



# Architectural Review Board Minutes

## December 6, 2023 – 3:00 P.M.

### ADMINISTRATIVE

---

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

#### 1. Roll Call

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

**Members Present:** Cartledge Blackwell, Catarina Echols, Stephen Howle, Karrie Maurin, Cameron Pfieffer-Traylor, Jennifer Roselius, and Barja Wilson

**Members Absent:** Stephen McNair and Abby Davis

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

#### 2. Approval of Minutes from November 1, 2023

Mr. Blackwell moved to approve the minutes from the November 1, 2023 meeting.

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

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

Ms. Roselius recused herself from voting on the midmonth application for 214 S. Cedar Street.

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

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

Auditorium, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street  
For more information, please visit: <http://www.mobilehd.org/>

## MID-MONTH APPROVALS - APPROVED

---

- 1. Applicant:** Building and Maintenance Company  
**Property Address:** 214 S. Cedar Street  
**Issue Date:** 10/24/2023  
**Project:** Remove existing 8-foot privacy fence and replace with new 6-foot wood privacy fence around rear yard. Entirety of fence is behind front plane of house.
- 2. Applicant:** Building and Maintenance Company  
**Property Address:** 201 S. Dearborn Street  
**Issue Date:** 10/24/2023  
**Project:**
  1. Construct a 4'-high wood picket fence running 15' south from the east end of the south elevation.  
A 3'-0" wide picket wood swing gate will be installed along this length of picket fence.
  2. Construct a 6'-high wood privacy fence running 22' east from the northeast (rear) corner of the house, then south to abut the rear corner of accessory structure. From the southwest corner of the accessory structure, the fence will run another 19' toward the southeast corner of the lot, then west along the south property line, abutting the picket fence.
- 3. Applicant:** Katherine Flowers  
**Property Address:** 922 Conti Street  
**Issue Date:** 10/24/2023  
**Project:**
  1. Repaint east elevation in matching color: Gettysburg Gray.
  2. Repaint front porch deck in matching color.
  3. Repaint window frames on east elevation in matching color.
  4. Repaint all window rails and stiles in Leatherbound to match front entry door.
  5. Add following paint colors to highlight front porch posts, brackets, and top of railing: Leatherbound and Gettysburg gray.
- 4. Applicant:** Christopher Scott & Jodi W. Turner  
**Property Address:** 160 S. Dearborn Street  
**Issue Date:** 10/26/2023  
**Project:** Remove existing privacy fence and replace in-kind. Placement, measurements, and materials will be replaced in-kind.
- 5. Applicant:** Dial Construction Inc  
**Property Address:** 153 S. Catherine Street  
**Issue Date:** 10/27/2023  
**Project:** Construct a 3'-high wood picket fence to enclose front yard.

A 3'-wide gate will span the front walkway. The fence will be stained a dark green.

6. **Applicant:** Mac McGovern  
**Property Address:** 1050 New St. Francis Street  
**Issue Date:** 10/27/2023  
**Project:** Construct a 6'-tall wood privacy fence to the rear of the structure along the east and north property lines. A wooden gate will be installed on the east portion of fence and will span the existing driveway and will measure 16' wide.
7. **Applicant:** Complete Roofing LLC  
**Property Address:** 365 S. Broad Street  
**Issue Date:** 10/30/2023  
**Project:** Reroof in-kind with black shingles.
8. **Applicant:** Damon Lett Roofing  
**Property Address:** 261 Marine Street  
**Issue Date:** 11/02/2023  
**Project:** Reroof in-kind with shingles in Charcoal color.
9. **Applicant:** Fortified Exteriors LLC  
**Property Address:** 155 Macy Place  
**Issue Date:** 11/06/2023  
**Project:** Reroof in-kind with shingles in Colonial Slate color.
10. **Applicant:** Wendmark Fence LLC  
**Property Address:** 1216 Texas Street  
**Issue Date:** 11/06/2023  
**Project:** Repaint as follows: Trim- BLP Egyptian Antique White; Body - SW Alabaster; Accent- SW Rockwood Terracotta; Window Sashes - Tomcat Black
11. **Applicant:** C. Dennis Carlisle Architect  
**Property Address:** 255 West Street  
**Issue Date:** 11/07/2023  
**Project:** Construct two-bay carport behind existing house, per submitted plans. The carport will be placed on an existing slab and measure approximately 25' wide by 20' deep with vehicle entry on the south side. The rear-gabled roof will be clad in asphalt shingles. The exterior will be clad in aluminum siding salvaged from the previously extant rear additions.
12. **Applicant:** J & J Services  
**Property Address:** 252 Stocking Street  
**Issue Date:** 11/07/2023  
**Project:** Reroof in-kind with shingles in Olde English Pewter color.

13. **Applicant:** CAP & Company, LLC  
**Property Address:** 202 N St. Michael Street  
**Issue Date:** 11/07/2023  
**Project:** Sandwich board sign measuring 1.6'x3'. Wood frame with changeable chalkboard sign area.
14. **Applicant:** J&J Services  
**Property Address:** 1016 Old Shell Road  
**Issue Date:** 11/7/2023  
**Project:** Remove asbestos tile roofing and reroof with shingles.
15. **Applicant:** Mobile Bay Roofing LLC  
**Property Address:** 1004 Selma Street  
**Issue Date:** 11/8/2023  
**Project:** Reroof in-kind with shingles in Estate Gray color.
16. **Applicant:** Clark Geer Latham & Associates  
**Property Address:** 1501 Old Shell Road  
**Issue Date:** 11/8/2023  
**Project:** Infill recessed opening on north elevation of field house (located on Lafayette Street) with brick to match existing.
17. **Applicant:** Steve May  
**Property Address:** 1204 Old Shell Road  
**Issue Date:** 11/13/2023  
**Project:** All work is to ancillary building.  
1. Repair windows in-kind  
2. Replace rotten wood in-kind where needed and side entire structure with hardie lap siding.
18. **Applicant:** Alabama Iron Works  
**Property Address:** 251 St. Francis Street  
**Issue Date:** 11/14/2023  
**Project:** Install a double-faced hanging blade sign which projects from the façade of the structure.  
a. The sign will be vinyl covered aluminum and will measure 2'-9" wide by 3'-0" high.  
b. The sign will read "Downtown Church."  
c. Colors will be black and white.
19. **Applicant:** Tuff Shed Inc  
**Property Address:** 1402 Blacklawn  
**Issue Date:** 11/17/2023  
**Project:** Install a 10' x 12' shed clad in engineered wood siding at the northwest (rear) corner of the lot on an existing concrete slab foundation. The gabled

roof will be clad in shingles in Pewter Gray color.

20. **Applicant:** Community & Housing Development  
**Property Address:** 311 George Street  
**Issue Date:** 11/17/2023  
**Project:**
1. Remove tree growing into northwest corner of house.
  2. Remove and replace in-kind any displaced masonry units (bricks) at porch foundation to ensure structural stability.
  3. Remove existing floor covering and replace decking to match original.
  4. Repair or replace in-kind all support beams and columns as needed.
  5. Repair damaged porch overhang.
  6. Paint any new material to match existing.
  7. Install framed wood lattice between porch piers.
  8. Reroof house with shingles.
21. **Applicant:** Jasenn Hardin  
**Property Address:** 352 Charles Street  
**Issue Date:** 11/17/2023  
**Project:**
1. Replace all rotten or damaged siding with wood boards to match existing.
  2. Install 36"-high wood porch railing with 2"-square spindles and top and bottom rails. The balustrade will be painted white to match the color of the trim on the house.
  3. Paint exterior of the home as follows (BLP Mobile Paints): Body: Oakleigh Place Ivory; Trim and accent areas: White
22. **Applicant:** Solomon Anson LLC  
**Property Address:** 409/413 Dauphin Street  
**Issue Date:** 11/21/2023  
**Project:** Repair of existing, fire-damaged south and east walls and roof to exclude water on a temporary basis until permanent repairs can be made.
1. Fill in missing bricks on south and east elevations with similar.
  2. Install matching dimension framing sistered into existing roofing structure to support 5/8" plywood sheathing and felt waterproof roofing.
23. **Applicant:** Wendell McGhee  
**Property Address:** 957 Old Shell Road  
**Issue Date:** 11/21/2023  
**Project:**
1. Repair and replace in-kind rotten siding and trim where needed.
  2. Repaint exterior in an appropriate color.
  3. Reroof in-kind with shingles.

## APPLICATIONS

---

### 1. 2023-57-CA

**Address:** 8 N. Dearborn Street  
**Historic District:** Lower Dauphin Street Commercial  
**Applicant / Agent:** Douglas Kearley on behalf of Steve Moore  
**Project:** Construct a single-story wood framed addition  
**APPROVED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

### 2. 2023-58-CA

**Address:** 160 S. Dearborn Street  
**Historic District:** Church Street East  
**Applicant / Agent:** Christopher Turner & Jodi White  
**Project:** Demolish non-historic ancillary structure  
**APPROVED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

### 3. 2023-59-CA

**Address:** 154 S. Monterey Street  
**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way  
**Applicant / Agent:** Tyler Pham  
**Project:** After-the-Fact: Replace windows on north, south, and west elevations with vinyl windows; replace windows on façade with aluminum-clad windows  
**WITDRAWN BY THE APPLICANT - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

### 4. 2023-60-CA

**Address:** 7 Hannon Avenue  
**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way  
**Applicant / Agent:** Douglas Kearley on behalf of Andrew & Abby Bradley  
**Project:** Construct rear second half-story addition and porch. Fenestration changes.  
**APPROVED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

## OTHER BUSINESS

---

The next ARB meeting is scheduled for December 20, 2023.



# Agenda Item #1

## Application 2023-57-CA

### CERTIFIED RECORD

#### DETAILS

---

**Location:**

8 N. Dearborn Street

**Summary of Request:**

Construct a single-story wood framed addition

**Applicant (as applicable):**

Douglas Kearley

**Property Owner:**

Steve Moore, Esq.

**Historic District:**

Lower Dauphin Street Commercial

**Classification:**

Contributing

**Summary of Analysis:**

- The application proposes the construction of a one-story addition which would be located to the rear and to the south of the existing building.
- The proposed addition is subordinate to the historic structure and compatible in massing and scale.
- All proposed materials match those of the existing, and all proposed details are compatible with the character of the original structure.

**Report Contents:**

Property and Application History ..... 2

Scope of Work..... 2

Applicable Standards ..... 2

Staff Analysis..... 4

Attachments ..... 5

## PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

---

Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District was initially listed in the National Register in 1979 under Criteria A (historic significance) and C (architectural significance) for its local significance in the areas of commerce and architecture. The district is significant for its unique character stemming from the high concentration of closely spaced two- and three-story brick buildings and as Mobile's nineteenth century commercial thoroughfare. The district boundaries were expanded in 1982, 1995, 1998, and 2019.

Constructed c. 1895 by the Goode family, the frame structure at 8 N. Dearborn Street is a two-story side-hall double gallery dwelling with Italianate detailing. A one-story rear addition was added in the 1940s. In the 1990s, the property, which had fallen into disrepair, underwent a significant tax credit rehabilitation project which restored the dwelling's character and integrity.

The property has not previously appeared before the Architectural Review Board (ARB).

## SCOPE OF WORK

---

1. Construct a single-story wood-framed addition to the rear of the property.
  - a. The proposed addition would be rectangular in shape, measuring 45'-0" wide by 15'-0" deep.
  - b. The addition would be topped by a cross-gable roof, which would be clad in 5 V crimp metal to match the existing structure.
  - c. A square hipped-roof vestibule measuring 6'-6" x 6'-6" would project from the addition's west elevation and access the existing ramp which abuts the existing structure's south elevation.
  - d. Ceiling heights would measure approximately 10'-8".
  - e. The foundation would be raised on brick piers, with brick infill to match the existing floor heights. Metal vents would be centered between piers.
  - f. The proposed siding, painted wood clapboards, would match that of the existing structure. All trim would be wood and painted to match existing.
  - g. Fenestration would include the following:
    - Three (3) six-over-six wood windows measuring 2'-8" wide by 5'-3" high, one (1) of which would be relocated from the existing rear elevation.
    - Two six-over-six wood windows measuring 2'-10" wide by 2'-10" high.
    - One (1) wood pane-and-panel entry door with three-lite transom measuring 3'-0" wide by 6'-8" high.
    - One (1) wood louvered vent measuring 2'-0" wide by 3'-0" high would be centered on the east elevation's gable end.
  - h. The elevations would appear as follows:
    - East (rear) elevation (from south to north)  
Corner board: one (1) 2'-10" wide by 2'-10" window; one (1) 2'-10" wide by 2'-10" window; one (1) 2'-8" wide by 5'-3" high window (relocated) irregularly dispersed across the elevation; corner board.
    - West elevation (from north to south)  
One (1) pane-and-panel door with three-lite transom; one (1) 2'-8" wide by 5'-3" high window; corner board.
    - North elevation (from east to west)  
No fenestration is proposed for this elevation.
    - South elevation (from west to east)  
Corner board on vestibule wall; corner board on addition wall; one (1) 2'-8" wide by 5'-3" high window centered on the elevation; corner board.

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

---

1. **6.9** Place an addition so that it is subordinate to the historic residential structure.
  - Place and design an addition to the rear or side of the historic building wherever possible.



- Place a vertical addition in the rear so it is not visible from the street
2. **6.10** Design an addition to be compatible in massing and scale with the original historic structure.
    - Design the massing of an addition to appear subordinate to the historic building.
    - Where feasible, use a lower-scale connecting element to join an addition to a historic structure.
    - Where possible, match the foundation and floor heights of an addition to those of the historic building.
  3. **6.11** Design the exterior walls of an addition to be compatible in scale and rhythm with the original historic structure.
    - Design the height of an addition to be proportionate with the historic building, paying particular attention to the foundation and other horizontal elements.
    - Design the addition to express floor heights on the exterior of the addition in a fashion that reflects floor heights of the original historic building.
  4. **6.12** Clearly differentiate the exterior walls of an addition from the original historic structure.
    - Use a physical break or setback from the original exterior wall to visually separate the old from new.
    - Use an alteration in the roofline to create a visual break between the original and new, but ensure that the pitches generally match.
  5. **6.13** Use exterior materials and finishes that are comparable to those of the original historic residential structure in profile, dimension and composition. Modern building materials will be evaluated for appropriateness or compatibility with the original historic structure on an individual basis, with the objective of ensuring the materials are similar in their profile, dimension, and composition to those of the original historic structure.
    - Utilize an alternative material for siding as necessary, such as cement-based fiber board, provided that it matches the siding of the historic building in profile, character and finish.
    - Use a material with proven durability.
    - Use a material with a similar appearance in profile, texture and composition to those on the original building.
    - Choose a color and finish that matches or blends with those of the historic building.
    - Do not use a material with a composition that will impair the structural integrity and visual character of the building.
    - Do not use a faux stucco application.
  6. **6.14** Design a roof of an addition to be compatible with the existing historic building.
    - Design a roof shape, pitch, material and level of complexity to be similar to those of the existing historic building.
    - Incorporate overhanging exposed rafters, soffits, cornices, fascias, frieze boards, moldings or other elements into an addition that are generally similar to those of the historic building.
    - Use a roofing material for an addition that matches or is compatible with the original historic building and the district.
  7. **6.15** Design roofs such that the addition remains subordinate to the existing historic buildings in the district.
    - Where possible, locate a dormer or skylight on a new addition in an inconspicuous location.
    - In most cases, match a roof and window on a dormer to those of the original building.
  8. **6.16** Design doors and doorways to an addition to be compatible with the existing historic building.
    - If a historic door is removed to accommodate the addition, consider reusing it on the addition.
    - Design a door and doorway to be compatible with the historic building.
    - Use a door material that is compatible with those of the historic building and the district.
    - Use a material with a dimensionality (thickness) and appearance similar to doors on the original historic building.
    - Design the scale of a doorway on an addition to be in keeping with the overall mass, scale and design of the addition as a whole.
  9. **6.19** Design piers, foundations and foundation infill on a new addition to be compatible with those on the

historic building.

- Match the foundation of an addition to that of the original.
- Use a material that is similar to that of the historic foundation.
- Match foundation height to that of the original historic building.
- Use pier foundations if feasible and if consistent with the original building.
- Do not use raw concrete block or wood posts on a foundation.

10. **6.20** Use details that are similar in character to those on the historic structure.

- Match a detail on an addition to match the original historic structure in profile, dimension and material.
- Use ornamentation on an addition that is less elaborate than that on the original structure.
- Use a material for details on an addition that match those of the original in quality and feel.
- Match the proportions of details on an addition to match the proportions used on the original historic structure.

11. **6.21** Design a window on an addition to be compatible with the original historic building.

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

## STAFF ANALYSIS

---

The application under review proposes the construction of a one-story addition which would project 15'-0" feet off the rear (east) elevation, span the width of said elevation and extend approximately 15'-0" south of the structure. The addition would be placed behind an existing 1940s addition to the house.

The *Guidelines* call for an addition to an existing historic structure to be subordinate to the main structure in placement, along with massing and scale. This application achieves these objectives with the placement of the one-story addition towards the rear and to the side of the property, which does not disrupt the existing massing and scale of the property. The footprint, which measures approximately 700 square feet, would be approximately 28% of the footprint of the historic mass of the house. The raised foundation would match the existing floor height and would be clad in brick veneer to be compatible with the historic house. (6.9 - 6.11, 6.19)

The proposed addition would project from an elevation which is not part of the original structure (the 1940s rear one-story addition). The proposed addition is also distinguished from the original structure by the cross-gable roof line and the perpendicular placement to the original rear projection. (6.12) As called for in the *Guidelines*, the proposed roof for the one-story addition would be subordinate to the roof on the original two-story structure, but remains compatible in pitch and shape, and utilizes a cornice design that matches the original. (6.14, 6.15) All exterior materials intended for the addition would match the original historic structure in composition, design, and profile. (6.13, 6.19) Proposed doors and windows are in character with the historic building, with the proposed door matching the original entry door's pane-and-panel design and proposed windows matching the six-over-six lite configuration of the existing historic windows. (6.16, 6.21) Further, the plan calls for the relocation of an existing window to the proposed addition, which is considered as a best practice by the *Guidelines*.

## PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Douglas Kearley was present to represent the application. He gave an overview of the project.

There was no public comment.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board had no comments or questions.

**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.

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

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, the proposed project would not impair the architectural or historic character of the subject property or the district and should be granted a Certificate of Appropriateness.

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



## Agenda Item #2

Application 2023-58-CA

### CERTIFIED RECORD

#### DETAILS

---

**Location:**

160 S. Dearborn Street

**Summary of Request:**

Demolish non-historic ancillary structure

**Applicant (as applicable):**

Chris Turner

**Property Owner:**

Same

**Historic District:**

Church Street East

**Classification:**

Contributing

**Summary of Analysis:**

- The subject shed structure is not original to the property, nor is it historic.
- The structure is in a deteriorated state.
- The applicant plans to install grass at the site, and to potentially construct a larger and more useful carport/storage structure in the near future.

**Report Contents:**

Property and Application History .....	2
Scope of Work.....	2
Applicable Standards .....	2
Staff Analysis.....	2
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 160 S. Dearborn Street is a one-story gable roof frame house with an asymmetrical front porch spanning the southern bay of the façade and accessed by concrete steps with flanking cheek walls. The structure exhibits restrained architectural features, the most significant of which is a single tapered column with base and corbelled capital which supports the front porch on its southeast corner. According to Historic Development vertical files, historic maps, and photos, the houses at 160 and 158 S. Dearborn were built at the same time, around 1938, on a lot that previously fronted Monroe Street and was occupied by a single frame house and a small masonry building. Other than a porch addition to the rear elevation in the 1980s, the house at 160 S. Dearborn has been altered very little from its original form over the years. Between 1979 and 1982, the western (rear) boundary of the property shifted west to encompass the adjacent lot at 654 Monroe Street. The structure extant at 654 Monroe at this time was relocated to the neighboring lot to the west. This lot which had previously been 656 Monroe, was redesignated as 654 Monroe Street. This arrangement created a larger space to the rear of the dwellings at both 158 and 160 S. Dearborn Street. A COA to construct the shed at 160 S. Dearborn Street was issued in 1982.

This property has appeared once before the Architectural Review Board, when it received approval in 1982 to construct a shed, install a rear porch addition, and reroof the structure.

## SCOPE OF WORK

---

1. Demolish non-historic ancillary building.

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

---

### *Demolition Guidelines (12.0)*

1. Consider the current significance of a structure previously determined to be historic
2. Consider the condition of the structure in question. Demolition may be more appropriate when a building is deteriorated or in poor condition

### *Impact on the street*

3. Consider whether the building is one of the last remaining positive examples of its kind in the neighborhood, county, or region.
4. Consider the impact that demolition will have on surrounding structures, including neighboring properties, properties on the same block or across the street or properties throughout the individual historic district.
5. Consider whether the building is part of an ensemble of historic buildings that create a neighborhood.

### *Nature of Proposed Development*

6. Consider the future utilization of the site.

## STAFF ANALYSIS

---

The *Guidelines* require that the following be considered when a demolition is proposed: the architectural significance of the building, the impact the demolition will have on the streetscape, and the nature of future utilization of the site.

### **Significance**

The shed structure proposed for demolition is not original to the subject lot. It was constructed c. 1982, so is also not historic. It is a small rectangular frame structure which consists of restrained features such as a gable roof, exposed rafters, and a paneled door, which echo the character of the historic dwelling on the property. The

portion of the property on which the structure sits was originally part of an adjacent lot to the west, which was incorporated into the present lot between 1979 and 1982.

#### **Condition**

Presently, the entire structure is in a state of deterioration with possible foundation issues. The structure is leaning and bulging, and the entrance door cannot seal the opening due to an apparent shift in the foundation.

#### **Impact on the Street and District**

Due to its non-historic status and lack of architectural significance, the shed structure at 160 S. Dearborn does not contribute to the historic character or context of the property at 160 S. Dearborn, nor to that of the surrounding district. Further, the location of the structure is not visible from the street.

#### **Nature of Proposed Development**

The applicant would like to add grass to the rear of the lot and plans to construct a slightly larger ancillary structure within the next year, which would potentially consist of a covered carport and storage structure and would match the house in architectural character and color. No application for such a structure has been submitted to Historic Development, but the applicant will apply for a COA when the plans have been finalized.

#### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Ms. Jodi White was present to represent the application. She stated that she had nothing to add.

There was no public comment.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor reminded the applicant that when construction for a new accessory structure is planned, a COA would be required.

#### **FINDING FACTS**

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

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, the proposed project would not impair the architectural or historic character of the subject property or the district and should be granted a Certificate of Appropriateness.

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



# Agenda Item #3

## Application 2023-59-CA

### CERTIFIED RECORD

#### DETAILS

---

**Location:**

154 S Monterey Street

**Summary of Request:**

After-the-Fact: Replace windows on north, south, and west elevations with vinyl windows; replace windows on façade with aluminum-clad windows

**Applicant (as applicable):**

Tyler Pham

**Property Owner:**

Same

**Historic District:**

Old Dauphin Way

**Classification:**

Contributing

**Summary of Analysis:**

- One-over-one vinyl windows have replaced all wood Prairie style nine-over-one windows on the structure.
- Vinyl is considered an unacceptable window material for Mobile’s historic districts.
- The application proposes replacing the two (2) recently installed vinyl windows on the façade with Prairie style nine-over-one aluminum clad wood windows.
- The historic (non-original) metal windows extant in the arched openings on the façade have been repaired.

**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 154 S. Monterey Street is a frame one-story Craftsman style bungalow with a gable roof and an enclosed brick front porch spanning the two northern bays of the façade. Although the exact construction date is unknown, probate records show that the area was surveyed for subdivision in 1907. The extant house is represented on the 1925 Sanborn map. Considering this evidence and the style of the building, it can be reasonably deduced to have been built c.1925. The form on the Sanborn map depicts a front porch spanning the northern half of the façade, the footprint of which matches that of the existing brick projection on the façade. Google Street View images show the porch was infilled and windows installed in the arched openings prior to 2007.

This property has appeared before the Architectural Review Board (ARB) once. In June 2023, a COA was granted to demolish a garage structure at the rear of the property.

## SCOPE OF WORK

---

1. Replace windows on north, south, and west elevations with vinyl windows.
2. Replace windows on façade with aluminum-clad windows.

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

---

1. **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.
2. **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

---

The subject property is a contributing resource within the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The application under review seeks after-the-fact approval to replace windows on north, south, and west elevations with one-over-one vinyl windows and approval to replace two existing new one-over-one vinyl windows on the façade with Prairie style nine-over-one aluminum-clad windows.

The one-over-one vinyl windows were recently installed in all extant window openings on the structure, with the exception of the arched window openings on the enclosed front porch. Photos show that prior to installation, the historic windows were wood with a Prairie style nine-over-one configuration. The *Guidelines* recommend that historic windows that are intact and in repairable condition be retained and repaired, and those that are not repairable be replaced with new windows that are consistent with the existing in location, framing, and light configuration. (5.20, 5.21) According to the applicant, prior to replacement, the historic wood windows were deemed unrepairable. Although the Prairie style nine-over-one configuration of the historic windows contributes significantly to the character of the historic bungalow, the one-over-one vinyl replacement windows are an acceptable configuration and are compatible with existing window openings with minor infill at the bottom. The *Guidelines* further note that vinyl is not an approved window material for contributing properties within Mobile's historic districts. (5.21) To mitigate this problem, the application seeks approval to replace the two vinyl windows which have been installed on the east façade with prairie-over-one aluminum clad windows. The applicant has provided sample drawings of the proposed windows. It is unclear if the samples provided would fit the historic window openings on the façade. It should be noted that the remaining vinyl windows, which are being proposed for retention, are not located on key character-defining walls such as the façade, whereas the two windows being proposed for replacement are located on the façade, which is a primary wall, thus character-defining. (5.22)

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Mr. Tyler Pham was present to represent the application.

There was no public comment.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Ms. Roselius commented that in the photos, it appears that the new windows do not fit the openings.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor asked Staff if the Board is to consider the painting of the brick and the windows not fitting the original openings. Ms. Allen replied no.

Ms. Echols asked the applicant to describe what work he had approval for. Mr. Pham stated that he had approval to remove the garage, rehabilitate his house, and to paint.

Ms. Dawson explained that the ARB approved the demolition of a shed and added that the repainting of the exterior of the dwelling was approved as a mid-month.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor asked the applicant if he knew he had to go to the ARB for the shed and painting, why he didn't seek approval for replacing the windows. Mr. Pham responded that a realtor told him he didn't need approval for the windows.

Ms. Wilson described the condition of the original windows when she visited the property, stating that she saw no intact sashes, but that she could not say if they were damaged before or after removal.

Ms. Roselius asked the applicant when the property was purchased. Mr. Pham responded that it was purchased 6 to 7 months ago.

Ms. Roselius asked the applicant why some of the window openings were resized. Mr. Pham responded that one opening is located on a shower wall.

Ms. Roselius asked if the aluminum clad windows proposed for the façade will fit the original openings. Mr. Pham replied that he believed so.

Mr. Blackwell asked Staff if the vinyl replacement windows currently installed compare well in dimensionality, etc. to the vinyl windows previously approved on non-primary elevations. Ms. Allen stated that in her opinion they do.

Ms. Maurin noted that there is no reveal on the windows.

Ms. Roselius asked Mr. Pham if he intends to add trim. Mr. Pham replied no, that the original trim was kept.

Ms. Echols stated that Mr. Pham was aware of the process and did not follow it.

Ms. Roselius asked Mr. Pham if window replacement was included in the scope of work submitted in the building permit application. Mr. Pham replied it was not because he did not know that the windows needed replacing until parts of the siding were removed.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor asked Mr. Pham if he would consider replacing all of the vinyl windows with aluminum clad windows. Mr. Pham responded that this would be extremely pricey.

Mr. Blackwell recommended that Mr. Pham consider withdrawing his application and meet with a Design Review Committee to mitigate the issue. Mr. Pham stated that he would withdraw the application.

Mr. Blackwell and Ms. Maurin stated that they would be willing to sit on the Design Review Committee to further review this application.



## Agenda Item #4

Application 2023-60-CA

### CERTIFIED RECORD

#### DETAILS

---

**Location:**

7 Hannon Avenue

**Summary of Request:**

Construct rear second half-story addition and porch.  
Fenestration changes.

**Applicant (as applicable):**

Douglas Kearley

**Property Owner:**

Andrew and Abby Bradley

**Historic District:**

Old Dauphin Way

**Classification:**

Contributing

**Summary of Analysis:**

- The proposed second-floor addition will encompass the footprint of existing rear additions.
- The application proposes the construction of a new rear porch.
- The proposed addition is subordinate to the historic structure and compatible in massing and scale.
- All proposed materials match those of the existing, and all proposed details are compatible with the character of the original structure.

**Report Contents:**

Property and Application History .....	2
Scope of Work.....	2
Applicable Standards .....	2
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.”

According to the National Register nomination, the house at 7 Hannon Avenue, a side-gabled centerhall plan dwelling, was constructed c. 1920. A gable-on-hip roof covers a porch centered on the façade, which expresses a neoclassical revival character with four columns supporting the porch roof and pilasters with capitals at each of the house’s front corners. The 1925 Sanborn map, republished in 1956, depicts the house as a one-story structure, square in form, with a shallow rear wing which does not quite span the entire east elevation. It is likely that this wing is an enclosed porch, or that it was later removed and replaced with a rear addition with a similar footprint. According to aerial photography and historic maps, the gable roof portion of the rear addition was constructed sometime between 1956 and 1967.

This property has appeared once before the Architectural Review Board. An application to partially demolish and renovate an existing garage received approval in 2021.

## SCOPE OF WORK

---

1. Construct rear second half-story addition and porch.
  - a. The proposed addition will incorporate the footprint of the existing rear wing and will include a new hipped roof back porch, which will measure 28’-6” wide by 10’-0” deep.
  - b. Construction of the proposed half-story rear addition will involve replacing the existing gable and flat roof with a 11:12 gable roof which will match the pitch of the historic side-gable roof.
  - c. Two (2) new one-over-one aluminum clad windows would be centered on the gable and over the proposed hipped porch roof. An existing louvered wood vent would be relocated to the proposed rear gable apex. The rear entry door and window extant on the rear elevation would remain in place.
  - d. The proposed rear porch’s hipped roof would be clad in shingles to match those of the existing structure.
  - e. Four (4) 8”x 8” wood columns with capitals would support the porch roof and be equally dispersed across the elevation.
  - f. Three (3) wood steps would be centered on the porch deck to provide access to the porch.
  - g. The proposed porch foundation would be raised on brick piers matching those of the existing structure. Framed wood lattice to match existing would be installed between piers. The foundation height would be 2’-5”.
2. Fenestration changes.
  - a. South elevation: Remove the existing small square second-story window located on the eastern end of the elevation. Matching siding to be feathered into the opening.
  - b. Raise the two existing six-over-six windows located on the eastern end of the north elevation by 6”.

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

---

1. **6.9** Place an addition so that it is subordinate to the historic residential structure.
  - Place and design an addition to the rear or side of the historic building wherever possible.
  - Place a vertical addition in the rear so it is not visible from the street
2. **6.10** Design an addition to be compatible in massing and scale with the original historic structure.
  - Design the massing of an addition to appear subordinate to the historic building.
  - Where feasible, use a lower-scale connecting element to join an addition to a historic structure.
  - Where possible, match the foundation and floor heights of an addition to those of the historic building.

3. **6.11** Design the exterior walls of an addition to be compatible in scale and rhythm with the original historic structure.
  - Design the height of an addition to be proportionate with the historic building, paying particular attention to the foundation and other horizontal elements.
  - Design the addition to express floor heights on the exterior of the addition in a fashion that reflects floor heights of the original historic building.
4. **6.12** Clearly differentiate the exterior walls of an addition from the original historic structure.
  - Use a physical break or setback from the original exterior wall to visually separate the old from new.
  - Use an alteration in the roofline to create a visual break between the original and new, but ensure that the pitches generally match.
5. **6.13** Use exterior materials and finishes that are comparable to those of the original historic residential structure in profile, dimension and composition. Modern building materials will be evaluated for appropriateness or compatibility with the original historic structure on an individual basis, with the objective of ensuring the materials are similar in their profile, dimension, and composition to those of the original historic structure.
  - Utilize an alternative material for siding as necessary, such as cement-based fiber board, provided that it matches the siding of the historic building in profile, character and finish.
  - Use a material with proven durability.
  - Use a material with a similar appearance in profile, texture and composition to those on the original building.
  - Choose a color and finish that matches or blends with those of the historic building.
  - Do not use a material with a composition that will impair the structural integrity and visual character of the building.
  - Do not use a faux stucco application.
6. **6.14** Design a roof of an addition to be compatible with the existing historic building.
  - Design a roof shape, pitch, material and level of complexity to be similar to those of the existing historic building.
  - Incorporate overhanging exposed rafters, soffits, cornices, fascias, frieze boards, moldings or other elements into an addition that are generally similar to those of the historic building.
  - Use a roofing material for an addition that matches or is compatible with the original historic building and the district
7. **6.15** Design roofs such that the addition remains subordinate to the existing historic buildings in the district.
  - Where possible, locate a dormer or skylight on a new addition in an inconspicuous location.
  - In most cases, match a roof and window on a dormer to those of the original building.
8. **6.17** Design and place a new porch to maintain the visibility to and integrity of an original historic porch, as well as the overall historic building.
  - Do not expand an original historic front porch. Additions of new front porches or expansion of existing front porches are generally not appropriate.
  - Limit the height of a porch addition roofline so it does not interfere with second story elevations.
  - Replace a rear porch where a previously existing rear porch is lost or enclosed.
  - Design a rear porch so that its height and slopes are compatible with the original historic structure.
9. **6.18** Design a new porch to be compatible with the existing historic building.
  - Design the scale, proportion and character of a porch addition element, including columns, corner brackets, railings and pickets, to be compatible with the existing historic residential structure.
  - Match the foundation height of a porch addition to that of the existing historic structure.
  - Design a porch addition roofline to be compatible with the existing historic structure. However, a porch addition roofline need not match exactly that of the existing historic building. For example, a porch addition may have a shed roof.

- Use materials for a porch addition that are appropriate to the building.
  - Do not use a contemporary deck railing for a porch addition placed at a location visible from the public street.
  - Do not use cast concrete steps on façades or primary elevations.
10. **6.19** Design piers, foundations and foundation infill on a new addition to be compatible with those on the historic building.
- Match the foundation of an addition to that of the original.
  - Use a material that is similar to that of the historic foundation.
  - Match foundation height to that of the original historic building.
  - Use pier foundations if feasible and if consistent with the original building.
  - Do not use raw concrete block or wood posts on a foundation.
11. **6.20** Use details that are similar in character to those on the historic structure.
- Match a detail on an addition to match the original historic structure in profile, dimension and material.
  - Use ornamentation on an addition that is less elaborate than that on the original structure.
  - Use a material for details on an addition that match those of the original in quality and feel.
  - Match the proportions of details on an addition to match the proportions used on the original historic structure.
12. **6.21** Design a window on an addition to be compatible with the original historic building.
- Size, place and space a window for an addition to be in character with the original historic building.
  - If an aluminum window is used, use dimensions that are similar to the original windows of the house. An extruded custom aluminum window approved by the NPS or an aluminum clad wood window may be used, provided it has a profile, dimension and durability similar to a window in the historic building.
13. **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.

## STAFF ANALYSIS

---

The application under review proposes the construction of a half-story addition and a rear porch.

The addition would comprise the footprint of the existing rear addition which is approximately 15'-0" deep and slightly narrower than the original structure on either side. The height of the roof of the addition would match that of the original structure and would be compatible in pitch and shape. The addition's roof would not be visible from the street due to its placement behind the original side-gable roof. (6.14, 6.15) Therefore, the proposed addition complies the *Guidelines* in that it does not disrupt the existing massing and scale of the historic dwelling, would be compatible in rhythm and scale, and maintains an inferior status to that of the original structure. (6.9 - 6.11)

The *Guidelines* require that porch additions be placed in such a way to visually maintain the integrity of the historic building and that the addition be compatible in scale, proportion, and character with the existing structure. (6.17, 6.18) The proposed porch will project 10'-0" from the existing home's rear elevation and will not be visible from the street. Its 28'-6" width, which is slightly narrower than the existing rear elevation, and its 10'-4" ceiling height make this porch addition subordinate to the historic structure. The hipped roof design does not

impair the character of the existing building, and its height does not obstruct the second story elevations. The foundation height proposed for the porch would be equal to that of the existing house and also utilizes materials which are suitable to the historic building. (6.19)

All materials proposed for the addition are consistent and compatible with the original building, along with those used throughout the historic district. (6.13, 6.21) Likewise, details such as columns with capitals, brick foundation piers, and gable roof echo existing architectural elements and complement the character of the historic dwelling. (6.20)

The second-floor addition would be distinguished from the original structure by the use of Hardie board siding as cladding, which departs from the bead board and asbestos shingles present on the original portion of the house. (6.12) The proposed fenestration changes are minor and do not disrupt the established fenestration pattern of the historic building. (5.20)

#### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Mr. Douglas Kearley was present to represent the application. He gave an overview of the project.

There was no public comment.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board had no questions or comments.

#### **FINDING FACTS**

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

Ms. Maurin 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 proposed project would not impair the architectural or historic character of the subject property or the district and should be granted a Certificate of Appropriateness.

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

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:45pm.

