



# Architectural Review Board Minutes

## January 3, 2024 – 3:00 P.M.

### ADMINISTRATIVE

---

The meeting was called to order by the Chair Catarina Echols at 3:01 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, Jennifer Roselius, and Barja Wilson

**Members Absent:** Abby Davis, Stephen McNair, and Cameron Pfeiffer-Traylor

**Staff Members Present:** Christine Dawson, Hannon Falls, Marion McElroy, Bruce McGowin, and Meredith Wilson

#### 2. Approval of Minutes from December 20, 2023

Mr. Blackwell moved to approve the minutes from the December 20, 2023 meeting.

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

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

Ms. Roselius moved to approve the mid-month COAs granted by Staff.

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

### MID-MONTH APPROVALS - APPROVED

---

1. **Applicant:** Anthony Andrew Saybe  
**Property Address:** 659 Dauphin Street  
**Issue Date:** 12/11/2023  
**Project:**
  1. Reroof in-kind with TPO roofing.
  2. Replace all gutters in-kind.
  
2. **Applicant:** John Baker  
**Property Address:** 956 Charleston Street  
**Issue Date:** 12/12/2023  
**Project:**
  1. Remove and replace existing wood front steps. Install brick steps in bricks to match the existing house piers. Steps will match existing in dimensions.
  2. Install wrought iron handrails.

- 3. **Applicant:** Secor Enterprises Inc.  
**Property Address:** 151 S. Levert Street  
**Issue Date:** 12/13/2023  
**Project:** Replace in-kind soffit and exterior molding where needed due to rot and damage. Repaint soffit and molding to match existing.
  
- 4. **Applicant:** Mobile Bay Roofing LLC  
**Property Address:** 301 S. Ann Street  
**Issue Date:** 12/15/2023  
**Project:** Reroof using shingles. Color: Weather Wood
  
- 5. **Applicant:** Star Signature Homes LLC  
**Property Address:** 1704 Church Street  
**Issue Date:** 12/18/2023  
**Project:** Reroof with shingles. Color: Thunderstorm Gray.
  
- 6. **Applicant:** Lee Allen Pool Aid Services  
**Property Address:** 204 Lanier Avenue  
**Issue Date:** 12/19/2023  
**Project:**
  - 1. Install a gunite pool with spa.
    - a. Pool and spa will be installed on the southeast corner of the lot, approximately 15' behind the dwelling.
    - b. The pool will be rectangular in shape and will measure 22' wide x 16' deep. The spa will also be rectangular and will measure 5' wide x 10' deep.
    - c. Setbacks from the south and east property lines will be 10'.
  
- 7. **Applicant:** KCUFA Consulting LLC  
**Property Address:** 957 Augusta Street  
**Issue Date:** 12/19/2023  
**Project:** Reroof in-kind with modified bitumen roofing on flat portion of roof. Repair shingles in-kind where needed.

## APPLICATIONS

---

### 1. 2024-01-CA

**Address:** 911 Augusta Street  
**Historic District:** Oakleigh Garden  
**Applicant / Agent:** Gillian McGee  
**Project:** Demolish rear addition and side porch; replace both on same footprint. Reroof with rubber synthetic shakes. Replace all windows. Install new fiber cement siding at existing house and new addition.

**APPROVED**

- **CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

## 2. 2024-02-CA

**Address:** 216 St. Michael Street  
**Historic District:** Lower Dauphin Street Commercial  
**Applicant / Agent:** Alton Powell  
**Project:** After-the-Fact: Paint non-historic brick  
**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 and west elevations with vinyl windows; replace windows on façade and south elevation with aluminum-clad windows  
**APPROVED** - **CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

## OTHER BUSINESS

---

The next ARB meeting is scheduled for January 17, 2024.



# Agenda Item #1

## Application 2024-01-CA

### CERTIFIED RECORD

#### DETAILS

---

**Location:**

911 Augusta Street

**Summary of Request:**

Remove and replace existing rear addition; remove and replace existing siding on façade gable with fiber cement board; fenestration replacement and alterations

**Applicant (as applicable):**

Gillian McGee

**Property Owner:**

Naude Gouws

**Historic District:**

Oakleigh Garden

**Classification:**

Contributing

**Summary of Analysis:**

- The proposed addition is complementary to the historic structure and compliant with the *Guidelines* in regard to placement, scale, massing, and most materials. Because synthetic shake roofing varies in quality, appearance, and durability, the specific product proposed for this property should be evaluated by the ARB.
- The proposed in-kind replacement of windows is not compliant with the *Guidelines'* directive to repair original windows when at all possible. The proposed ribbed metal awnings on the east elevation are not compatible with the *Guidelines*.
- The proposed fenestration changes in relation to the remodeling project do not disrupt the established rhythms or impair the character of the house.
- The wholesale replacement of original siding with fiber cement lap siding is generally not permitted under the *Guidelines*.
- The proposed privacy fence meets requirements in regard to placement and materials. However, the proposed 8'-0" height exceeds height limits imposed by the *Guidelines*.

**Report Contents:**

Property and Application History	2
Scope of Work	2
Applicable Standards	3
Staff Analysis	6
Attachments	8

## PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

---

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

The property at 911 Augusta Street is a one-story frame cottage. The three-bay dwelling is topped by a gable roof with a front porch spanning the façade. From the street, a small shed-roofed addition visibly projects from the south end of the west elevation. Historic Development records date the structure from c. 1890. The 1904 Sanborn map portrays a structure much like the current one, yet without the existing later additions. This representation depicts a single projecting wing off the west end of the rear elevation. The shed roof addition is present on the 1956 Sanborn overlay. At some point, a second addition was constructed which filled in the “L” shaped area created by the original rear projection. Historic imagery suggests that the later addition may have been added between 1967 and 1980.

According to Historic Development vertical files, this property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board.

## SCOPE OF WORK

---

### Proposed Rear Addition

1. Remove existing rear addition and replace with a new 2 bedroom/2 bath addition.
  - a. The existing rear addition to be removed measures approximately 32'-9 5/8" wide by 14'-11 1/8" deep.
  - b. The proposed new 745 sf rear addition would be located in the same location of the existing addition with a slightly larger footprint of 41'-2" wide by 18'-4 3/8" deep.
  - c. The new addition would be topped by a hipped roof clad in rubber simulated shake shingles and would measure approximately 16'-2 7/8" high from finished floor to peak.
  - d. The new addition would be clad in fiber cement lap siding to match the lap siding proposed for existing elevations.
  - e. The proposed foundation would sit on concrete piers parged in painted stucco to match those of the existing dwelling. The foundation height would also match the existing foundation height. Lattice infill to match that of the original dwelling would be installed between piers.
  - f. Elevations of the proposed addition would appear as follows:
    - North Elevation on east side of original structure (from east to west)  
Corner board; one six-over-one window measuring 29" wide x 49" high, centered on the elevation.
    - North Elevation on west side of original structure (from east to west)  
Two six-over-one windows measuring 36" wide x 62" high, regularly placed on the elevation; corner board
    - West Elevation (from north to south)  
Corner board; one six-over-one window measuring 34" wide x 49" high located on the south end of the elevation; corner board.
    - South (rear) Elevation (from west to east)  
Corner board; one six-over-one window measuring 36" wide x 62" high, located approximately 10'-0" eastward from the west corner board; corner board.
    - East Elevation (from south to north)

Corner board; two six-over-one window measuring 34" wide x 49" high, irregularly spaced; corner board.

#### Proposed changes to existing/original structure

2. Replace existing siding on façade and original side elevations with fiber cement board.
  - a. The proposed fiber cement lap siding would match the existing clapboard siding in dimension and smooth finish type.
3. Replace existing roof with new rubber simulated shake shingles to match those proposed for the new rear addition.
4. Remove and replace all existing windows (with the exception of the two existing windows on the west elevation) with wood windows.
  - a. All replacement windows would match existing configuration.
  - b. The replacement windows proposed for the two existing windows on the façade would additionally match existing in size.
5. Replace two (2) existing windows on the west elevation with two (2) pairs of wood and pane French doors.
  - a. Each pair of French doors would measure 74" wide x 81" high. Each door would consist of eight (8) panes.
  - b. Above each pair of doors, a new rib metal panel awning would be installed which would span the length of the doors and would be supported by a pair of wood brackets installed on either side of the doors.
6. Additional proposed fenestration changes to the east elevation include the following:
  - a. Remove the second (from the north) existing six-over-one window, and replace it with a new wood window which would match the existing in configuration and measure 34" wide x 49" high.
  - b. Install an additional wood six-over-one window measuring 34" wide x 49" high.

#### Proposed site improvements

7. Install a new 8'-0" high wood privacy fence with horizontal boards to match the existing fence.
  - a. The proposed fence would sit just behind the front plane of the structure on both the east and west sides and run outward to the property line.
  - b. A pair of wood gates, each measuring 3'-0" wide, would be installed on the east portion of the fence.
  - c. One wood gate measuring 3'0" wide would be installed on the west portion of the fence.

#### **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.
  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.

- 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.
12. **5.4** Preserve original building materials.
- Repair deteriorated building materials by patching, piecing-in, consolidating or otherwise reinforcing the material.
  - Remove only those materials which are deteriorated and beyond reasonable repair.
  - Do not remove original materials that are in good condition.
13. **5.6** Use original materials to replace damaged materials on primary surfaces where possible.
- Use original materials to replace damaged building materials on a primary façade if possible. If the original material is wood clapboard, for example, then the replacement material should be a material that matches the original in finish, size and the amount of exposed lap. If the original material is not available from the site, use a replacement material that is visually comparable with the original material.
  - Replace only the amount of material required. If a few boards are damaged beyond repair, for example, then only they should be replaced, rather than the entire wall.
  - Do not replace building materials on the primary façade, such as wood siding and masonry, with alternative or imitation materials unless it cannot be avoided.
  - Wholesale replacement of exterior finishes is generally not allowed.
14. **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.
15. **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.

#### Window Replacement Schedule

Applications involving wholesale replacement of wooden windows must include a window schedule. This includes photographs of each window documenting the condition...If the degree of deterioration is substantiated by a window schedule, replacement may be approved for designs matching originals as per window type, installation, and light configuration. Double-paned and clad wood window replacement alternatives may be considered if the replacements match the configuration, dimensions and profiles.

16. **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)

17. **10.2** Design a fence to be compatible with the architectural style of the house and existing fences in the neighborhood.

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

## STAFF ANALYSIS

---

The application under review proposes the removal of a non-historic rear addition, the construction of a new addition, and fenestration alterations to the exterior of the original structure.

The *Guidelines* call for an addition to an existing historic structure to be subordinate to the main structure in placement, massing, and scale. This application achieves these objectives with the placement of the one-story addition on the rear elevation, the same location of the existing rear addition. Therefore, the proposed addition would not disrupt the existing massing and scale of the property. The footprint of the addition, which measures 745 square feet, would increase the existing square footage by approximately 113 square feet, which is approximately 9% of the current footprint of the house, which is 1281 square feet. The proposed raised pier foundation which would match existing floor heights; the incorporation of fiber cement lap siding would create compatibility in scale and rhythm with the historic house. (6.9 - 6.11, 6.19)

The proposed addition is clearly differentiated from the original part of the house by its perpendicular placement and roof line deviation. (6.12) All exterior materials intended for the addition either match those of the original historic structure, or are compatible alternatives, such as the wood windows and fiber cement lap siding. (6.13) Likewise, the hipped roof planned for the addition is appropriate, in that it is similar in pitch and level of complexity to that of the existing historic building. While wood shake roofing would not be inappropriate for the subject property, the applicant has not submitted information regarding the proposed rubber shake roofing. Synthetic shake roofing varies in quality, appearance, and durability, and the specific proposed product should be evaluated by the ARB. (6.13, 6.14) With a height of approximately 16'-2 7/8", the addition roof is subordinate in height to the original which is 20'-7" at the ridge. (6.14, 6.15) The plans call for other comparable elements and details which maintain and complement the historic character of the property such as matching the windows' size and lite configuration to those of the original, and matching foundation and infill type to that of the historic structure. (6.20, 6.21)

In regard to the proposed window replacement, the *Guidelines* state "where historic (wooden or metal) windows are intact and in repairable condition, retain and repair them to match the existing as per location, light configuration, detail and material." (5.20) The applicant submitted a window survey form, detailing the condition of each extant window on the structure. On the survey, all windows were classified as being in poor condition. Taking into consideration the windows on the façade, east and west elevations, for which replacement or alteration is proposed, Staff does not find this classification to be accurate. The survey describes most applicable windows as having damaged muntins and glazing and being inoperable (unable to open). Photo evidence suggests that the damages are repairable; in cases where in-kind replacement is proposed, existing windows could be retained. (5.21) The proposed replacement windows match the originals in design and material, as directed by the *Guidelines*. Further, fenestration alterations proposed for the east elevation do not significantly disrupt the established fenestration pattern on the elevation. Likewise, the proposed replacement of the two windows on the west elevation with pairs of French doors is a sympathetic alteration to a secondary elevation which does not visibly impair the character of the house; however, the proposed ribbed metal awning above these doors would not be compliant with the *Guidelines* (6.16, 6.46, 6.47)

The *Guidelines* advise against wholesale replacement of exterior finishes and states that building materials on the primary façade should not be replaced. Instead, only the exterior materials that are compromised by damage or rot should be replaced. The subject project's proposal to replace existing wood siding with fiber cement siding does not comply with this guideline. (5.4, 5.6)

The proposed new wood privacy fence conforms with the *Guidelines* in regard to placement and materials. However, the proposed height of 8'-0" is not an approved height for privacy fences on residentially zoned lots. A 6'-0" height is the maximum allowed under the *Guidelines*. (10.2)

#### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Ms. Gillian McGee was present to discuss the application. She offered an overview of the project. She noted that the property owner prefers to use fiber cement board siding, rather than wood clapboards. The living room windows would be replaced with new wood windows, and the side porch would be replaced with a porch on a concrete base.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Ms. Roselius asked if the material proposed for the trim and soffits on the addition is wood. Ms. McGee responded that it is.

Ms. Roselius asked if fiber cement siding is proposed for only the addition or a full replacement for the existing wood siding on the original structure. Ms. McGee stated that fiber cement siding is intended for the addition and to replace the wood siding on the original structure. She noted that, after removal of the existing addition, only half of the current building's exterior would remain.

Ms. Roselius commented that the *Design Review Guidelines* call for the retention of wood siding on an original façade. Ms. McGee stated that she understands that fiber cement siding may not be approved for the façade of the original structure.

Ms. Roselius asked if the applicant had a sample of the rubber shake shingle proposed for the roof. Ms. McGee responded that she did and produced the sample for the Board to review, mentioning that there is an example of this material in the district at 1009 Church Street.

Ms. Maurin asked for clarification as to the replacement of the living room windows. Ms. McGee stated that the living room windows would be replaced in-kind to match materials, profile, lite configuration and size. She elaborated that, due to a tree falling on the house in 2020, the existing windows are no longer square or operable; and added that Fox Restoration would build all windows.

Ms. Echols asked Staff if the window survey had been conducted by Staff or the applicant. Ms. Allen responded that Ms. McGee completed the window survey form given to her by Staff. Staff then reviewed it. Based on the evidence and documentation provided, Staff initially did not concur with the applicant's assessment of the condition of the windows. However, a discussion with the applicant brought new information to light to account for Ms. McGee's assessment.

Ms. Roselius asked Ms. McGee why metal roofing material was proposed for the pent roofs over the French doors on the east elevation. Ms. McGee responded that the 3:12 pitch of the pent roofs calls for a metal roof for optimal performance.

Ms. Roselius asked if the proposed 8' fence height is proposed for the section of the privacy fence which runs along the front of the property. She stated that the Guidelines do not permit an 8' fence on residential lots. Ms. McGee said it is, but that the owner is open to a 6' high fence.

Ms. Echols recommended to the applicant that all wood siding on the original structure, in addition to that on the façade, be either retained or replaced in-kind. She added that this will aid in further distinguishing the original structure from the newer addition, which is called for in the *Guidelines*. Ms. McGee stated that she was amenable to this.

#### **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, amended to note the height of the fence at 6', and to include the in-kind repair and replacement of wood siding to match the existing on all original elevations.

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

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

Mr. Blackwell moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, the proposed application, as amended, would not impair the architectural or historic character of the district and should be granted a Certificate of Appropriateness.

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



# Agenda Item #2

## Application 2024-02-CA

### CERTIFIED RECORD

#### DETAILS

---

**Location:**

216 St. Michael Street

**Summary of Request:**

After-the-Fact: Paint non-historic brick

**Applicant (as applicable):**

Alton Powell

**Property Owner:**

BWS-LD 2010 PROPERTIES, LP; KIDCO, LLC; B COMPANY, LLC

**Historic District:**

Lower Dauphin Street

**Classification:**

Non-Contributing

**Summary of Analysis:**

- The application seeks after-the-fact approval to paint all exposed brick.
- The *Guidelines* state that exposed brick on historic commercial buildings should not be painted
- The brick is non-historic.

**Report Contents:**

Property and Application History ..... 2

Scope of Work ..... 2

Applicable Standards ..... 2

Staff Analysis ..... 2

Attachments ..... 3

## PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

---

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

The property at 216 St. Michael Street is a one-story brick commercial building with a recessed three-bay façade. The 1904 and 1924 Sanborn maps each depict a one-story frame dwelling at this location. A one-story brick commercial building is represented on the 1955 overlay. Aerial imagery shows the same building extant in 1952. Given the form and design of the building, it is likely that it was constructed in the early 1950s.

This property has never before appeared before the Architectural Review Board (ARB).

## SCOPE OF WORK

---

1. Paint all brick and concrete on exterior walls and the ceiling above entrances.
  - a. Color: Shoji White by Sherwin Williams (7042)
2. Paint rear exit door, door trim, window trim, and steel lintel above front entryways.
  - b. Color: Iron Ore by Sherwin Williams (7069)

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

---

1. **7.7** Preserve and repair original materials on a historic commercial building whenever possible.
  - Do not paint over exposed brick.
  - Strive to preserve materials on the sides and rear of a historic commercial building where possible.
  - Brick is the most common façade material, but in some cases stucco has been applied to an original brick façade.
  - If brick repair is required, match the mortar color, consistency and strike to the original as closely as possible.

## STAFF ANALYSIS

---

The subject property is not a contributing resource to the Lower Dauphin Street Commercial District. The application under review seeks after-the-fact approval to paint all brick on exterior walls. The color proposed for the exposed brick is a white color which is intended to match the building adjacent to the west.

The *Guidelines* state that exposed brick should not be painted over on historic commercial buildings in Mobile's historic districts. The building at 216 St. Michael consists of multiple styles and colors of non-historic brick. The applicant proposed painting the building in an attempt to produce a more cohesive aesthetic and protect the building from water intrusion through the masonry.

## PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Alton Powell was present to discuss the application. He gave an overview of the project and explained that some of the bricks were missing or damaged; painting the building was undertaken to improve its appearance.

## BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Maurin asked if the applicant intended to leave the alcove unpainted. Mr. Powell stated that the alcove would be painted.

Mr. Blackwell asked if this building is non-contributing. Ms. Allen confirmed that the building is non-contributing.

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

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

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

Mr. Blackwell 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.
- The applicant met with a Design Review Committee to mitigate the relevant issues.

**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) twice. In June 2023, a COA was granted to demolish a garage structure at the rear of the property. An earlier iteration of the current application appeared before the ARB on December 6, 2023.

## SCOPE OF WORK

---

3. Replace windows on north, south, and west elevations with vinyl windows.
4. 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)

### UPDATE TO APPLICATION

On December 13<sup>th</sup>, the applicant met with a Design Review Committee which consisted of members of Staff and the Architectural Review Board to further review the subject application in an attempt to mitigate the non-compliant components of the project. At the meeting, it was agreed that the applicant would replace the two vinyl windows on the façade, along with the first two windows (from east to west) on the south elevation, with custom aluminum-clad nine-over-one windows from Ply Gem Windows, per the order form submitted with the original application.

### PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Tyler Pham was present to discuss the application. He gave an update to the application.

### BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Echols asked which Board members were part of the Design Review Committee. Mr. Blackwell responded that he and Ms. Maurin took part.

Ms. Echols asked Mr. Pham if he was amenable to the proposed modifications to the application. Mr. Pham replied that he was.

**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.

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

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

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

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

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:29 pm.

*These minutes were approved by the Architectural Review Board in their January 17, 2024 meeting.*