



# Architectural Review Board Minutes

March 6, 2024 – 3:00 P.M.

## ADMINISTRATIVE

---

The meeting was called to order by the acting Chair, Jennifer Roselius, at 3:10 pm.

### 1. Roll Call

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

**Members Present:** Abby Davis, Karrie Maurin, Cameron Pfeiffer-Traylor, Jennifer Roselius, and Barja Wilson

**Members Absent:** Cartledge Blackwell, Catarina Echols, Stephen Howle, and Stephen McNair

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

### 2. Approval of Minutes from February 21, 2024

Ms. Wilson moved to approve the minutes from the February 21, 2024 meeting.

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

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

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

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

## MID-MONTH APPROVALS - APPROVED

---

- Applicant:** Luis A. Murphy dba H & M Contractors  
**Property Address:** 10 S. Reed Avenue  
**Issue Date:** 02/14/2024  
**Project:** Replace rotten and damaged areas in-kind on exterior of house including:
  1. Replace rotten fascia and soffit boards.
  2. Replace rotten decking on the front porch.
  3. Replace damaged siding on back left of house.

2. **Applicant:** Wrico Signs  
**Property Address:** 270 Dauphin Street  
**Issue Date:** 02/14/2024  
**Project:** Install a temporary vinyl banner sign to the façade of the building, to expire 3/15/2024.  
a. The banner will measure 8'-0" wide by 4'-0" high, for a total of 32 square feet.  
b. The banner will be mounted to the frieze above the first floor with bolted grommets.  
c. The banner will read "509 Live".
  
3. **Applicant:** ASF Contracting LLC  
**Property Address:** 1172 Elmira Street  
**Issue Date:** 02/15/2024  
**Project:** Remove rotten wood on the east and west elevations; replace in-kind.
  
4. **Applicant:** Harvard Lamar Elliott d/b/a Lamar Elliott Construction  
**Property Address:** 256 Michigan Avenue  
**Issue Date:** 02/15/2024  
**Project:** Reroof in-kind with shingles. Color: Charcoal
  
5. **Applicant:** Mike Henderson Roofing and Repair Service  
**Property Address:** 19 S. Lafayette Street  
**Issue Date:** 01/16/2024  
**Project:** Reroof in-kind with shingles. Color: Pewter Gray
  
6. **Applicant:** Dandi Dolbear  
**Property Address:** 157 S. Jefferson Street  
**Issue Date:** 02/16/2024  
**Project:** 1. Replace rotten siding in-kind where needed on all exterior elevations.  
2. Repaint as needed to match existing.
  
7. **Applicant:** Mobile Bay Roofing LLC  
**Property Address:** 306 West Street  
**Issue Date:** 02/19/2024  
**Project:** Reroof in-kind with shingles. Color: Moire Black
  
8. **Applicant:** Fortified Exteriors LLC  
**Property Address:** 7 McPhillips Avenue  
**Issue Date:** 02/20/2024  
**Project:** Reroof with shingles. Color: Charcoal Black
  
9. **Applicant:** Jay Roberds  
**Property Address:** 918 Conti Street  
**Issue Date:** 02/20/2024

- Project:**
1. Construct front porch steps and railings per submitted plans.
  2. Repair foundation pier at southeast corner of house per submitted plans.
  3. Repair roof and cover with asphalt dimensional shingles to match existing.
  4. Replace damaged/missing siding on rear and sides as necessary using 1"x6" wood shiplap to match existing, or Hardie type siding to match existing.
  5. Paint house to match existing.
- 10. Applicant:** Anthony Kahaley  
**Property Address:** 68 Fearnway  
**Issue Date:** 02/20/2024  
**Project:** Reroof in-kind with shingles to match existing color
- 11. Applicant:** Cooner Construction Inc  
**Property Address:** 1104 Old Shell Road  
**Issue Date:** 02/21/2024  
**Project:** Reroof in-kind with shingles. Color: Black
- 12. Applicant:** Kristin A. Granade  
**Property Address:** 1104 Government Street  
**Issue Date:** 02/23/2024  
**Project:** Construct wood privacy fence around rear (north) yard of property. Privacy fence to be 6 feet in height along frontages of Common and Conti Streets and south returns. Fence to be 8 feet along the western property line with adjacent property at 1006 Government Street. Privacy fence not to extend beyond the front (south) plane of the residence.
- 13. Applicant:** Adams Paint & Repairs  
**Property Address:** 1056 Government Street  
**Issue Date:** 02/26/2024  
**Project:** Paint windows as follows: frame – white; sash - black

## APPLICATIONS

---

### 1. 2023-56-CA

**Address:** 34 S. Reed Avenue  
**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way  
**Applicant / Agent:** Reilly Terrell  
**Project:** After-the-Fact Approval: Various fenestration changes; remove attic gable window

**APPROVED**

-

**CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

## 2. 2024-11-CA

**Address:** 362 Dauphin Street  
**Historic District:** Lower Dauphin Street Commercial  
**Applicant / Agent:** Hadley Construction Specialties, Inc. on behalf of G&R Holdings  
**Project:** Install copper coping on south elevation (façade)  
**APPROVED** - **CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

## 3. 2024-12-CA

**Address:** 262 Marine Street  
**Historic District:** Oakleigh Garden  
**Applicant / Agent:** James & Katherine Martin  
**Project:** Move porch steps to north side of porch; extend width of front porch  
**APPROVED** - **CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

## OTHER BUSINESS

---

The next ARB meeting is scheduled for April 3, 2024.



# Agenda Item #1 - CERTIFIED RECORD

## Application 2023-56-CA

### DETAILS

---

**Location:**

34 S. Reed Avenue

**Summary of Request:**

Update to After-the-Fact Approval: Install aluminum-clad replacement windows that do not match muntin profile of the original windows, as issued COA required; replace two windows with French doors on façade; replace two-light window with single-light sash; remove attic gable window.

**Applicant (as applicable):**

Reilly Terrell

**Property Owner:**

same

**Historic District:**

Old Dauphin Way

**Classification:**

Contributing

**Summary of Analysis:**

- The muntin profile of the installed replacement windows does not match the original windows, as required in the issued COA and *Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts*, but two of the four elevations would not be considered character-defining.
- The light pattern of the installed replacement window on the south end of the east elevation (façade) does not match the original, as required in the issued COA and *Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts*.
- The two windows at the south end of the second-floor east elevation were removed and replaced with French doors without review.
- The fixed window in the front-facing attic gable was removed without review.
- A Design Review Committee met with applicant to resolve non-compliant components of the project.

**Report Contents:**

Property and Application History ..... 2

Scope of Work ..... 2

Applicable Standards ..... 2

Staff Analysis ..... 3

Attachments ..... 5

## PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

---

Old Dauphin Way Historic District was initially listed in the National Register in 1984 under Criterion C for significant architecture and community planning. The district includes most nineteenth-century architectural styles and shows adaptations of middle-class domestic designs of the nineteenth century to the regional, Gulf Coast climate. It includes “fine examples of commercial, institutional, and religious structures as well as 20<sup>th</sup>-century apartments.”

Per the National Register nomination, the two-story, side-hall plan house was constructed c. 1905, just missing representation on the 1904 Sanborn map. According to city directory, deed, and oral history records, the house was constructed for William A. Godwin who resided at that time at the Hotel Royal. The 1925 Sanborn map, updated in 1956, shows a rear one-story addition stepped back from the north and south planes of the house.

According to Historic Development Department records, this property has appeared twice previously before the Architectural Review Board (ARB). In February 2021 the Board considered but did not approve the demolition of two rear, one-story additions and restoration of the historic appearance of the rear elevation due to a lack of information on the elevation restoration. The work was approved by the ARB in March 2021. The current application first appeared before the ARB in November 2023.

## SCOPE OF WORK

---

1. Install aluminum-clad replacement windows that do not match muntin profile of the original windows, as Required by issued COA.
2. Install single-light window at south end of east elevation where original window was of two-light pattern.
3. Remove four-light window in front-facing attic gable; close opening with siding to match.
4. Remove two (2) two-over-two windows at south end of second-floor façade; replace with French doors.

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

---

1. Preserve the functional historic and decorative features of a historic window.
  - Where historic (wooden or metal) windows are intact and in repairable condition, retain and repair them to match the existing as per location, light configuration, detail and material.
  - Preserve historic window features, including the frame, sash, muntins, mullions, glazing, sills, heads, jambs, moldings, operation, and groupings of windows. (5.20)
2. When historic windows are not in a repairable condition, match the replacement window design to the original.
  - In instances where there is a request to replace a building's windows, the new design shall match the existing as per location, framing and light configuration.
3. When a historic window is missing on a key character-defining wall, use a historically accurate replacement.
  - Historically accurate light patterns shall be employed. Use photographic, physical, and/or documentary evidence for the design.
  - A new window shall be installed in such a manner as to fit within the original window opening and match in depth and filling of the reveal.
  - A double-paned or clad wood window may be considered as a replacement alternative only if the replacement matches the configuration, dimensions, and profiles of the original windows.

### ACCEPTABLE WINDOW MATERIALS

Materials that are the same as the original, or that appear similar in texture, profile and finish to the original are acceptable. These often include:

- Wood sash
- Steel, if original to structure
- Custom extruded aluminum

- Aluminum clad wood
- Windows approved by the National Park Service

#### UNACCEPTABLE WINDOW MATERIALS

- Vinyl
- Mill-finished aluminum
- Interior snap-in muntins (except when used in concert with exterior muntins and intervening dividers) (5.22)

## STAFF ANALYSIS

---

The subject property, 34 S. Reed Avenue, is a c. 1905 two-story frame residence within the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The application under review is for after-the-fact approval of replacement windows that do not match muntin profile of original windows, as provided in the issued COA; removal of an attic window without review; removal and replacement of two façade windows with French doors, and replacement of a 2-light window on the faced with a single-light window.

A Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the replacement of “rotten windows with wood or clad windows to match in light pattern and muntin profile” was administratively issued on January 29, 2021. In response to an alert from a member of the public, a Historic Development staff member visited the property and determined that the installed replacement windows did not match the original windows. A Notice of Violation (NOV) was issued on October 29, 2021 and was delivered to the property owner via Certified mail on November 1, 2021. The property owner did not respond to the NOV. Due to delays in project completion, the applicant applied for an extension of his building permit for this property, and the Historic portion of the permit approval was held because of the outstanding Notice of Violation.

The original window at the south end of the east elevation (façade) on the first floor had two fixed lights, and the smaller upper light echoed the transom above the front door to its immediate north. The window has been replaced with a single-light fixed window that does not match the original light configuration, as required by the *Guidelines* and the issued COA. (5.21)

The *Guidelines* require that when a window located on “a key character-defining wall” must be replaced, a historically accurate replacement matching the “configuration, dimensions, and profiles of the original windows” should be used. (5.22) The balance of replacement windows (excluding the window discussed above) installed in the house are aluminum-clad sashes in a two-over-two light pattern, matching the original windows. The dimensions of the rails and stiles of the replacement windows closely match those of the original windows. The width of the muntins is also a close match to the originals. However, the depth and profile of the muntins in the replacement windows does not resemble the original windows, as required by the *Guidelines* and the issued COA.

The *Guidelines* specifically reference “key character-defining” walls. The façade (east elevation) and original block of the south elevation are the most visible walls of the building and may be considered character-defining. Therefore, the removal of the four-light fixed window in the attic gable on the façade (without review) was not in compliance with the *Guidelines*. (5.20, 5.22) Likewise, the removal of two (2) two-over-two windows at the second-floor level of the façade and their replacement with French doors (without review) was not in compliance with the *Guidelines*. (5.20, 5.22)

With the key character-defining walls in mind, the profile of the muntins in replacement windows located at the west end of the south elevation, on the west elevation, and on the north elevation may not be as critical since these would not be considered key character-defining walls. Therefore, the lack of matching profile on those elevations may be permissible.

## UPDATE TO APPLICATION

On December 1, 2023, the applicant met with a Design Review Committee which consisted of members of Staff and the Architectural Review Board to further review the subject application in an attempt to mitigate the non-compliant components of the project.

At the meeting, the following conclusions were made:

- ARB members agreed that it would be acceptable for the existing windows in the side and rear elevations to remain as-is since they are secondary elevations.
- Mr. Terrell agreed to place a louvered vent in the gable on the front elevation.

Other issues and actions discussed:

- Options for some indication of a transom (or genuine transom) in regard to the large, single-light window on the first floor of the façade
- Options for replacing one of the French doors on the second floor of the façade with a window matching the existing windows, in an evenly spaced arrangement across the façade.
- ARB members suggested that the missing trim at the installed windows be addressed and that Mr. Terrell should verify with his window manufacturer that the installation was done to the manufacturer's specifications.
- Mr. Terrell proposed square replacement porch supports. The ARB members present stated that the design would require a vote of the entire Board.

On February 1, 2024, the Design Review Committee reconvened.

The following further conclusions were made:

- Mr. Terrell stated that the window manufacturer is not able to make a simulated divided light thick enough to resemble the missing transom on the first-floor façade window. Possible alternative solutions presented were installing a two-over-two window to match other existing windows, or to install a simulated two-over-two divided light on the single-light window. ARB members were not amenable to installing a simulated divided light, but agreed with the option of replacing the single-light window with a two-over-two window to match existing windows. They recommended moving an existing two-over-two window from a secondary elevation to the façade and reusing the single-light window on a non-primary elevation.
- Mr. Terrell has ordered a window for the second floor of the façade which will replace one of the French doors. The second floor fenestration pattern (from left to right) will be converted to single door; two-over-two window; two-over-two window.

*Items still in need of discussion include window trim and replacement porch supports.*



## PUBLIC TESTIMONY

---

Mr. Reilly Terrell was present to discuss the application. He spoke to the issues that were discussed at the Design Review Committee meetings. He stated that it was agreed that the gable window which had been removed would be replaced with a louvered vent which would fit the opening. He further stated he had determined that replacing the non-compliant window on the first floor of the façade with a window and transom to match what had been removed proved to be too cost-prohibitive, so it was agreed that a two-over-two window from the rear elevation could be installed, and the existing window could be placed on the rear elevation. Lastly, it was agreed that the inappropriate fenestration pattern which had been installed on the second story of the façade would be changed to consist of a window, a single door – one of the existing pair, and the existing window, all of which would be symmetrically placed and equal in height.

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

## BOARD DISCUSSION

---

Ms. Dawson commented to the Board that Mr. Terrell had taken part in two Design Review Committee meetings to resolve the items which are out of compliance.

Ms. Davis asked the applicant if he is still requesting approval for the trim on the windows and to replace the posts on the front porch. Mr. Terrell stated that, in regard to the turned posts, the existing were rotten, had been rebuilt, then had rotted again. He wished to replace the posts with box columns, adding that more than half the houses on the street have “rectangular columns” and that the Design Review Committee couldn’t find evidence that the existing columns were original.

Ms. Roselius asked the applicant what type of door would be installed on the second story. Mr. Terrell clarified that it would be one of the existing pair.

Ms. Traylor inquired about the railing or balustrade intended for the second story. Mr. Terrell replied that it would look the same as the previous.

Ms. Roselius asked about the trim around the second-floor porch. Mr. Terrell said it would be there.

Ms. Roselius asked the applicant if he had considered sourcing salvaged porch posts. Mr. Terrell responded that he had a bit.

Ms. Davis asked how the intended box columns would be incorporated into the fretwork trim on the porch. Mr. Sledge offered that a chamfered post would be more appropriate than a boxed column, would provide support, and could be cohesively incorporated into the fretwork trim. He explained that a turned post, like the previous existing posts, is turned on a lathe, which can be costlier. The chamfer would offer a similar visual. Mr. Terrell stated that he did not want to do a chamfered post as it would not tie into the foundation piers.

Ms. Davis commented that a chamfered post would be structural. Mr. Terrell stated that column work had actually already been done with no COA.

Ms. Davis stated that a cap and base is necessary, which is a portion of the top and bottom of the post with no chamfer. Mr. Terrell asked if a post could be chamfered in place.

Ms. Roselius suggested that Mr. Terrell explore this possibility. Mr. Terrell stated that he would look into it.

Ms. Traylor asked the applicant to explain the proportionality of the supports to the house. Mr. Terrell stated that he wanted the porch columns to look like the other houses on the street.

Ms. Roselius explained that Mr. Terrell also needed to question whether the porch columns were appropriate to this specific house. Ms. Traylor added that the façade of the house is very important, and that work to the façade must be harmonious in order to protect the integrity of the historic structure. She added that a visual is needed in order to see the full design proposed for the façade.

Mr. McGowin recommended approving the windows and door portions of the application and hold the other issues over to a subsequent meeting.

Ms. Traylor stated that another concern was the inappropriately installed trim on all the newly installed windows. Mr. Terrell stated that he had nothing to say on this matter.

Ms. Davis informed the Board that the trim was discussed in the Design Review Committee, but no resolution had been reached.

Ms. Roselius asked the applicant if he intended to trim out the new fenestration on the façade appropriately to match the original? Mr. Terrell responded that the trim would match the rest of the house.

Ms. Traylor asked the applicant if he had spoken with his window distributor to determine if they had been installed correctly? Mr. Terrell stated that it was fine.

Ms. Davis stated that window trim is a significant part of preserving the integrity of the building.

Ms. Maurin asked the applicant if there would be any reveal on the trim or if the joint would simply be filled with sealant. She added that traditionally, there would not have been a butt joint as sealant did not exist, and that water proofing was accomplished by overlapping the trim. She stated that in this case, the sealant would eventually degrade.

Ms. Roselius asked if the Design Review Committee felt that the side elevations windows should remain as-is. Ms. Davis replied that the focus had been on the façade in the Design Review Committee.

Ms. Roselius specified to the applicant that when replacing the windows and door on the façade, they will have to be reframed and trimmed out appropriately. Mr. Terrell stated that the trim was already done.

Ms. Roselius stated that the applicant was aware that the work had to be approved. Mr. Terrell stated that he thought the Design Review Committee discussion meant that he had permission to do the work on the windows, porch supports, etc. as a compromise.

Ms. Roselius reminded the applicant that the porch supports and window trim were not approved or resolved with the Design Review Committee.

Ms. Traylor reminded the applicant that there is no approval until a COA is in hand. Mr. Terrell stated that he is not trying to do things in spite of the ARB but misunderstood. He added that this process isn't like elsewhere.

Ms. Traylor assured the applicant that the process is more complex in other historic cities. She added that she appreciates the applicant taking on the investment in a historic district; and that the ARB wants the process to be smooth but difficulties arise when work is executed prior to acquiring approval. She stated that certain items in the application can be approved today, but that a rendering of the columns would be necessary before approval.

Ms. Roselius stated that she would like to mandate historic trim on the façade fenestration. Ms. Davis agreed that the trim needs to be historically accurate, especially on the façade.

Ms. Maurin told the applicant to be clear on dimensions and profiles on his plans, adding that professional drawings would be appropriate. Mr. Terrell stated that he already has professional drawings on his phone, which he could provide.

Mr. Terrell asked what guidance he should use to design the trim on the façade. Ms. Davis advised that he use the original trim on the house as a guide, and to get direction from Staff.

#### **FINDING FACTS**

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

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

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

Ms. Davis moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, that the executed work at 34 S. Reed Avenue, with the exception of the porch supports and façade fenestration trim, does not impair the architectural or historic character of the property or the district, and should be granted a COA.

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



## Agenda Item #2 - CERTIFIED RECORD

### Application 2024-11-CA

#### DETAILS

---

**Location:**

362 Dauphin Street

**Summary of Request:**

Install copper coping along parapet wall and over chimney.

**Applicant (as applicable):**

Ryleigh Tatum, Hadley Construction Specialties, Inc.

**Property Owner:**

G & R Holdings

**Historic District:**

Lower Dauphin Street Commercial

**Classification:**

Contributing

**Summary of Analysis:**

- The application proposes the addition of copper coping to the façade.
- The Guidelines call for the preservation of key historic walls and defining features.

**Report Contents:**

Property and Application History .....	2
Scope of Work .....	2
Applicable Standards .....	2
Staff Analysis .....	3
Attachments .....	4

## PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

---

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

The property at 362 Dauphin Street is a two-story brick commercial building which sits on the northeast corner of Dauphin and N. Franklin Streets. Originally the building was two separate buildings. The 1891 Sanborn map shows the entire south-facing block on Dauphin, between N. Franklin and N. Claiborne Streets, consisting of two and three-story brick buildings fronted by a frame gallery which spanned the entire block. By the time of the 1955 overlay, the two buildings had been reconfigured interiorly into one structure behind a unified façade. The façade may have received its current design c. 1937. In 2022, the structure underwent a tax-credit rehabilitation project, which included repairing the wood storefronts and windows on the façade.

This property has appeared once before the Architectural Review Board (ARB). In 2021, an application was approved for repairs to the south and west elevations; the reconstruction of the north wall of both east and west elevations; replacement of the storefront; and fenestration changes.

## SCOPE OF WORK

---

1. Install copper coping on façade along the parapet wall and over the chimney sitting behind said wall.

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

---

1. **5.3** Preserve the key historic walls of a building.
  - Maintain significant historic façades in their original form.
  - Maintain historic façade elements.
  - Pay special attention to maintaining the historic appearance of building walls of corner buildings.
2. **5.6** Use original materials to replace damaged materials on primary surfaces where possible.
  - Use original materials to replace damaged building materials on a primary façade if possible. If the original material is wood clapboard, for example, then the replacement material should be a material that matches the original in finish, size and the amount of exposed lap. If the original material is not available from the site, use a replacement material that is visually comparable with the original material.
  - Replace only the amount of material required. If a few boards are damaged beyond repair, for example, then only they should be replaced, rather than the entire wall.

- Do not replace building materials on the primary façade, such as wood siding and masonry, with alternative or imitation materials unless it cannot be avoided.
  - Wholesale replacement of exterior finishes is generally not allowed.
3. **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.

## STAFF ANALYSIS

---

The property at 362 Dauphin Street is a contributing structure to the Lower Dauphin Street Commercial District. The application under review proposes the installation of copper coping on the south façade, along the subject structure's parapet wall and on the chimney located behind said wall. Other proposed work includes repairs to the façade and west elevation, which can be approved on the staff level.

The *Guidelines* direct that key historic walls of a building, such as a façade, be maintained in their original form and that key elements, including defining masonry features, be preserved. Replacing building materials with alternative materials is not appropriate. (5.3, 5.6, 5.8)

The application of copper coping would obscure the existing stone coping which is an integral element of the c.1930s façade design. A coping cap applied to the chimney would not be visible from the street. The coping would serve to preserve the contributing structure, diverting water away from the wall's surface. This proposed installation is an impermanent alteration that could be reversed and would not damage the existing masonry. It should be noted that copper coping was installed without a COA at some point along the east elevation parapet, and a portion of the eastern third of the façade parapet.

## PUBLIC TESTIMONY

---

Ms. Ryleigh Tatum from G & R Holdings was present to discuss the application, stating that the application under review proposes the installation of copper coping on the façade and a copper cap on the chimney. She added that the stone coping is cracked, which is allowing for water penetration, though she is not aware of any active leaks

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

## BOARD DISCUSSION

---

Ms. Davis asked the applicant if the option of repairing the stone coping had been considered.

Ms. Tatum responded that three alternatives were explored regarding the stone coping. The first, to seal the cracks with sealant which matches the stone color. However, she explained that this option would still show visible crack lines, if someone was looking for it. The second option, the application of a parge coat and the third, applying water proof coating, would change the appearance of the stone.

Ms. Wilson asked if the existing coping was a cast stone? Ms. Tatum replied that it is.

Ms. Wilson explained that copper coping is durable and would be better than sealant or coating from a materials standpoint, adding that coatings would probably not work as well.

Ms. Roselius noted that coping would be reversible. She also asked Mr. McGowin to comment on the existing façade easement. Mr. McGowin stated that once work has been approved by the ARB and other relevant City departments, the City would give approval under the easement.

#### **FINDING FACTS**

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

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

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

Ms. Davis moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, the proposed application would not impair the architectural or historic character of the building or the district and that a COA be granted.

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



# Agenda Item #3 - CERTIFIED RECORD

## Application 2024-12-CA

### DETAILS

---

**Location:**  
262 Marine Street

**Summary of Request:**  
Alterations to front porch

**Applicant (as applicable):**  
James & Katherine Martin

**Property Owner:**  
same

**Historic District:**  
Oakleigh Garden

**Classification:**  
Contributing

**Summary of Analysis:**

- The application proposes the relocation of the existing front porch steps, the extension of the porch floor to the south, and the construction of a new knee wall.
- The proposed new steps, porch floor, and knee wall would match the existing in material, size, and profile.
- The existing location of the steps poses a logistical concern.

**Report Contents:**

Property and Application History ..... 2  
 Scope of Work ..... 2  
 Applicable Standards ..... 2  
 Staff Analysis ..... 3  
 Attachments ..... 4



## PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

---

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

The property at 262 Marine Street is a frame one-story Craftsman style bungalow with a side gable roof. A front-gabled roof porch is centered on the façade. Historic maps show that 264 and 262 Marine were at one time one lot. The 1904 Sanborn map depicts a one-story store structure sitting on this lot oriented to Augusta Street (750 Augusta Street). Sometime after 1904, the store was demolished and two dwellings were constructed on the lot, facing Marine Street. According to Historic Development Department vertical files, the subject structure was constructed c. 1927. The adjacent structure at 264 was built the following year. At the time the single lot was divided into two separate properties, a zero-lot line was established on the south end of the 262 Marine.

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

## SCOPE OF WORK

---

1. Relocate existing front porch steps from south end of the porch to north end.
  - a. The existing concrete steps and stuccoed knee wall on the south end of the porch would be removed.
  - b. The existing northern porch knee wall would be removed.
  - c. Four (4) new 12" deep steps would span the north end of the porch.
2. Extend existing front porch on south end and construct a new knee wall on both north and south ends.
  - a. An extension of the concrete porch floor measuring approximately 7'-0" wide by 6'-0" deep (to match the depth of the existing 16'-0" wide porch) would occupy the footprint of the existing porch steps on the south end of the porch. The porch floor extension would match the floor height of the existing front porch.
  - b. A new 15"-deep stuccoed knee wall, which would match the existing in height, depth, and profile, would enclose the extension on the east and south.
  - c. On the north end of the porch, a proposed new knee wall of the same design would extend approximately 7'-0" northward from the north front porch column, obscuring the new steps.
3. The proposed new porch steps, knee wall, and porch deck would match the existing in materials, and would be painted to match the existing color scheme on the front porch.

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

---

1. **6.4** Preserve an original porch or gallery on a house.

- Maintain the height and pitch of a porch roof.
  - Do not enclose a front porch if feasible.
  - If a porch is to be screened, do so in a manner that preserves the existing porch elements and does not damage them.
  - Where a rear or side porch is enclosed, preserve the original configuration of columns, handrails and other important architectural features.
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.
  - 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 a railing that is too elaborate for the building (of a different style).
  - Do not relocate an original front stairway or steps.

## STAFF ANALYSIS

---

The subject property is a contributing resource in the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. The application under review seeks approval to reposition the existing front porch steps and extend the porch floor and knee wall. The proposed alterations observe the *Guidelines'* call to preserve an original porch on a historic house while providing a functional solution to a logistical challenge. (6.5) The visible extension of the knee wall on either end of the existing porch does not disrupt the roof or the original configuration of the porch, nor does it impair the intended aesthetic or design. The porch steps, as they are currently oriented, pose a logistical challenge as they direct the flow of foot traffic from the porch onto the adjacent lot to the south. Additionally, the driveway is located on the north end of the property. Relocating the steps to the north end of the porch would create a more appropriate access point to the porch.

The submitted alterations and additions would match the existing front porch in both materials and design. The *Guidelines* mention that original front steps should not be relocated. (6.6) In the case of the subject property, the existing steps are located behind a low knee wall, obstructing their visibility from the street. The proposed new steps on the north end of the porch would likewise be located behind a knee wall. The intentional concealment of the front steps is inherent to the design of the structure and therefore their relocation does not impact the porch design in the same way as that of a visible stairway.

## PUBLIC TESTIMONY

---

Ms. Kathy Martin was present to discuss the application. She explained the logistical challenges presented by the existing arrangement of the porch steps descending to the south, toward the zero lot line on the south, away from the driveway, which sits to the north of the house.

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

## BOARD DISCUSSION

---

Ms. Maurin asked Ms. Martin if she would be amenable to keeping the knee wall on the south and north the same height as the existing to the south, and not raising it.

Ms. Davis agreed, noting the hierarchy established on the gable porch with symmetrical columns, by the lower knee wall and higher porch, that leads to a focal point of the centrally placed entry door.

Ms. Martin explained that she was hoping to extend the porch to the south and that the porch floor is higher than the lower knee wall.

Ms. Traylor asked if the new knee wall on the south would turn back towards the façade wall. Ms. Martin replied that it would.

Ms. Davis suggested making the new knee wall slightly higher than the porch floor. Ms. Martin stated that this may look awkward with a knee wall just above the floor height.

Ms. Maurin added that the new knee wall could be raised more but still be lower than the central knee wall by at least six inches. Ms. Martin stated that she was amenable.

Ms. Traylor asked if the existing curbing would have to be removed. Ms. Martin said it would not as a landing would be created on the north side at the same height as the curbing.

### FINDING FACTS

Ms. Davis moved that, based on the evidence presented in the application, the Board finds the facts in the Staff's report of the application, amended to include the new knee walls on the north and south sides would sit at least six inches lower than the central knee wall, and the existing curbing may or may not be removed.

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

### DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Ms. Traylor moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, the proposed application, as amended, would not impair the architectural or historic character of the property or the district and that a COA be granted.

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

## OTHER BUSINESS

---

Mr. McGowin informed the Board that the Historic Development office has received revised site plans for 900 Government Street which demonstrate alternative orientations of the structure. He noted that it would be difficult to move forward with this application without feedback from the ARB regarding orientation. He suggested convening a Design Review Committee consisting of the whole Board to meet and discuss the issue of orientation with the applicant. The discussion would not be binding upon the ARB, no decisions would be made, and public comment would not be accepted.

All Board members present were in agreement.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:31 pm.

*These minutes were approved by the Architectural Review Board on April 17, 2024.*