approximately 45".  
The mid-rail would measure 2.5."  
End rails would measure 2.75."  
The louvers would measure 1.625" high.  
Simulated push-rods would measure 0.5" thick.  
The shutters would have a thickness of 1.375."
  - d. The proposed shutters would be fixed but would appear to be operable.
  - e. The shutters would be painted black to match existing.

## APPLICABLE STANDARDS

---

1. **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

## STAFF ANALYSIS

---

The property under review is a contributing structure in the Church Street East Historic District. The application proposes the installation of five (5) pairs of new shutters on the west elevation of the house. The shutters would replace existing wood shutters which are deteriorated. According to the applicant, efforts to maintain and repair all shutters at the property have been ongoing. However, the shutters on the west elevation in particular are now in such an advanced state of deterioration, repair work is no longer a feasible option.

The proposed new shutters would be installed on the west elevation of the main block of the house and would flank two historic windows on the second floor and three windows on the first floor (as noted in the accompanying photo). The proposed shutters are of a PVC composite material that closely simulates the appearance of wood, which is directed by the *Guidelines* when using an alternative material. The shutters would be customized to closely match the dimensions and profile of the existing shutters. They would be fixed shutters that appear to be operable. (5.25)

The Mobile Historic Development Commission (MHDC) holds a Scenic, Open Space, and Architectural Façade Easement on 407 Church Street that was granted in 1992. As such, written permission for the work proposed in this application, as required in the terms of the easement, was received from the Properties Committee of the MHDC on March 19, 2024.

## PUBLIC TESTIMONY

---

Mr. Tuan Titlestad was present to discuss the application.

No members of the public were present to comment on the application, and no written comments were received.

## BOARD DISCUSSION

---

Mr. Blackwell asked Mr. Titlestad to confirm that the existing shutters at 407 Church are not original.

Mr. Titlestad confirmed that they are not.

Ms. Echols asked if the proposed shutters would be operable.

Mr. Titlestad replied that they would be operable, adding that they come with a lifetime warranty.

## FINDING FACTS

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

Ms. 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, that the application does not impair the architectural or historic character of the property or the district, and should be granted a COA.

Ms. Wilson seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.



# Agenda Item #4

## Certified Record 2024-16-CA

### DETAILS

---

**Location:**

1055 Dauphin Street

**Summary of Request:**

Add a porch on the side wing and fenestration change.

**Applicant (as applicable):**

John Cocke, IV

**Property Owner:**

same

**Historic District:**

Old Dauphin Way

**Classification:**

Contributing

**Summary of Analysis:**

- The proposed porch echoes the existing porch on the main façade and is compatible with the character of the structure in scale, design, and materials.
- The proposed fenestration change does not disrupt the established fenestration pattern and utilizes approved materials which match the historic structure.

**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 20<sup>th</sup>-century apartments.”

The property at 1055 Dauphin Street is a one-story frame gable front cottage with an off-set side wing to the east and rear projection to the south, which consisted of a rear side porch. According to Historic Development vertical files, the dwelling was constructed in 1887 as a rental property for Catherine Steiner. Ms. Steiner also owned 1053 Dauphin, which was constructed in the same year and is a mirror image of 1055. At a later date, the rear porch at 1055 was enclosed, and the façade was clad in brick veneer. The brick veneer was removed in 2015, to reveal the façade’s original clapboard siding. The original form of the front porch (to match that of 1053 Dauphin Street) was restored in 2023.

This property has never before appeared before the Architectural Review Board.

## SCOPE OF WORK

---

1. Construct a front porch across the north elevation of the side wing.
  - a. The porch would measure 10’-2” wide by 5’-6” deep. The porch would consist of wood tongue-and-groove decking painted green.
  - b. The foundation and floor height would match that of the existing front porch, which is approximately 2’-3” high. The raised foundation would be infilled with framed wood lattice panels.
  - c. The porch would be supported by two 6” x 6” square columns with base and cap, which would match the existing columns. Columns would be approximately 9’-0” high.
  - d. The porch would be topped with a shed roof which would project from below the existing eave of elevation’s side gable roof. The proposed roof would be clad in charcoal colored shingles to match the existing roof.
  - e. The porch would be accessed by four wood steps centered on the elevation and flanked by wood hand rails. The steps would be painted green to match the porch deck.
  - f. A 33” wood balustrade, painted white, would enclose the porch on all elevations. The railing would consist of 2”x2” balusters and a beveled top rail.
2. Remove existing window on the north elevation of the side wing and replace with a salvaged paneled door.
  - a. The proposed six-paneled wood door would be topped by a two-light transom which would match the existing transom over the main entry door on the façade.
  - b. The top of the transom would align with the height of the existing window opening.
  - c. A copper lantern would be installed to the right of the door.

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

---

1. **5.0** The type, size, framing, and dividing lights of windows, as well as their location and configuration (rhythm), help establish the historic character of a building.
2. **6.18** Design a new porch to be compatible with the existing historic building.

- Design the scale, proportion and character of a porch addition element, including columns, corner brackets, railings and pickets, to be compatible with the existing historic residential structure.
- Match the foundation height of a porch addition to that of the existing historic structure.
- Design a porch addition roofline to be compatible with the existing historic structure. However, a porch addition roofline need not match exactly that of the existing historic building. For example, a porch addition may have a shed roof.
- Use materials for a porch addition that are appropriate to the building.
- Do not use a contemporary deck railing for a porch addition placed at a location visible from the public street.
- Do not use cast concrete steps on façades or primary elevations.

## STAFF ANALYSIS

---

The property under review is a contributing structure within the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The application seeks approval for the construction of a new porch which would span the north elevation of an original wing which projects eastward from the main block of the house. Additionally, the existing window which is centered on this elevation would be replaced with an entry door with transom.

The *Guidelines* call for a new porch to be compatible with the existing historic building. The scale of the proposed new porch is suited to the elevation to which it would be adhered, and its design would emulate the existing front porch, using the same materials and matching elements such as square columns with base and cap, picket balusters, and tongue-and-groove decking. The foundation height of the porch would match that of the structure and would correspond to the existing front porch height. The shed roof intended for the porch would distinguish it from that of the original building. (6.18)

The application further proposes the removal of an existing window centered on the north elevation of the side wing. The window would be replaced with a wood six-panel door topped by a two-light transom. The top of the transom would align with the top of the current window frame. The proposed door and transom would maintain the established fenestration rhythm, and would match the window and transom design of the entry door on the main façade of the dwelling. (5.0)

## PUBLIC TESTIMONY

---

Mr. John Cocke was present to discuss the application. He stated that he has owned the subject property since 2014 and is seeking to add a second entrance which would match the front entrance and porch.

No members of the public were present to comment on the application, and no written comments were received.

## BOARD DISCUSSION

---

Ms. Roselius requested the reason for the additional entrance.

Mr. Cocke explained that the building is being used as an office space, which had previously been shared between him and his wife. Now the space will be shared with a new tenant who requires separate access to the rented office space.

Ms. Roselius asked if the proposed columns for the secondary porch would be wood.

Mr. Cocke replied that they would, adding that the proposed porch design would mirror the front porch.

Ms. Roselius voiced a concern regarding the sister house to the east at 1053 Dauphin, stating that they were meant to present as a pair as part of a consistent street scape along a significant street in the district, that altering the façade of one may impair the intended cohesive look.

Mr. Cocke agreed that 1055 Dauphin was meant to be similar to its neighbor, but that 1053 Dauphin currently has already impaired the façade with a large HVAC system placed directly in front of the street-facing elevation of its side wing. Mr. Cocke explained that his intention is to improve the façade and appearance from the street with the proposed secondary porch and entrance.

Ms. Echols commented that the proposed alteration made sense to her and that she did not personally see it as a problem.

Ms. Davis asked Mr. Cocke if the proposed door and transom would match the existing front entrance.

Mr. Cocke explained that the existing front door is not the original. He noted that he has a collection of salvaged historic doors that he will choose from for this project and confirmed that he would be selecting one that most closely matches the existing, and that a matching transom would be installed.

Ms. Roselius asked if the existing oak tree on the property would visibly screen the proposed alteration.

Mr. Cocke replied that it may.

Ms. Echols asked Staff if this type of alteration is a typical alteration or existing element on historic homes in Mobile's historic district.

Ms. Dawson replied that it is.

#### **FINDING FACTS**

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

#### **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

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

Ms. Wilson seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:39 pm.

*These minutes were approved by the Architectural Review Board at their May 1, 2024 meeting.*