



Architectural Review Board Minutes

July 17, 2024 – 3:00 P.M.

ADMINISTRATIVE

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

1. Roll Call

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

Members Present: Cartledge Blackwell, Catarina Echols, Karrie Maurin, Stephen McNair, Cameron Pfeiffer-Traylor, and Jennifer Roselius. Abby Davis arrived at 3:08pm

Members Absent: Stephen Howle and Barja Wilson

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

2. Approval of Minutes from June 18, 2024

Jennifer Roselius moved to approve the minutes from the June 18, 2024 meeting.

The motion was seconded by Cartledge Blackwell and approved unanimously.

3. Approval of Mid-Month COAs granted by Staff

Cameron Pfeiffer-Traylor moved to approve the mid-month COAs granted by Staff.

Stephen McNair seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.

MID-MONTH APPROVALS - APPROVED

1. **Applicant:** Po Boy 911 LLC
Property Address: 65 S. Monterey Street
Issue Date: 06/11/2024
Project: Repair in-kind the north-facing double nine-over-one wood windows.
2. **Applicant:** DBK Incorporated
Property Address: 66 Houston Street
Issue Date: 06/12/2024
Project:
 1. Construct an open carport with attached storage room and patio with wood pergola.

2. Install a new concrete driveway.
 3. Repair existing picket fence in-kind.
 4. Install new picket gates to match the existing picket fence.
3. **Applicant:** David Cooner Roofing Company
Property Address: 1361 Brown Street
Issue Date: 06/12/2024
Project: Repair shingle roof around two chimneys, two turbines, and elsewhere where needed. Replacement shingles will match existing.
4. **Applicant:** Flippin' Renovations LLC
Property Address: 1013 Elmira Street
Issue Date: 06/14/2024
Project: Repaint exterior to match existing body and trim colors.
5. **Applicant:** Poplar Home Waterproofing
Property Address: 115 Providence Street
Issue Date: 06/14/2024
Project:
 1. Remove and replace the damaged portion of skirt board on north elevation, near northeast corner of the residence. Replacement board will match existing.
 2. Replace siding where needed at location of skirt board repair. Replacement siding will match existing.
 3. Repaint area of repair/replacement to match existing.
6. **Applicant:** Jeremy Phillip Wheeler d/b/a State Line Construction LLC
Property Address: 1626 Springhill Avenue
Issue Date: 06/14/2024
Project: Repairs to east elevation:
 1. Remove and replace 20 LF of 2x3 cedar window trim.
 2. Re-nail lap siding and replace any that requires replacement in the damaged area.
 3. Paint 100 SF of exterior wall to match existing.
7. **Applicant:** Ben M Radcliff Contractor Inc.
Property Address: 10 St. Emanuel Street
Issue Date: 06/14/2024
Project: Remove and replace plywood coverings to secure structure's openings.
8. **Applicant:** All Weather Roofing & Construction LLC
Property Address: 456 Michigan Avenue
Issue Date: 06/14/2024
Project: Remove existing asbestos roofing and reroof with shingles. Color: Thunderstorm Gray
9. **Applicant:** Hand Quality Roofs LLC
Property Address: 69 Bradford Avenue
Issue Date: 06/17/2024
Project: Reroof with shingles. Color: Gray
10. **Applicant:** James Saad
Property Address: 67 Bradford Avenue
Issue Date: 06/17/2024
Project:
 1. Remove non-historic temporary portable shed and debris from back yard.

2. Replace damaged and rotten trim (fascia, soffits, and vents) with fiber cement trim.
3. Paint existing doors and trim white.
4. Repair and re-glaze existing windows and replace broken glass.
5. Repair existing 6' privacy fence along north property line.
6. Install a new 6' wood privacy fence behind the front building plane.
7. Replace a 6' chain link fence that runs along the north property line to the west property line with a 48" wood picket fence.

11. **Applicant:** Green Valley Partners LLC
Property Address: 25 Macy Place
Issue Date: 06/18/2024
Project: Reroof with shingles. Color: Driftwood
12. **Applicant:** QPI Services Inc.
Property Address: 1312 Dauphin Street
Issue Date: 06/20/2024
Project:
 1. Reroof with shingles. Color: Royal Slate
 2. Replace rot where needed on trim, porch, and siding. Replacement materials will match existing.
13. **Applicant:** 165 Dauphin LP
Property Address: 165 Dauphin Street
Issue Date: 06/20/2024
Project: Remove damaged plywood panels and replace them with new to secure building.
14. **Applicant:** Bowmar Construction LLC
Property Address: 261 Rapier Avenue
Issue Date: 06/21/2024
Project:
 1. Enclose porch on non-historic rear addition with wood siding and trim to match existing. Install reclaimed eight-light French door on the west elevation of enclosed porch. Install five (5) wood steps to access French doors. Installing a 7'0" wide shingled awning above Shingles would match existing roof shingles.
 2. Replace framed wood lattice foundation infill panels on south and west elevation of rear addition to match existing.
 3. Raise bottom sashes on two (2) one-over-one kitchen windows located on the west (rear) end of the north elevation. Install wood lap siding to match existing in resulting opening. Window sashes will remain operable.
15. **Applicant:** Laura Addington
Property Address: 154 Macy Place
Issue Date: 06/21/2024
Project:
 1. Repair and replace brick foundation skirting where needed.
 2. Repaint foundation skirting to match existing color.
 3. Screen in northwest corner of porch. The screen will be framed with wood. Install a wood-framed screen door to access the porch.
16. **Applicant:** All Weather Roofing & Construction LLC
Property Address: 1106 Montauk Street
Issue Date: 06/21/2024

- Project:** Reroof with shingles. Color: Pewter
17. **Applicant:** Howard Stallworth
Property Address: 955 Selma Street
Issue Date: 06/24/2024
Project: 1. Construct 10'x15' deck with two sets of steps on either side with rails, 3 steps each, at rear of house.
2. Paint exterior siding gray (Sherwin Williams Intellectual or Agreeable Gray); trim: eggshell white
18. **Applicant:** Sharee Brouard
Property Address: 1611 Government Street
Issue Date: 06/25/2024
Project: 1. In-kind replacement of three (3) non-historic metal two-lite slider windows on non-historic rear elevation.
2. Repair wood windowsill below replaced windows.
19. **Applicant:** Tuff Shed Inc.
Property Address: 154 S. Monterey Street
Issue Date: 06/25/2024
Project: Install a 6'x10' engineered wood shed to the west (rear) of the house. The roof will be clad in shingles.
a. Engineered wood double doors, each measuring 3'-0"x6'-0", will be centered on the south elevation.
b. A single engineered wood horizontal sliding window, measuring 2'-0"x2'-0", will be centered on the east elevation.
c. The structure will partially sit on an existing concrete slab.
20. **Applicant:** Margaret Stone
Property Address: 107 Houston Street
Issue Date: 06/28/2024
Project: Reroof in kind with asphalt shingles. Color: Dark gray
21. **Applicant:** Stacy Pritchard d/b/a SL Pritchard Home Improvement
Property Address: 310 N. Joachim Street
Issue Date: 07/01/2024
Project: Reroof in kind with shingles. Color: Weathered Wood
22. **Applicant:** Philip Smith
Property Address: 603 Church Street
Issue Date: 07/02/2024
Project: Repair damaged exterior woodwork with like materials. Prepare and paint all woodwork using following colors: Body -SW 6555 Enchant; Trim- SW 7006 Extra White; Doors - SW 6909 Lemon Twist; Front porch floor and steps - SW 7019 Gauntlet Gray; Porch ceiling - SW 9054 Little Boy Blu; Rear porch floor and steps, deck, and exterior shutters - SW 28218 Renwick Heather. Garage exterior: North (primary) façade and adjoining fence - SW2818 Renwick Heather; South, east, and west elevations - SW 6555 Enchant
23. **Applicant:** Presley Roofing & Construction Inc.
Property Address: 1755 Hunter Avenue
Issue Date: 07/02/2024
Project: Reroof in kind with shingles in Rustic Black color.

24. **Applicant:** Richard Collum
Property Address: 259 S. Broad Street Unit A
Issue Date: 07/02/2024
Project: Reroof in kind with shingles in Charcoal color.
25. **Applicant:** Mobile Bay Roofing LLC
Property Address: 14 S. Pine Street
Issue Date: 07/03/2024
Project: Reroof in kind with shingles in Summit Grey color.
26. **Applicant:** Michael Purvis Construction Inc.
Property Address: 1002 Dauphin Street
Issue Date: 07/03/2024
Project: Remove rotten areas of wood porch decking. Replace with tongue-and-groove wood decking to match existing. Paint new boards to match existing.
27. **Applicant:** Grayson Air Conditioning Inc.
Property Address: 65 S. Monterey Street
Issue Date: 07/03/2024
Project: Replace in-kind furnace, evaporator, duct system, and related equipment.
28. **Applicant:** Mack Lewis Contractor LLC
Property Address: 32 S. Lafayette Street
Issue Date: 07/03/2024
Project:
 1. Replace three (3) non-historic windows on the north end of the rear (west) elevation with two (2) 4'-2"x6'-4" two-over-two aluminum-clad windows and one (1) 4'-2"x2'-4" two-sash aluminum-clad casement window. All windows will fit existing openings.
 2. Replace the non-historic casement window in southern bay of rear (west) elevation with aluminum-clad casement window with fixed transom to fit existing opening.
 3. Replace the 15-light rear door on rear elevation with single-light aluminum-clad door.

APPLICATIONS

1. 2024-33-CA

Address: 105 N. Hallett Street
Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Applicant / Agent: Shandton Williams on behalf of Cynthia Williams
Project: Extend and modify existing attached carport
APPROVED - **CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

2. 2024-34-CA

Address: 205 Congress Street
Historic District: DeTonti Square
Applicant / Agent: Douglas Kearley on behalf of Derek Norman
Project: Completion of porch at SW corner to match porch at SE corner. Remove window

at rear conservatory. Add new wood door and transom to match existing.

APPROVED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

3. 2024-35-CA

Address: 105, 107, and 109 S. Jefferson Street
Historic District: Church Street East
Applicant / Agent: Figures Investment, Inc.
Project: New construction: three (3) two-story townhouses

WITHDRAWN - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

4. 2024-25-CA

Address: 406 Wisconsin Avenue
Historic District: Leinkauf
Applicant / Agent: Baumgardner House Raising, LLC d/b/a BHL Federal, LLC
Project: Demolition of 1-story frame house. New construction: 1-story single-family Residence

TABLED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

5. 2024-36-CA

Address: 102 Gilbert Street
Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Applicant / Agent: 1818 Design, LLC
Project: Paint brick exterior. Replace all windows with aluminum-clad sashes.

APPROVED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

6. 2024-37-CA

Address: 962 Dauphin Street
Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Applicant / Agent: Chad E. Foster
Project: Reroof with Gavalume 26g Tuff Rib metal panels.

DEFERRED TO AUGUST 7TH MEETING - APPLICANT NOT PRESENT

7. 2024-38-CA

Address: 157 Dauphin Street
Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street Commercial
Applicant / Agent: Carlos Gant
Project: Amend previously approved COA to allow fenestration change.

APPROVED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

OTHER BUSINESS

1. The next ARB meeting will be held on Wednesday, August 7, 2024.



Agenda Item #1

Application 2024-33-CA

DETAILS

Location:

105 N. Hallett Street

Summary of Request:

Extend and modify existing attached carport

Applicant (as applicable):

Shandton Williams on behalf of Cynthia Williams

Property Owner:

Cynthia Williams

Historic District:

Old Dauphin Way

Classification:

Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The existing carport is attached to the north elevation of the historic residence and is considered a non-historic addition.
- The proposed extension to the west would double the depth of the carport from 22'-0" to 44'-0". The width would remain the same.
- All proposed materials comply with the *Guidelines* and meet the requirements of Staff level review.

Report Contents:

Property and Application History 2

Scope of Work 2

Applicable Standards 2

Staff Analysis 2

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 20th-century apartments.”

The property at 105 N. Hallett Street is a one-and-a-half-story frame Craftsman bungalow with a full-width brick front porch. The form represented at the property on the 1925 Sanborn Map matches that of the extant structure. The 1904 Sanborn shows a one-story shotgun form building, which was removed prior to 1925. The given evidence suggests a c.1920 construction date for the current structure. A 22'-0" shed roof carport structure was constructed along the south elevation across the driveway at an unknown date. The Historic Development property files do not contain a record of when this alteration occurred, which may have been before Old Dauphin Way became a historic district. Aerial photography does not give a clear indication, but it appears to have been present at least as far back as 2009.

According to Historic Development records, this property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board (ARB).

SCOPE OF WORK

Extend and alter existing carport.

- a. An addition which matches the existing carport would extend to the west and would measure 10'-0" wide by 22'-0" deep, adding 220sf to the existing carport, for a total of 440sf.
- b. A new metal or shingle shed roof would replace the existing and extend over the addition.
- c. The five (5) existing wood posts would be replaced, and seven (7) additional posts would be installed to support the new roof extension. Posts would measure 4'x4".
- d. The ceiling height would measure 8'-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.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The subject property is a contributing property in the Old Dauphin Way historic district. The application under review seeks approval to extend the existing 22'-0" carport to the west by 22'-0" feet. Because the existing carport is attached to the historic residence, the proposed work is considered an addition. The *Guidelines* specify that an addition sit to the rear or the side of the historic structure. The location of this addition, on the south side of the house, would conform to this guideline. (6.9) In regard to massing and scale, the proposed addition would sit lower to the historic structure. Additionally, the carport's open construction and 440sf extended footprint would remain inferior in scale and massing to the approximately 2200 sf home. (6.10)

All materials proposed for the extension of the carport and for repairs to the existing comply with the *Guidelines* and meet the requirements of Staff level review.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Williams, the applicant, was not able to be present. He was available by phone to answer any questions from the Board. Ms. Allen gave a summary of the project.

No one from the public came forward to speak for or against the application, and no written comments were received

BOARD DISCUSSION

Catarina Echols stated that the project was very straightforward.

Cartledge Blackwell agreed, noting that it was also reversible.

FINDING FACTS

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

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

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



Agenda Item #2

Application 2024-34-CA

DETAILS

Location:

205 Congress Street

Summary of Request:

Completion of porch at SW corner to match porch at SE corner. Remove window at rear conservatory. Add new wood door and transom to match existing.

Applicant (as applicable):

Douglas Kearley

Property Owner:

Derek Norman

Historic District:

DeTonti Square

Classification:

Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The subject structure historically consisted of a full-width rear porch, which has been significantly altered.
- The proposed porch plan would match the existing east portion of the rear porch and adhere to all *Guidelines* regarding porch design and replacement.
- Proposed window removal, new wood door and transom, fence repairs, and installations comply with the *Guidelines* and meet the requirements of Staff level review.

Report Contents:

Property and Application History 2

Scope of Work 2

Applicable Standards 2

Staff Analysis 3

Attachments 4

PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

DeTonti Square Historic District was initially listed in the National Register in 1972 under Criterion A for social and urban planning significance and Criterion C for significant architecture. The district was one of two historic districts created by a municipal ordinance in 1962 in an effort to halt the rapid demolition of historic buildings near the city's central business district. The district, named for the French explorer Henri DeTonti, contains a few structures surviving from the 1830s, but the majority were built in the 1850s as residences of the wealthy and influential cotton factors, merchants, and planters.

The structure at 205 Congress Street is a frame five-bay central hall raised cottage with a full-width front porch. This house originally sat at the southwest corner of St. Anthony and N. Hamilton streets (orientated to St. Anthony Street), where it was constructed c. 1886. Its representation on the 1891 Sanborn Map shows a rear projecting wing on the east end of the south elevation. The structure was moved to its current location in 1985. In 1986, the structure underwent an extensive restoration project. At this time, physical evidence was found to indicate that the rear projecting wing was not original to the house, which originally had a full-width open rear porch similar to that on the front. During the renovation, the rear wing was removed and a glass vestibule housing a spiral staircase was added to the center of the rear elevation. The open porch was rebuilt to the east of the vestibule, supported by columns modeled from those on the front porch. The porch floor to the west of the vestibule was eliminated, but the columns were retained.

According to Historic Development vertical files, this property appeared before the Architectural Review Board in 1986, when plans for the restoration of the property were approved.

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Rebuild rear porch on southwest corner of the house.
 - a. Install wood porch floor framing and decking to match existing porch on the southeast end of the structure.
 - b. Construct wood inset stairs and railing to match the existing staircase on the front porch. The stairs would rise from west to east against the southwest exterior end-wall of the house. Steps would measure 38" wide. The handrail would measure approximately 36" high.
 - c. Install a new wood handrail to enclose the porch. The handrail would match existing in materials, style, and dimensions.
 - d. Repair existing brick piers.
 - e. Install framed wood lattice infill panels between piers where needed to match existing.
 - f. Remove transom and cut down door on the lower west elevation of the glass vestibule to accommodate the porch floor. Fill opening with new wood siding to match that on the structure.
 - g. Remove second window (from the west) on the rear elevation and replace it with a new wood panel door and transom to match the existing door and transom on the east side of the vestibule. The door and transom would measure 3'-0" wide by 10'-0" high.
2. Repair existing brick wall to the west of the structure.
3. Install brick and iron fence on east property line which matches existing fence along west property line.
4. Install 6' wood privacy fence along south property line.

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

1. **6.5** Repair a porch in a way that maintains the original character.
2. **6.6** If replacement is required, design it to reflect the time period of the historic structure.
 - Replace a historic porch element to match the original.
 - Use replacement materials and elements that are appropriate to the style, texture, finish, composition and proportion of the historic structure.
 - Where an original porch is missing entirely, base a replacement porch on physical or photographic evidence. If no evidence exists, draw from similar structures in the neighborhood.
 - Match the balustrade of a historic porch to the design and materials of the porch.
 - When reconstructing a porch, pay particular attention to matching the handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions and decorative details.
 - Do not completely replace an entire porch or element unless absolutely necessary. Only replace the element or portion of an element that requires replacement.
 - Do not use cast-iron columns or railing where no evidence exists that these elements were used historically.
 - Do not use a brick base for a wood column (exception is Craftsman styles).
 - Do not use a railing that is too elaborate for the building (of a different style).

STAFF ANALYSIS

The subject property is a contributing structure to the DeTonti Square Historic District. The application under review proposes rebuilding the west portion of the rear porch. As stated above, the structure originally had a full-width porch on the rear (south) elevation. Extensive alterations were carried out on this elevation both early with the addition of a rear projection, and later after its relocation to 205 Congress, with the construction of a glass vestibule and the removal of the west portion of the porch decking to allow for access to a door under the floor level. There is little original fabric, if any, remaining of the original rear porch.

The proposed plan to rebuild the porch deck, railing, and inset stairs would match the design of both the east portion of the rear porch and the front porch, maintaining the structure's character and complying with the *Guidelines'* directive to design a replacement porch to echo that of the time period of the historic structure. (6.5, 6.6)

The proposed repairs to the existing brick wall, along with new fence installation comply with the *Guidelines* and meet the requirements of Staff level review.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Douglas Kearley was present to represent the application. He stated that the porch would be rebuilt to look like the existing porch on the east side of the rear elevation.

No one from the public came forward to speak for or against the application, and no written comments were received.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There were not questions or comments from the Board.

FINDING FACTS

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

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

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



Agenda Item # 3

Application 2024-35-CA

DETAILS

Location:

105, 107, and 109 S. Jefferson Street

Summary of Request:

New construction: three (3) two-story townhouses

Applicant (as applicable):

Jeff Carter on behalf of Figures Investment, Inc.

Property Owner:

Figures Investment, Inc.

Historic District:

Church Street East

Classification:

Vacant

Summary of Analysis:

- The subject block has seen significant demolition.
- All proposed materials are approved under the *Guidelines*.
- The proposed design reflects certain elements of nearby historic structures.
- The proposed foundation is slab-on-grade.
- All exterior lighting would be recessed and is not visible on the submitted elevations.
- No landscape plan was provided.

Report Contents:

Property and Application History 2

Scope of Work 2

Applicable Standards 4

Staff Analysis 7

Attachments 9

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 19th 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 properties at 105, 107, and 109 S. Jefferson are vacant lots and have not previously appeared before the ARB.

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Construct three (3) two-story townhouses.
 - a. The proposed structure would be rectangular in shape and would measure 62'-3" wide by 49'-0" deep. The height of the building to top of the roof would measure 28'-0", with second floor ceiling height from finished floor measuring 21'-0".
 - b. The structure would be located on the lot such that the front wall plane would sit 9'-0" back from the west (front) property line. The north and south side yards would measure approximately 7'-7" and 15'-10", respectively.
 - c. The façade would be articulated by three (3) gabled roof projections. The first story would be clad in a white brick veneer, the second story in stucco, painted white. A decorative brick string course comprising a soldier bond topped by a rowlock would run across all four elevations and serve to define the division between the first and second floors.
 - d. The hipped roof and projection gables would be clad in a shingle to look like slate, or shingles in the weather wood color.
 - e. The foundation would be slab on grade and would measure 1'-4" high.
 - f. Fenestration: All windows would be aluminum clad and black in color. Each door would be a black iron six-light pane-and-panel design and would measure 3'-0" wide by 7'-0" high.
 - g. Elevations would appear as follows.
 - 1) West façade (from north to south)
Each townhouse would consist of two bays. The north entry bay would measure approximately 6'-0" wide, and the wider south bay would measure approximately 15'-0" wide, and project approximately 3'-8" forward of the north bay.
North bay – The first floor would consist of a 3'-0" wide by 7'-0" high iron entry door topped by a 1'-6" one-light transom. Three (3) 5'-6" concrete steps would access each door. A 6'-0" wide black metal awning would stretch the full width of the bay above the entry door. The second floor would consist of a single round four-light window, 2'-0" in diameter, with a 4" wood trim, centered on the bay.
South bay – The first floor would consist of three six-light casement windows measuring 9'-0" wide by 8'-8" high, centered on the bay. The second floor would consist of three two-over-two windows measuring 9'-0" wide by 5'-9" high, centered on the bay.
 - 2) East (rear) elevation (from south to north)

First floor – Door under awning, topped by transom and accessed by three (3) concrete steps measuring 5'-6" wide; paired two-over-two windows measuring 8'-0" wide by 6'-0" high; door under awning, topped by transom and accessed by three (3) concrete steps measuring 5'-6" wide; paired two-over-two windows measuring 8'-0" wide by 6'-0" high; paired two-over-two windows measuring 8'-0" wide by 6'-0" high; door under awning, topped by transom and accessed by three (3) concrete steps measuring 5'-6" wide.

Second floor – Two (2) two-over-two windows measuring 3'-0" wide by 5'-9" high, each pair equally spaced on the south, center, and north bay.

3) North elevation (from east to west)

First floor – two pairs of six-light windows measuring 6'-0" side by 8'-6" high, regularly spaced along the east two-thirds of the elevation.

Second floor – Two (2) one-light fixed windows measuring 4'-0" wide by 1'-4" high, regularly spaced slightly west of center on the elevation.

4) South elevation (from west to east)

First floor – two pairs of six-light windows measuring 6'-0" wide by 8'-6" high, regularly spaced along the east two-thirds of the elevation.

Second floor – Two (2) one-light fixed windows measuring 4'-0" wide by 1'-4" high, regularly spaced slightly west of center on the elevation.

2. Proposed site improvements:

- a. Install a 10'-0" wide rock aggregate driveway south of the proposed structure, in line with existing curb cut. The driveway would extend east to the rear of the property.
- b. Install a rear paved parking area behind the structure. The paved area would encompass the entire open area behind the structure, measuring approximately 81'-6" wide by 37'-0" deep. Five (5) 10'-0" wide parking spaces orientated east to west would be located directly adjacent to the building's rear elevation.
- c. Three (3) walkways measuring 4'-6" (1) and 4'-11 1/2" wide would connect the front door steps to the existing sidewalk. In addition, three (3) similar walkways would connect the back door steps to the rear parking area.

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

1. **6.34** Maintain the visual line created by the fronts of buildings along a street.
 - Where front yard setbacks are uniform, place a new structure in general alignment with its neighbors.
 - Where front yard setbacks vary, place a new structure within the established range of front yard setbacks on a block.
2. **6.35** Maintain the side yard spacing pattern on the block.
 - Locate a structure to preserve the side yard spacing pattern on the block as seen from the street.
 - Provide sufficient side setbacks for property maintenance.
 - Provide sufficient side setbacks to allow needed parking to occur behind the front wall of the house.
3. **6.36** Design the massing of new construction to appear similar to that of historic buildings in the district.
 - Choose the massing and shape of the new structure to maintain a rhythm of massing along the street.

- Match the proportions of the front elevations of a new structure with those in the surrounding district.
4. **6.37** Design the scale of new construction to appear similar to that of historic buildings in the district.
 - Use a building height in front that is compatible with adjacent contributing properties.
 - Size foundation and floor heights to appear similar to those of nearby historic buildings
 - Match the scale of a porch to the main building and reflect the scale of porches of nearby historic buildings.
 5. **6.38** Design exterior building walls to reflect traditional development patterns of nearby historic buildings.
 - Use a ratio of solid to void that is similar in proportion to those of nearby historic buildings.
 - Reflect the rhythm of windows and doors in a similar fashion on all exterior building walls. The ARB will consider all building walls; however, building walls facing streets may face increased scrutiny.
 - Use steps and balustrades in a similar fashion as nearby historic structures.
 - Design building elements on exterior building walls to be compatible with those on nearby historic buildings. These elements include, but are not limited to:
 - Balconies
 - Chimneys
 - Dormers
 6. **6.39** Use exterior materials and finishes that complement the character of the surrounding district.
 - Use material, ornamentation or a color scheme that blends with the historic district rather than making the building stand out.
 - If an alternative material is used that represents an evolution of a traditional material, suggest the finish of the original historic material from which it evolved.
 - Use a material with proven durability in the Mobile climate and that is similar in scale, character and finish to those used on nearby historic buildings.

ACCEPTABLE MATERIALS

Materials that are compatible in character, scale, and finish to those used on nearby historic buildings are acceptable. These often include:

- Stucco
- Brick
- Stone
- Wood (lap siding, shingles, board and batten)
- Concrete siding
- Cement fiber board siding
- Skim stucco coat

UNACCEPTABLE MATERIALS

Materials that are incompatible in character, scale and finish to those used on nearby historic buildings are unacceptable. These often include:

- Metal siding
- Vinyl siding
- Unfinished concrete block
- Plywood
- Masonite
- Vinyl coatings
- Ceramic coatings

- Exterior insulation and finishing system (EIFS) wall systems
7. **6.40** Design a roof on new construction to be compatible with those on adjacent historic buildings.
- Design the roof shape, height, pitch, and overall complexity to be similar to those on nearby historic buildings.
 - Use materials that appear similar in character, scale, texture, and color range to those on nearby historic buildings.
 - New materials that have proven durability may be used.

ACCEPTABLE ROOF MATERIALS

Materials that are similar in character, scale, texture, and color range to those used on nearby historic buildings are acceptable. These often include:

- Asphalt dimensional or multi-tab shingles
 - Wood shake or shingle
 - Standing seam metal
 - Metal shingles
 - 5-V crimp metal
 - Clay tile
 - Imitation clay tile or slate
8. **6.41** Design a new door and doorway on new construction to be compatible with the historic district.
- Place and size a door to establish a solid-to-void ratio similar to that of nearby historic buildings.
 - Place a door in a fashion that contributes to the traditional rhythm of the district as seen in nearby historic buildings.
 - Incorporate a door casement and trim similar to those seen on nearby historic buildings.
 - Place and size a special feature, including a transom, sidelight or decorative framing element, to complement those seen in nearby historic buildings.
 - Use a door material that blends well with surrounding historic buildings. Wood is preferred. Paneled doors with or without glass are generally appropriate.
9. **6.43** Design piers, a foundation and foundation infill to be compatible with those of nearby historic properties.
- Use raised, pier foundations.
 - If raised foundations are not feasible, use a simulated raised foundation.
 - Do not use slab-on-grade construction. This is not appropriate for Mobile's historic neighborhoods. If a raised slab is required, use water tables, exaggerated bases, faux piers or other methods to simulate a raised foundation.
 - Do not use raw concrete block or exposed slabs.
 - If foundation infill must be used, ensure that it is compatible with the neighborhood.
 - If solid infill is used, recess it and screen it with landscaping.
 - If lattice is used, hang it below the floor framing and between the piers. Finish it with trim.
 - Do not secure lattice to the face of the building or foundation.
 - Do not use landscaping to disguise inappropriate foundation design.

ACCEPTABLE FOUNDATION MATERIALS

Materials that are similar in character, texture and durability to those used on nearby historic buildings are acceptable. These often include:

- Brick piers

- Brick infill
- Wood (vertical pickets)
- Framed lattice infill

UNACCEPTABLE FOUNDATION MATERIALS

Materials that are not similar in character, texture, and durability to those used on nearby historic buildings are unacceptable. These often include:

Mineral board panels

Concrete block infill

- Metal infill
- Plywood panel infill
- Plastic sheeting infill
- Vinyl sheeting infill

10. **6.44** Use details and ornamentation that help new construction integrate with the historic buildings in the district.
- Use a decorative detail in a manner similar to those on nearby historic buildings. A modern interpretation of a historic detail or decoration is encouraged.
 - Do not use a decorative detail that overpowers or negatively impacts nearby historic buildings.
11. **6.45** Locate and design windows to be compatible with those in the district.
- Locate and size a window to create a solid-to-void ratio similar to the ratios seen on nearby historic buildings.
 - Locate a window to create a traditional rhythm and a proportion of openings similar to that seen in nearby historic buildings.
 - Use a traditional window casement and trim similar to those seen in nearby historic buildings.
 - Place a window to match the height of the front doorway.
 - Place a window so that there is proportionate space between the window and the floor level.
 - Do not place a window to directly abut the fascia of a building.
 - Use a window material that is compatible with other building materials.
 - Do not use a reflective or tinted glass window.
 - Use a 1/1 window instead of window with false muntins. A double paned window may be acceptable if the interior dividers and dimensional muntins are used on multi-light windows. A double paned 1/1 window is acceptable.
 - Do not use false, interior muntins except as stated above.
 - Recess window openings on masonry buildings.
 - Use a window opening with a raised surround on a wood frame building.

ACCEPTABLE WINDOW MATERIALS

Materials that are similar in character, profile, finish and durability to those used on nearby historic buildings are acceptable. These often include:

- Wood
- Vinyl-clad wood
- Aluminum-clad customized wood
- Extruded Aluminum

UNACCEPTABLE WINDOW MATERIALS

Materials that are not similar in character, profile, finish and durability to those used on nearby historic buildings are unacceptable. These often include:

- Mill finish metal windows
- Snap-in or artificial muntins

- Vinyl
12. **10.5** Visually connect the street and building.
 - Maintain or install a walkway leading directly from the sidewalk to the main building entry.
 13. **10.7** Minimize the visual impact of parking.
 - Locate a parking area at the rear or to the side of a site whenever possible.
 - Use landscaping to screen a parking area.
 - Minimize the widths of a paved area or a curb cut.
 - If a curb cut is no longer in use, repair the curb. In some areas, granite curbs may be required.
 - Do not use paving in the front yard for a parking area. Paving stones might be acceptable in certain instances. Do not create a new driveway or garage that opens onto a primary street.
 - Do not create a new driveway or garage that opens onto a primary street.
 14. **10.10** Provide a landscaped front yard for a residential property in a historic district.
 - Maintain a predominant appearance of a planted front yard/lawn.
 - Minimize paved areas in a front yard.
 - Consider using decorative modular pavers, grass and cellular paving systems in order to minimize the impact of hard surface paving where grass or other plant materials are not used.
 - In commercial areas, consider using landscaping to screen and soften the appearance of surface parking areas. Use an internal and perimeter landscaping treatment to screen a fenced or walled parking area.
 - Do not use landscaping to hide a design feature that is inconsistent with these Design Review Guidelines.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The subject properties are vacant lots in the Church Street East historic district. The application under review seeks approval for the construction of three two-story townhouses.

The *Guidelines* state that a new structure should maintain the alignment with the established range of front and side setbacks on the street. This block of S. Jefferson Street has witnessed widespread demolition resulting in the loss of all residential structures previously extant on both the east and west sides of the street. Therefore, there is no established range of setbacks. However, the proposed placement does fall into the setback ranges of existing historic residences along S. Jefferson, one block south below Church Street. Here, front setbacks range between approximately 4'-0" to 12"-0". Side setbacks are also similar to those proposed. Additionally, the proposed setbacks are comparable to those of the remaining historic structures on adjacent lots facing S. Bayou Street. (6.34, 6.35)

The massing of the proposed building – which according to the *Guidelines*, is established by the arrangement and proportion of a building's main block, wings, porches, roof, and foundation – is somewhat out of step with the rhythm of the massing of nearby buildings. The steeply pitched roof and the lower foundation height are visually out of proportion with neighboring historic two-story residences. The scale or size of the building appears compatible with the surrounding structures. (6.36, 6.37)

In regard to the new building's exterior walls and fenestration application, the solid to void pattern present on the façade serves to reflect the traditional patterns of nearby historic buildings. Likewise, the façade's rhythm of windows and doors echoes the fenestration pattern at nearby 803 Government in particular – also a multifamily residence. The use of a door and window pairing on the first floor and the grouping of three windows on the second floor resemble 803 Government's first floor façade and its three-part bay windows on the second floor. The longer multi-light windows planned for the first floor are suggestive of the multi-light sidelights at 106 and 110 S. Bayou, 805 Government, and of the storefront doors at 809 Government. In line with the *Guidelines*, the use of the round window above each entry door on the second floor at 105-109 S Jefferson reads as a modern interpretation of the quatrefoil element at 803 Government, along with the small one-over-one window used in 803's stair halls. Although the rear and side elevations of the proposed structure express a similar fenestration pattern as those seen on nearby buildings, with multi-light windows and pane-and-panel doors, the walls themselves present as flat surfaces, lacking the dimensionality of the side and rear elevations of surrounding historic structures which consist of projections, recesses, and decorative lintels and sills. Also conspicuous is the lack of building elements, or suggestions of elements, that are seen on nearby buildings such as balconies, porches, columns, and chimneys. The application of details such as lintels, awnings, a string course, and transoms would help to integrate the new construction design with the character of the district. (6.38, 3.41, 6.45)

The brick and stucco cladding planned for the exterior of the building are common materials traditionally used in the surrounding district and throughout Mobile. However, historically brick would not have been painted. The proposed white paint finish on the brick veneer is not a traditional use of the material or finish. (6.39)

According to the *Guidelines*, the shape, height, pitch and complexity of a new roof should be comparable to those of adjacent historic structures. Hipped roofs are traditionally used throughout the district and are present on adjacent structures such as those at 110 and 106 S. Bayou. The pitches of these historic roofs are lower than the one proposed for the subject building. The combination of a hipped roof with gabled projections can be seen at the previously mentioned 803 Government. However, the main roofline of this historic building has a slighter pitch which sits lower than the gabled projections. This arrangement may be a more appropriate option for the subject design. (6.40)

The submitted drawings express a 1'-4" slab-on-grade foundation. The *Guidelines* state that a raised foundation or simulated raised foundation are to be used for new residential construction in historic districts. The proposed foundation does not appear to conform to traditional residential building practices in the immediate vicinity. A modest modification in height and the application of a simulated water table to simulate a raised foundation would create a more compatible design. (6.43)

The drawings propose three concrete walkways projecting from the west elevation, each of which would lead from the front entry door to the existing sidewalk on S. Jefferson Street, complying with the *Guidelines'* requirement to visually connect a structure to the street. A 10'-0" wide driveway which would lead to a rear parking area is planned for the south end of the property. Both would be paved with rock aggregate. Directing parking to the side and rear of the site conforms with the *Guidelines'* standard to minimize the visual impact of parking. All exterior lighting would be recessed and are not visible on the submitted drawings. The *Guidelines* require a landscaped front yard for residential properties in historic districts. No landscape plan was provided. (10.5, 10.7, 10.10)

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Jeff Carter from Figures Investment and Mr. Carlos Gant, architect, were present to discuss the application. Mr. Carter gave an overview of the project.

No one from the public came forward to speak for or against the application, and no written comments were received.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. McNair questioned the decision process regarding the details and materials proposed for the building. Mr. Gant replied that the materials were the client's choices, further explaining that the proportions of the windows are taller on the first floor than those on the second, which is typical of the historic districts. He added that the porches were elevated to be compatible with the district, but not high enough to require railings.

Ms. Roselius asked if the proposed windows were one-over-one. Mr. Carter replied that the windows would be two-over-two.

Mr. McNair asked if the windows would be operable. Mr. Gant stated that they would.

Mr. McNair asked for an explanation of the site plan and the placement of the building on the lot. Mr. Gant explained that the minimum setback on Jefferson Street has been met; that the building had been moved northward on the lot just enough for a 10'-0" driveway to be installed on the south, aligned with an additional curb cut; and all parking would be at the rear of the building, adding that crushed aggregate would be used for the drive and parking area. He added that the bricks intended for the building would be white washed, with stucco cladding the second story, and the trim would be black.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor asked the applicant if one wall treatment had been considered; noting that two wall treatments is not a traditional cladding method for building exteriors and that all brick would be better.

Ms. Davis agreed and added that the brick should not be painted.

Ms. Echols asked if downspouts and gutters are included in the plans. Mr. Gant replied that they would be part of the plans and would predominantly be located to the rear. He added that these featured could be presented to Staff.

Mr. McNair asked about exterior lighting. Mr. Gant replied that all exterior lighting would be installed under the soffits on the porches; that he was not sure about lighting on the site. He stated that it could be integrated into the landscape plan.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor asked about lighting for the parking lot. Mr. Gant explained that the parking lot size is not large enough to require lighting; that there would be lighting on the rear elevation.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor asked about a landscape plan. Mr. Gant stated that a landscape plan had not been completed yet.

Ms. Echols noted that the roof overhand seemed shallow and stated that extending them would be beneficial to protect the building. Mr. Gant stated that extending the overhangs would encroach on the adjacent lot.

Ms. Davis noted that the roof was very large and asked if there was an interior plan requiring that the roof be so massive. Mr. Gant replied that there was not.

Ms. Davis continued that that the massing was very top-heavy as the building sits not far off grade and stated that these are not typical proportions. She suggested simulating a raised foundation with a rowlock, which would help with heights and proportions.

Ms. Roselius added that lowering the roof would further help resolve the massing issues. Mr. Carter stated that the design was shared with the neighbors, who were in favor.

Ms. Roselius applauded the applicant's effort to add new residential construction to the area, but noted that some changes needed to be made to the proposed design before a COA could be approved.

Mr. McNair asked the applicants if they would be amenable to a design review committee. Mr. Gant and Mr. Carter stated that they would.

Mr. Blackwell stated that one wall material and lowering the roof height would go a long way to bringing the project into compliance.

Mr. Carter commented on project timelines, stating that the most efficient way to get the design approved would be preferred.

Ms. Roselius asked the applicants if they would prefer to make the suggested changes and resubmit plans to the Board. Mr. Gant replied that this would be preferable and withdrew the application.



Agenda Item #4 Application 2024-25-CA

DETAILS

Location:

406 Wisconsin Avenue

Summary of Request:

Demolish existing one-story frame single-family residence. New Construction: Construct one-story frame single-family residence.

Applicant (as applicable):

Baumgardner House Raising, LLC,
d/b/a BHL Federal, LLC

Property Owner:

Essie Etheridge

Historic District:

Leinkauf

Classification:

Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The extant structure does not appear to be structurally compromised.
- The proposed new construction is of similar size and form of the existing.
- The proposed new construction design incorporates elements that echo those of the original structure.
- The materials proposed for the new structure are compliant with the design guidelines for new construction.

Report Contents:

Property and Application History	2
Scope of Work.....	2
Applicable Standards	3
Staff Analysis	7
Attachments	9

PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

Leinkauf Historic District was initially listed in the National Register in 1987 under Criteria A and C for significant architecture and community planning; the district was expanded in 2009. The neighborhood was settled in the early 20th century as a streetcar suburb adjacent to Government Street and surrounding Leinkauf School (1904). Housing forms and styles in the district reflect the range of styles and forms popular from 1900 through 1955.

The property at 406 Wisconsin Avenue is a single-story wood-frame bungalow with a jerkinhead roof and a full-width porch across its primary (east) elevation. This section of Wisconsin Avenue was first platted in 1922, and Wisconsin Avenue is not listed in City Directories prior to 1924. The 1924 City Directory lists Edward Balzli as residing at 406 Wisconsin Avenue, and the 1925 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map shows a property with a similar footprint to the extant residence in the same location. An estimated construction date of 1924 is therefore appropriate for the residence. Stylistic evidence further supports a construction date of 1924, given the heavy square porch columns, exposed rafter ends, and the paired three-over-one windows, all of which are typical of modest dwellings of the early 1920s.

This property appeared before the Architectural Review Board (ARB) in May 2024 with the same application, to demolish the existing structure and construct a new single-family residence. The application was tabled with the provision that the applicant further consult with Historic Development staff to alter the design of the new construction to be more compatible with the historic character of the neighborhood and district.

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Demolish existing house.
2. Construct a single-family one-story residence.
 - a. The new structure would be oriented on the lot such that the front setback from the ROW on Wisconsin Avenue would measure 25'-2". Side yard setbacks on the north and south would measure 7'-2" and 14'-0" respectively.
 - b. The proposed one-story, three-bay dwelling would be rectangular in shape and would measure approximately 28'-10" wide by 52'-3" deep for a total of 1507 sf.
 - c. The structure would be topped by a gable/hipped roof with a full-width front porch under the gable. The roof structure would be clad in architectural shingles.
 - d. The house would sit on a 1'-6" high foundation of brick piers. Recessed wood lattice panels would be used for infill on the north, south, and west elevations. Recessed brick infill would be installed across the east (front) elevation.
 - e. Fenestration would be comprised of 14 single-hung one-over-one vinyl-clad wood windows and two steel paneled entry doors.
 - f. Plate height from the finished floor would measure 9'-0", with a roof ridge height of 17'-2 ½".
 - g. The house would be clad in fiber cement siding and trim.
 - h. A front porch would span the east façade. It would measure 28'-10" wide by 8'-3" deep and be supported by alternating paired and single wood square columns sitting on brick plinths. A brick knee wall would enclose the porch. Approximately five (5) brick steps would access the front porch, centered on the elevation. Wood handrails and brick cheek walls would flank either side of the steps.
 - i. A 10'-3" wide by 7'-0" deep recessed porch would be located on the south end of the west (rear) elevation. The porch would access a rear paneled entry door which would measure 3'-0" wide by 6'-8" high. The rear porch would be enclosed by a wood handrail and accessed by five (5) wood steps on the west.
 - j. Elevations would appear as follows:
East façade (from south to north)

Pair of one-over-one windows, each measuring 3'-0"x5'-0"; paneled door (sitting slightly south of center); pair of one-over-one windows, each measuring 3'-0"x5'-0".

West elevation (from north to south)

Corner board; one (1) one-over-one window measuring 3'-0"x3'-0"; corner board; one (1) one-over-one window measuring 3'-0" wide by 3'-0" high; square post.

North elevation (from east to west)

Side profile of brick cheek wall and wood handrail; corner board; one (1) one-over-one window measuring 3'-0"x5'-0"; one pair of one-over-one windows measuring 3'-0"x5'-0"; one (1) one-over-one window measuring 3'-0"x3'-0", somewhat regularly dispersed across the elevation; corner board

South elevation (from west to east)

Side profile of wood handrail; square post; six-paneled door; corner board; two (2) pairs of one-over-one windows, each measuring 3'-0"x5'-0", both located in the east half of the elevation; corner board; brick knee wall; brick plinth and wood column; side profile of brick cheek wall and wood handrail

3. Site improvements would include the following:
 - A 4'-0"-wide walkway would connect the sidewalk to the front porch steps. Just before the front porch steps, the walkway would widen to create a 5'-0"x5'-0" concrete pad.
 - Likewise, a 5'-0"x5'-0" concrete pad would also be installed at the base of the rear porch steps.
 - A 9'-0"-wide concrete driveway would replace the existing driveway on the south end of the lot. The driveway would widen to 12'-0" to match the width of the driveway apron.

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

1. **12.0** Demolition Guidelines
 - Consider the current significance of a structure previously determined to be historic.
 - Consider the condition of the structure in question. Demolition may be more appropriate when a building is deteriorated or in poor condition.
 - Consider whether the building is one of the last remaining positive examples of its kind in the neighborhood, county, or region.
 - 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.
 - Consider whether the building is part of an ensemble of historic buildings that create a neighborhood.
 - Consider the future utilization of the site.
 - If a development is proposed to replace a demolished historic structure, determine that the proposed replacement structure is consistent with the guidelines for new construction in historic districts.
2. **6.34** Maintain the visual line created by the fronts of buildings along a street.
 - Where front yard setbacks are uniform, place a new structure in general alignment with its neighbors.
 - Where front yard setbacks vary, place a new structure within the established range of front yard setbacks on a block.
3. **6.35** Maintain the side yard spacing pattern on the block.
 - Locate a structure to preserve the side yard spacing pattern on the block as seen from the street.
 - Provide sufficient side setbacks for property maintenance.

- Provide sufficient side setbacks to allow needed parking to occur behind the front wall of the house.
4. **6.36** Design the massing of new construction to appear similar to that of historic buildings in the district.
 - Choose the massing and shape of the new structure to maintain a rhythm of massing along the street.
 - Match the proportions of the front elevations of a new structure with those in the surrounding district.
 5. **6.37** Design the scale of new construction to appear similar to that of historic buildings in the district.
 - Use a building height in front that is compatible with adjacent contributing properties.
 - Size foundation and floor heights to appear similar to those of nearby historic buildings
 - Match the scale of a porch to the main building and reflect the scale of porches of nearby historic buildings.
 6. **6.38** Design exterior building walls to reflect traditional development patterns of nearby historic buildings.
 - Use a ratio of solid to void that is similar in proportion to those of nearby historic buildings.
 - Reflect the rhythm of windows and doors in a similar fashion on all exterior building walls. The ARB will consider all building walls; however, building walls facing streets may face increased scrutiny.
 - Use steps and balustrades in a similar fashion as nearby historic structures.
 - Design building elements on exterior building walls to be compatible with those on nearby historic buildings. These elements include, but are not limited to: • Balconies • Chimneys • Dormers
 7. **6.39** Use exterior materials and finishes that complement the character of the surrounding district.
 - Use material, ornamentation or a color scheme that blends with the historic district rather than making the building stand out.
 - If an alternative material is used that represents an evolution of a traditional material, suggest the finish of the original historic material from which it evolved.
 - Use a material with proven durability in the Mobile climate and that is similar in scale, character and finish to those used on nearby historic buildings.

ACCEPTABLE MATERIALS

Materials that are compatible in character, scale and finish to those used on nearby historic buildings are acceptable. These often include:

- Stucco
- Brick
- Stone
- Wood (lap siding, shingles, board and batten)
- Concrete siding
- Cement fiber board siding
- Skim stucco coat

UNACCEPTABLE MATERIALS

Materials that are incompatible in character, scale and finish to those used on nearby historic buildings are unacceptable. These often include:

- Metal siding
- Vinyl siding
- Unfinished concrete block
- Plywood
- Masonite
- Vinyl coatings
- Ceramic coatings

- Exterior insulation and finishing system (EIFS) wall systems
8. **6.40** Design a roof on new construction to be compatible with those on adjacent historic buildings.
- Design the roof shape, height, pitch and overall complexity to be similar to those on nearby historic buildings.
 - Use materials that appear similar in character, scale, texture and color range to those on nearby historic buildings.
 - New materials that have proven durability may be used.

ACCEPTABLE ROOF MATERIALS

Materials that are similar in character, scale, texture, and color range to those used on nearby historic buildings are acceptable. These often include:

- Asphalt dimensional or multi-tab shingles
 - Wood shake or shingle
 - Standing seam metal
 - Metal shingles
 - 5-V crimp metal
 - Clay tile
 - Imitation clay tile or slate
9. **6.41** Design a new door and doorway on new construction to be compatible with the historic district.
- Place and size a door to establish a solid-to-void ratio similar to that of nearby historic buildings.
 - Place a door in a fashion that contributes to the traditional rhythm of the district as seen in nearby historic buildings.
 - Incorporate a door casement and trim similar to those seen on nearby historic buildings.
 - Place and size a special feature, including a transom, sidelight or decorative framing element, to complement those seen in nearby historic buildings.
 - Use a door material that blends well with surrounding historic buildings. Wood is preferred. Paneled doors with or without glass are generally appropriate.
10. **6.42** Design a porch to be compatible with the neighborhood.
- Include a front porch as part of new construction if it is contextual and feasible.
 - When designing a porch, consider porch location, proportion, rhythm, roof form, supports, steps, balustrades and ornamentation relative to the main building and porches in the district.
 - Design the elements of a porch to be at a scale proportional to the main building.
 - Where a rhythm of porches exists on a street or block, design a porch that continues this historic rhythm.
 - Design a rear or side porch that is visible from the public right-of-way to be subordinate in character to the front porch.
11. **6.43** Design piers, a foundation and foundation infill to be compatible with those of nearby historic properties.
- Use raised, pier foundations.
 - If raised foundations are not feasible, use a simulated raised foundation.
 - Do not use slab-on-grade construction. This is not appropriate for Mobile's historic neighborhoods. If a raised slab is required, use water tables, exaggerated bases, faux piers or other methods to simulate a raised foundation.
 - Do not use raw concrete block or exposed slabs.
 - If foundation infill must be used, ensure that it is compatible with the neighborhood.
 - If solid infill is used, recess it and screen it with landscaping.
 - If lattice is used, hang it below the floor framing and between the piers. Finish it with trim.
 - Do not secure lattice to the face of the building or foundation.
 - Do not use landscaping to disguise inappropriate foundation design.

ACCEPTABLE FOUNDATION MATERIALS

Materials that are similar in character, texture and durability to those used on nearby historic buildings are acceptable. These often include:

- Brick piers
- Brick infill
- Wood (vertical pickets)
- Framed lattice infill

UNACCEPTABLE FOUNDATION MATERIALS

Materials that are not similar in character, texture and durability to those used on nearby historic buildings are unacceptable. These often include:

- Mineral board panels
- Concrete block infill
- Metal infill
- Plywood panel infill
- Plastic sheeting infill
- Vinyl sheeting infill

12. **6.44** Use details and ornamentation that help new construction integrate with the historic buildings in the district.
 - Use a decorative detail in a manner similar to those on nearby historic buildings. A modern interpretation of a historic detail or decoration is encouraged.
 - Do not use a decorative detail that overpowers or negatively impacts nearby historic buildings.
13. **6.45** Locate and design windows to be compatible with those in the district.
 - Locate and size a window to create a solid-to-void ratio similar to the ratios seen on nearby historic buildings.
 - Locate a window to create a traditional rhythm and a proportion of openings similar to that seen in nearby historic buildings.
 - Use a traditional window casement and trim similar to those seen in nearby historic buildings.
 - Place a window to match the height of the front doorway.
 - Place a window so that there is proportionate space between the window and the floor level.
 - Do not place a window to directly abut the fascia of a building.
 - Use a window material that is compatible with other building materials.
 - Do not use a reflective or tinted glass window.
 - Use a 1/1 window instead of window with false muntins. A double paned window may be acceptable if the interior dividers and dimensional muntins are used on multi-light windows. A double paned 1/1 window is acceptable.
 - Do not use false, interior muntins except as stated above.
 - Recess window openings on masonry buildings.
 - Use a window opening with a raised surround on a wood frame building.

ACCEPTABLE WINDOW MATERIALS

Materials that are similar in character, profile, finish and durability to those used on nearby historic buildings are acceptable. These often include:

- Wood
- Vinyl-clad wood
- Aluminum-clad customized wood
- Extruded Aluminum

UNACCEPTABLE WINDOW MATERIALS

Materials that are not similar in character, profile, finish and durability to those used on nearby historic buildings are unacceptable. These often include:

- Mill finish metal windows
 - Snap-in or artificial muntins
 - Vinyl
14. **10.5** Visually connect the street and building.
- Maintain or install a walkway leading directly from the sidewalk to the main building entry.
15. **10.7** Minimize the visual impact of parking.
- Locate a parking area at the rear or to the side of a site whenever possible.
 - Use landscaping to screen a parking area.
 - Minimize the widths of a paved area or a curb cut.
 - If a curb cut is no longer in use, repair the curb. In some areas, granite curbs may be required.
 - Do not use paving in the front yard for a parking area. Paving stones might be acceptable in certain instances.
 - Do not create a new driveway or garage that opens onto a primary street.

ACCEPTABLE WALK AND PAVING MATERIALS

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

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

16. **10.10** Provide a landscaped front yard for a residential property in a historic district.
- Maintain a predominant appearance of a planted front yard/lawn.
 - Minimize paved areas in a front yard.
 - Consider using decorative modular pavers, grass and cellular paving systems in order to minimize the impact of hard surface paving where grass or other plant materials are not used.
 - In commercial areas, consider using landscaping to screen and soften the appearance of surface parking areas. Use an internal and perimeter landscaping treatment to screen a fenced or walled parking area.
 - Do not use landscaping to hide a design feature that is inconsistent with these Design Review Guidelines.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The application proposes the demolition of the structure at 406 Wisconsin and the subsequent construction of a new one-story single-family residence.

The *Guidelines* state that when demolition is contemplated, the current significance of the structure should be considered. The subject house is considered a contributing property in the locally-only designated portion of Leinkauf Historic District. The one-story wood-frame bungalow represents a style which became widely popular in Mobile in the early twentieth century, after the First World War. The flexible plan, wide porches, protective overhangs, and simple decoration made this style easy to build and affordable for the up-and-coming middle class. The modest interpretation of the Craftsman style at 406 Wisconsin is a character-defining feature of Mobile's built heritage, and variations of it can be seen throughout the city's historic districts. Elements such as the square porch columns, masonry knee and cheek walls, exposed rafters, and three-over-one windows serve to define this house as an example of the vernacular interpretation of Craftsman style architecture in Mobile.

Per the *Guidelines*, “the condition of the structure in question” should be considered. “Demolition may be more appropriate when a building is deteriorated or in poor condition.” In the case of the subject property the building has sustained some superficial deterioration including areas of rotten or missing siding, along with damaged roof rafters and mortar corrosion between brick courses on foundation piers. There is some visual evidence of sunken piers signifying settling of the structure over time, which is common for historic homes in this region. A structural assessment report was submitted with the application which notes areas of deficiencies. The noted items in the report are typical of an aging building and do not indicate that the building cannot be rehabilitated or that it is a public hazard.

Whether the building in question is “one of the last remaining positive examples of its kind in the neighborhood, county or region” should be factored into any decision to allow or disallow demolition in a historic district. As stated above, the Craftsman style was enthusiastically embraced in Mobile during the early 20th century, as the simple design and the climate was well suited to this architectural trend and to Mobile’s post-war growth. The 1956 Sanborn map reveals that after the subdivision of this section of Wisconsin Street in 1922, nineteen single-family homes were built along both sides of the street between Eslava Street on the north and Ohio Street to the south. Almost all of these residences denote a form very similar to 406 Wisconsin. All of the homes are extant, with few modifications, with the exception of 405 Wisconsin, which was replaced with a new home around 1990. The demolition of the historic home at 406 Wisconsin would diminish the integrity of this minimally altered example of pre-World War II planned development in the Leinkauf Historic District.

Another consideration directed by the *Guidelines* is the impact that a demolition would have on surrounding structures. In this case, the applicant has submitted plans for the construction of a new single-family residence. The plans are analyzed against the *Guidelines* below. (12.0)

The *Design Review Guidelines* provide directives for new construction within Mobile’s historic districts. Front yard setbacks of a new residential structure should fall within the range established on the street. The new structure proposed for 406 Wisconsin would sit similarly on the lot as the existing house and the neighboring properties. With a proposed front setback of 25’-2” and side yard setbacks of 7’-2” and 14’-0”, the proposed structure would sit similarly on the lot as the existing historic house and would also fall within the established range that occurs on surrounding lots. (6.34, 6.35)

The historic structures in the immediate vicinity of the subject property vary slightly in size and details but are fairly consistently one-story structures, rectangular in shape, some with off-set front or side projections. The proposed design for the subject lot is fairly consistent in massing, proportions, and height with neighboring historic structures, with a lack of offset side walls along the elevations expressed on many of the surrounding buildings, which creates a pattern of projections and recesses. The contributing buildings in its immediate vicinity sit on raised foundations which appear to be comparable in height to that proposed for the subject property. The intended use of masonry piers and lattice infill is likewise compatible with the historic neighborhood. (6.36, 6.37, 6.43).

The street on which the subject property is located, along with immediate cross streets, is predominately populated with one-story gable or hipped-roof bungalows of three or four bays sitting on raised foundations and comprised of full or half-width front porches and restrained Craftsman style detailing such as exposed rafters, square columns, decorative brick detailing, and masonry knee walls. The majority of these residences possess long side elevations, many with occasional projections and recesses, and varying fenestration patterns. Proposed features of the three-bay, one-story bungalow-like design such as the gabled facade, full-width front porch, and foundation design reflects the design of the existing structure, uphold conventions of the district, and assimilate the proposed new construction with neighboring historic buildings, as the *Guidelines* advise. The proposed materials of fiber cement siding, wood, and shingles are acceptable building materials for new construction within Mobile’s historic districts, which respect the traditional building materials observable on nearby historic structures and throughout the historic district.

The applicant has stated that the front and rear paneled entry doors would be of steel construction. Vinyl clad wood, proposed for the windows, is an approved window material for new construction under the *Guidelines*, though a three-over-one lite configuration would be more appropriate than the proposed one-over-one pattern. The solid-to-void ratios along the side and rear elevations are not entirely compatible with those of nearby historic structures. Expanses of blank walls such as those seen on the south and west elevations in the submitted plans are not present on historic bungalows in the neighborhood; however, the full-width front porch and recess created by the rear porch serves to visually create variation along the elevations. (6.38 - 6.42, 6.44, 6.45).

The proposed installation of a concrete walkway connecting the existing sidewalk to the façade is a practice directed by the *Guidelines*. However, the 5'x5' concrete pad proposed for the west end of the walkway is not a common feature seen at surrounding historic properties. The replacement of the existing driveway appropriately would provide parking to the side and rear of the building, as called for in the *Guidelines*. (10.5, 10.7)

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Stephen Weirup, Essie Etheridge (the homeowner), and Melissa Burnett were present to discuss the application.

Mr. Weirup recapped the history and context of the application from the previous appearance before the Board in May. He stated that rehabilitation of the dwelling is not a possibility through the Home Repair Alabama Program (HRAP). He added that feedback from the Board had been seriously considered, and the applicant feels that the new proposed design reflects the design of the existing house.

Ms. Sheri Broussard, representing the Leinkauf Historic District Neighborhood Association came forward to speak against the application. She stated that the Association is opposed to the wholesale demolition of the property.

No other members of the public came forward to speak for or against the application, and no written comments were received.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Maurin complimented the applicant's accomplishments in accommodating the comments of the Board in the design and asked if there were any ADA accommodations planned for the property. Mr. Weirup replied that there were.

Ms. Echols asked about the off-centered front door. Mr. Weirup explained that the door position is such to accommodate a bedroom.

Mr. McNair asked the applicant to explain the report from Cobalt – who did the inspection and if they have experience in historic materials. Mr. Weirup replied that they did not have that specific experience but are structural engineers who determined the structure's suitability for living.

Mr. McNair asked if they concluded in the report that it is not. Mr. Weirup stated that this was correct.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor asked the applicant if the most recent report suggests that rehabilitation is not cost-effective. Mr. Weirup replied that Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor was correct.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor explained that the Board is hesitant to approve the demolition of a historic house if it is not an immediate danger.

Ms. Roselius added that the photos in the recent report from Knockout Inspections have no explanation and the entire content of the report was labeled "Section 1" and reads like a conclusion. She asked if there was more of the report. Mr. Weirup replied that they did a write up on the photos.

Ms. Roselius stated that the report was confusing, that Section 1 implies a Section 2, and there is no explanation of their conclusion. Mr. Weirup replied that the company was not the first choice and explained that after the previous ARB meeting, they were looking for someone to state whether the home could be rehabilitated.

Ms. Davis commented that the gap between the top of the windows and the bottom of the roof created by the plate height is too large, stating the design had several proportion and symmetry issues that need to be addressed. She also suggested placing a faux louvered vent in the front gable. Mr. Weirup stated that these elements could be revised.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor agreed, adding that the windows on the façade are not centered on the porch columns.

Mr. Blackwell stated that the applicant had successfully created a structure of appropriate massing and scale. He added that bungalows do not always have symmetrical fronts and also suggested that more measurements on the plans would be helpful and would answer a lot of questions.

Ms. Roselius asked the applicant if other options have been explored, such as building the new house in a different location nearby. Mr. Weirup replied that the grant money goes to this applicant at this address and cannot be used elsewhere.

Ms. Etheridge came forward to state that she does not understand why the demolition cannot be approved. She stated that they have followed the *Guidelines*. Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor explained that demolitions impair the historic integrity of the district and that the ARB is required to follow the standards and *Guidelines*. She noted that it is a shame that HRAP does not seriously consider rehabilitation, and that cost shouldn't be considered in the process; there should be a process to allow for the rehab of historic houses.

Mr. Blackwell added that the Board has to consider a variety of factors when approving demolitions, some of which the applicant has addressed. The designation of the house is causing a hang-up in the program's process, and the problem is with ADECA, as they have access to the maps and should have done their due diligence. He encouraged the applicant to request a Design Review Committee in light of the economic hardship.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor stated that the structural report does not indicate that the building can't be repaired.

Ms. Etheridge questioned why she was not told when she bought the house that it came with all these rules and regulations. Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor explained that the *Guidelines* did not apply when she bought the property and that it was brought under the purview of the ARB with the 2004 expansion of the Leinkauf District, when all residents within the boundary expansion received written notice.

Ms. Etheridge stated that it is her home and should be her decision; she shouldn't be forced out because of the *Guidelines*, noting that it seemed unfair. Ms. Roselius stated that if the Board allowed people to demolish historic buildings because it was cheaper to build something new than to rehabilitate, it would result in us not having historic districts.

Mr. Weirup stated that this is a unique situation involving a federal program, HUD policies, and the financial situation of the homeowner.

Mr. McNair asked if deconstruction and recreation is an option. Mr. Weirup replied that it is not. Under the program the house has to be leveled. He added that he would look further into it.

Ms. Dawson explained that the money available to rehabilitate a building is based in part on the assessed value of the property.

Ms. Echols also recommended a Design Review Committee. She then asked if any of the original features or materials could be kept.

Ms. Roselius recommended asking Cobalt and Knockout to provide more explanation of their conclusions and the building's threat to safety.

Bruce McGowin stated that the ordinance has provisions for economic hardship and that an application is available. Ms. Dawson stated that she would provide the application to the applicant.

The application was tabled.



Agenda Item #5

Application 2024-36-CA

DETAILS

Location:

102 Gilbert Street

Summary of Request:

Paint brick exterior. Replace all windows with aluminum-clad sashes.

Applicant (as applicable):

Tiffany Perkins, on behalf of 1818 Design, LLC

Property Owner:

1818 Design, LLC

Historic District:

Old Dauphin Way

Classification:

Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The subject property was constructed c. 1930, and the existing windows are replacements. The material and design of the original windows is unknown, though they likely were wood or steel multi-light sashes or casements.
- The proposed replacement of windows with windows that do not fit the original openings is not in conformance with the *Guidelines*, though the proposed window material is in conformance.
- The proposed painting of the exterior brick veneer is not in conformance with the *Guidelines*.

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 20th-century apartments.”

The one-story brick English Cottage type house at 102 Gilbert Street was constructed ca. 1930. Based on Sanborn maps and historic aerial photos, it appears the footprint of the house stayed essentially the same from the date of its initial construction until some point between 1955 and 1967 (there is a gap in aerial photos). During that timeframe, an addition was made to the east elevation (rear) of the house.

This property has appeared once before the ARB. In 2022, an application to demolish the rear addition and construct a new addition came before the Board and was tabled.

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Replace all windows. The existing replacement windows would be replaced with aluminum clad, two- over-two windows fitting the existing, not original wood openings.
2. Paint exterior brick veneer and wood trim around windows. Proposed paint colors include Benjamin Moore Swiss Coffee for the exterior body and Benjamin Moore Texas Leather for trim.

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

1. **5.3** Preserve the key historic walls of a building.
 - Maintain significant historic façades in their original form.
 - Maintain historic façade elements.
2. **5.8** Preserve and repair original masonry materials.
 - Preserve masonry features that define the overall historic character, such as walls, cornices, pediments, steps and foundations.
 - Take particular care with historic masonry. Consult Staff for guidance when repairing and replacing mortar joints and masonry.
 - Unpainted 19th Century imported Philadelphia and locally manufactured brick may not be painted. In cases where historic brick has been previously painted, the paint color should be of a suitable color to match the age and architectural style of the structure.
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 reveal is the part of the side of a window opening that is between the outer surface of the wall and the window.
 - A doubled-paned or clad wood window may be considered as a replacement alternative only if the replacement matches the configuration, dimensions, and profiles of original windows.

- For increased efficiency, storm windows can be installed. A storm window shall fit within the window reveal and avoid damaging window casings. Operable storm windows are encouraged.

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 property under review is considered contributing to the Old Dauphin Way historic district.

This application seeks approval to replace all existing windows. No original windows are extant in the original block of the house, and the application proposes the installation of aluminum clad two-over-two windows. The *Guidelines* instruct, “When a historic window is missing on a key character-defining wall, use a historically accurate replacement,” including “historically accurate light patterns.” Furthermore, “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.” (5.22) The light pattern of the original windows is not known, but likely was multi-pane such as six-over-six or more or multi-light casement, to complement the English Cottage style. The existing replacement windows were installed at an unknown date and employed wood furring along the outer edges of the original openings to facilitate the installation of smaller windows. It should be noted, however, that the 1984 file photo shows correctly fitted windows in the front porch (west elevation). The application proposes the installation of new windows in the existing, non-original openings. While the proposed window material, aluminum-clad wood, is considered appropriate for Mobile’s historic districts, the *Guidelines* clearly state that new windows should fit the original window openings.

The application further proposes to paint the brick veneer and exterior trim of the historic house. Painting historic brick generally should not be undertaken as bricks need to “breathe,” and painting prevents them from doing so. Further, the bricks of the original block of this particular house are decorative in nature, as darker rows of bricks are located over the doors, in the window lintels, in the windowsills, and at the water table level. Painting the brick veneer of the historic house would not be in conformance with the *Guidelines*, which instruct to “maintain significant facades in their original form” and further state, “masonry features that define the overall historic character, such as walls, cornices, pediments, steps, or foundations” should be preserved. (5.3, 5.8) It should be noted, however, that the bricks used for the original structure and the addition vary in color and texture.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Russell and Tiffany Perkins were present to discuss the application. Ms. Perkins stated the house currently has four different shades of brick, and the only solution is to paint.

No one from the public came forward to speak for or against the application, and no written comments were received.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Roselius asked if the applicants proposed painting the entire exterior. Ms. Perkins replied that this was correct.

Ms. Echols asked if the applicants had considered staining the brick. Ms. Perkins replied that they would consider staining but were concerned that the bricks still wouldn't match.

Ms. Echols explained that a solid stain is solid and would cover like paint, but still allow the bricks to breathe. She added that she recommends Keim brand stain.

Mr. McNair asked if there is plywood infilling above the porch windows. Meredith Wilson replied that there is.

Mr. McNair asked the applicants if they would consider custom windows to properly fill the opening. Annie Allen stated that she and Ms. Wilson had also suggested reopening the porch. Mr. Perkins stated that two-over-two windows were already purchased and had been included with the purchase of the house.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor inquired about the condition of the wood around the window. Mr. Perkins stated that it was in poor condition.

Ms. Davis asked the applicants if they were interested in reopening the front porch. Ms. Perkins stated that they had considered a custom trim for the arch above the porch window.

Ms. Davis also suggested a custom transom would work, too.

Ms. Roselius asked if the decorative brick details and trim would be painted/stained a different color from the body. Ms. Perkins stated that they would start by leaving it exposed, but that they may paint/stain it later. She stated they would install a transom over the porch window.

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 state that the treatment of the bricks will reflect the Keim stain discussion, with Staff having the final review of the proposed transom.

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

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



Agenda Item #7

Application 2024-38-CA

DETAILS

Location:

157 Dauphin Street

Summary of Request:

Amend previously approved COA to allow fenestration change.

Applicant (as applicable):

Carlos Gant

Property Owner:

Tracy Roberts, LLC

Historic District:

Lower Dauphin

Classification:

Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The previously approved new storefront design reflects the character of the c. 1937 storefront.
- The proposed fenestration reflects a traditional storefront design.
- The new design calls for a change from an aluminum to a wood storefront with three (3) sets of pane-and-panel doors rather than a central door with flanking windows.

Report Contents:

Property and Application History 2

Scope of Work 2

Applicable Standards 2

Staff Analysis 3

Attachments4

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.

157 Dauphin Street is a two-story contributing commercial building located in the Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District. It is a brick building with a masonry façade. Currently the storefront entry is boarded up. According to the MHDC vertical files, this building was constructed c. 1860 and was associated with a Thomas Byrnes. Historic photographs show that the building's original façade was brick and consisted of four large second story windows set above a suspended metal awning over the storefront. A heavy ornamented cornice was accentuated with a centered arched molding which echoed the shape of decorative hoods over the four windows. The property's façade underwent an art deco remodel by J.N Stafford around 1937. At this time, the four windows were covered on the second story by a masonry veneer which included a large, recessed stucco panel centered on the second story. On the ground floor, a glass storefront was installed with deep recesses leading to an entry door. Although this historic storefront is no longer extant, the rest of this façade remains intact.

This property appeared previously before the Architectural Review Board (ARB) in January 2023, when an application was presented to install a new storefront, signage, and window on the façade. The Board requested that the applicant make some changes to the proposed design of the storefront and provide more information regarding materials. The application was resubmitted with the requested changes in April 2023 and approved.

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Amend previously approved COA to allow fenestration change to storefront.
 - a. The proposed new storefront would measure approximately 20'-10"x10'- 1 ¾".
 - b. The storefront would include series of three (3) 8'-0"x6'-0" wide pane-and-panel wood double doors.
 - c. Each pair of doors would be topped by a 6'-0"x2'- 1 ¾ single-lite transom.
 - d. All other previously approved elements would remain the same.

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

- 1.7.1 Preserve the key character-defining features of a historic commercial façade
- 2.7.2 Repair an altered storefront to its original design.
 - Use historic photographs when determining the original character of a storefront design.
 - Where evidence does not exist, use a contemporary interpretation of a traditional storefront.
 - Consider retaining a non-original storefront where it has achieved historic importance as an option.
 - Do not remove a façade veneer if it may cause serious damage to the original historic materials underneath (i.e., historic brick).
- 3.7.5 Retain the original shape of the transom in a historic storefront.
 - Preserve the historic transom shape and configuration.
 - Add new glass if the original glass is missing.

- Do not remove or enclose a transom.
- 4.7.6 Replace a historic storefront to be consistent with the historic location.
- Locate a new storefront in the same plane as it was historically.
 - Do not recess or project a replacement storefront from the front façade.

STAFF ANALYSIS

As stated above, this application seeks to amend a previously approved application which came before the ARB in April 2023. The applicant wishes to alter only the storefront design portion of the scope of work on the currently issued Certificate of Appropriateness (COA), from a single door centered on the façade with two side windows, flanked by folding glass doors to a series of three (3) pane-and-panel wood double doors.

The *Design Review Guidelines* call for original and key character defining features of a historic commercial façade to be preserved, that original materials be repaired, and an altered storefront be restored to its original design. The current façade at 157 Dauphin is not original to the building. However, it is a historic one as it has been extant for over ninety years and has attained historic significance as an alteration. The previously approved new storefront design reflects the character of the c. 1937 storefront in its placement, in the design of the windows and transoms, and in the retention of the original bulkhead. The proposed new design would not significantly alter the previously approved fenestration rhythm. Visually, the most noted change would be material. The current COA calls for aluminum framed doors, folding walls, and transom. Although traditionally used in storefronts along Dauphin Street, the proposed wood doors and transoms would modify the current interpretation of the historic façade. (7.1, 7.2, 7.5, 7.6)

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Tracy Roberts and Carlos Gant were present to discuss the application. Mr. Gant explained that due to fire code issues, they were unable to use the entire space as a restaurant. He added that the residential space would be used as an apartment for the owner; two separate entrances would be created, and the courtyard would no longer be a part of the plan.

No one from the public came forward to speak for or against the application, and no written comments were received.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. McNair asked what would be taking place behind the current plywood doors. Mr. Gant explained that the storefront display windows were no longer extant.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor asked if there was a tile entrance floor with a logo at the original front entrance. Mr. Roberts stated that the flooring would remain.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor asked if the applicant would keep the tile, as it continued to the sidewalk and essentially was an extension of the sidewalk. Mr. Roberts replied that it would be kept.

Ms. Roselius asked what changed on this application from the original submittal. Mr. Gant replied that previously, one central door with folding windows to each side had been approved.

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, as written.

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

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

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:55 pm.

These minutes were approved by the Architectural Review Board in their meeting on August 7, 2024.