Architectural Review Board Minutes
May 1, 2024 – 3:00 P.M.

ADMINISTRATIVE

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

1. Roll Call
Annie Allen, Historic Development staff, called the roll as follows:

Members Present: Cartledge Blackwell, Catarina Echols, Stephen Howle, Karrie Maurin, Jennifer Roselius, and Cameron Pfeiffer-Traylor

Members Absent: Abby Davis, Stephen McNair, and Barja Wilson

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

2. Approval of Minutes from April 17th, 2024
Cart Blackwell moved to approve the minutes from the April 17th, 2024 meeting.

The motion was seconded by Jennifer Roselius and approved unanimously.

3. Approval of Mid-Month COAs granted by Staff
Ms. Roselius moved to approve the mid-month COAs granted by Staff.

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

MID-MONTH APPROVALS - APPROVED

1. **Applicant:** Franchise Management Services, Inc.
   Property Address: 1506 Monroe Street
   Issue Date: 4/09/2024
   Project: Reroof in-kind with shingles. Color: Charcoal
2. **Applicant:** Guy Brothers Roofing, Inc.
   Property Address: 26 S. Julia Street
   Issue Date: 4/10/2024

Project: 1. Remove and replace low-sloping metal roof on one-story porch located on the north side of house. Replacement will be a modified bitumen roof.
2. Remove and replace metal roof on one-story addition located northwest of the main structure. Replacement roof material will be shingles to match the main block of the house. Color: Hickory

3. **Applicant:** Cooner Construction, Inc.
Property Address: 714 Monroe Street
Issue Date: 4/12/2024
Project: Remove and replace in-kind cement fiber siding and trim on north elevation due to termite damage.

4. **Applicant:** John Edge
Property Address: 165 Hannon Avenue
Issue Date: 4/16/2024
Project: Repaint exterior of home in the following colors -Body: Sherwin Williams Oyster Bay; Trim: Sherwin Williams White

5. **Applicant:** Roger Franklin
Property Address: 205 Marine Street
Issue Date: 4/17/2024
Project: Replace six (6) rotten wood windows with clad wood windows to fit existing openings on the non-historic residence. Windows to be replaced include four (4) on the south elevation, one (1) on the east elevation, and one (1) on the north elevation**.**

6. **Applicant:** John W. Glover Construction
Property Address: 7 N. Claiborne Street
Issue Date: 4/18/2024
Project: Repair in-kind Hardie board window trim on north end of façade. Repaint to match.

7. **Applicant:** Johnathan Todd
Property Address: 17 N. Ann Street
Issue Date: 4/18/2024
Project: 1. Remove existing fence on the west property line that borders 1307 Chamberlain and the portion of the fence along the west property line that borders 19 N. Ann.
2. Replace both removed fence portions with a 6ft wood privacy fence with "dog ear" pickets.

8. **Applicant:** Ez-Roof Gulf LLC
Property Address: 1365 Dauphin Street
Issue Date: 4/18/202
Project: Reroof in-kind with shingles. Color: Black

9. **Applicant:** Pigeons on the Roof LLC
Property Address: 1055 Dauphin Street
Issue Date: 4/18/2024
Project: Reroof in-kind with shingles. Color: Charcoal

10. **Applicant:** Chad E. Foster (BLD)
Property Address: 159 S. Monterey Street

Issue Date: 4/18/2024
Project: Replace existing asbestos roofing with shingles. Color: Oyster Grey.

11. **Applicant:** Mobile Bay Roofing LLC
Property Address: 963 Palmetto Street
Issue Date: 4/18/2024
Project: Reroof in-kind with shingles. Color: Drift Shake

APPLICATIONS

1. 2024-17-CA

Address: 54 N. Cedar Street/261 N. Dearborn Street
Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street Commercial District/none
Applicant / Agent: Douglas Kealey on behalf of William Carroll
Project: Relocate contributing house from Lower Dauphin Street Commercial District to 261 N. Dearborn (no district). Construct rear addition and site improvements at new location.

APPROVED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

2. 2024-18-CA

Address: 958 Augusta Street
Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Applicant / Agent: Douglas Kearley on behalf of Bill & Connie Knauf
Project: Remove existing rear porch and construct approximate 778sf addition including rear screened porch

APPROVED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

3. 2024-19-CA

Address: 950 Elmira Street
Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Applicant / Agent: Tim Spafford on behalf of Bayleigh Thompson
Project: Remove rear porch and construct 200sf addition. Add new entry with stoop at north end of eat elevation.

APPROVED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

4. 2024-03-CA

Address: 916 Church Street
Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Applicant / Agent: Corte Development, Inc.
Project: New Construction: seven two-story single-family residences

APPROVED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

Architectural Review Board
May 1, 2024

Agenda Item #1
Certified Record 2024-17-CA

DETAILS

Location:
54 N. Cedar Street

Summary of Request:
Relocate historic structure to 265 N. Dearborn Street

Applicant (as applicable):
Douglas Kearley

Property Owner:
Janice Morrison
Jaime Hobbs
Darnisha Boykin

William Carroll (contingent owner)

Historic District:
Lower Dauphin Street Commercial

Classification:
Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The house at 54 N. Cedar Street is located in a locally designated historic district.
- The removal of the subject house would result in an empty lot, the equivalent of a demolition, and would impair the historic integrity of the district.
- The lot to which the subject house would be moved is not within a locally designated historic district. It is currently vacant but formerly was the site of a similar frame single-family residence.
- The proposed receiving lot is part of a redevelopment and infill project initiated by the Downtown Mobile Alliance.
- The proposed addition, alterations and site improvements would be in conformance with the *Guidelines,* if the *Guidelines* were applicable.

Report Contents:

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

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 contributing dwelling at 54 N. Cedar is a wood-frame shotgun type house with a rear projection on its south elevation. The 1878 City Directory, along with the 1891, 1904, and 1924 Sanborn maps, depict a large brick commercial building at 54 N. Cedar. This east side of the block remained predominately comprised of commercial structures through 1924. The subsequent Sanborn overlay, which occurred in 1955, depicts a domestic structure at 54 N. Cedar in a form that appears to be that of the existing dwelling. According to one of the owners, Ms. Morrison, the subject structure was moved to its current location. The original location is unknown. Aerial photography reveals that the house may have been extant at 54 N. Cedar in 1952. The National Register nomination dates the structure to c. 1900.

A rear porch and carport on the north elevation were added to the structure at an unknown date. These were demolished in 2017.

Historic Development Department records show that the property has appeared once before the Architectural Review Board (ARB). In 2017 an application was approved to remove the roof of a collapsing carport and portions of later additions.

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Move frame house at 54 N. Cedar Street to the vacant lot at 265 N. Dearborn Street
   Cardinal directions discussed here and shown on the plans refer to the proposed placement of the house at 265 N. Dearborn Street, and not to its current location.
   a. The structure would sit on the lot 16'-0" west of the N. Dearborn Street ROW. Side yard setbacks on the north and south would be 12'-0" and 8'-0", respectively.
   b. The building would be placed on masonry piers. Grade to finish floor height would be 2'-8". Framed wood lattice panels would be installed between the piers as infill.
   c. The existing metal roof would be replaced with a new 5 V Crimp standing seam metal roof.
   d. Existing wood siding would be repaired and replaced with new wood siding to match where needed.
   e. Repairs and alterations to the existing elevations would be as follows:
      <u>East façade</u>
      A wood front porch would replace the existing concrete porch.
      Scrape, prime, and repaint the extant iron columns, valence, brackets, and rail on front porch.
      Retain masonry steps and brick walls.
      Retain and repair existing door, transom, and windows.
      <u>West elevation</u>
      Additions to this elevation are described below
      <u>North elevation</u>
      Retain and repair existing windows.
      <u>South elevation</u>
      Retain and repair existing windows.
      Install a new two-over-two wood sash window which would measure 2'-10" wide by 5'-8" high, and would fit the existing opening.

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

1. Impact on the Street and District
    - Consider the impact of removing the historic structure relative to its context.
    - Consider whether the building is part of an ensemble of historic buildings that create a neighborhood. (12.0)
2. Nature of Proposed Development
    Consider the future utilization of the site. (12.0)
3. Relocation Guidelines
    - New Location: Consider whether or not a structure will be relocated within the same district and in a similar context. Relocation may be more appropriate when the receiving site is in the district. Relocated buildings shall be placed in situations that do not impair the architecture or the historic character of the surrounding buildings and district.
    - Building Placement: When relocating a building, maintain its general placement and orientation on the new site so as to maintain the architectural and historical character of the streetscape and district.
    - Where possible, relocate a building to a site that is similar in size as perceived from the street. (12.0)

STAFF ANALYSIS

The application involves relocating the historic structure at 54 N. Cedar Street to 265 N. Dearborn Street, constructing a rear addition, and carrying out site improvements. Mr. Carroll has purchased the house from the owners, with the contingency that if the Architectural Review Board does not approve its relocation to 265 N Dearborn, ownership will revert back to Ms. Morrison, Ms. Hobbs, and Ms. Boykin.

The Code of the City of Mobile (Chapter 44, Article IV, Sec. 44-80) requires that the ARB not grant a Certificate of Appropriateness "for the demolition or relocation of any Historic Property or property within a local Historic District unless the Board finds that the removal or relocation of such building will not be detrimental to the historic or architectural character of the District."

The structure to be moved is located in the Lower Dauphin Street Commercial District. The house would be removed from its current site, subsequently producing an end result for N. Cedar Street identical to a demolition. Therefore, when relocation is considered, the *Guidelines* direct consideration of the following: the significance of the structure, the condition of the structure in question, the impact on the street and district, the nature of proposed development at the origination property, the new location, and the building placement of the relocated building. (12.0)

<u>The significance of the structure</u>
The house at 54 N. Cedar is listed as a contributing property in the Lower Dauphin Street Commercial District National Register nomination. The shotgun dwelling type, which features single room width and multiple room depth, represents a vernacular form common mainly in urban areas throughout the Southeast. The subject property is a hipped-roof structure consisting of an off-set perpendicular rear wing, which represents a typical variation of the shotgun form, intended to create more living space.

<u>Condition</u>
The structure at 54. N Cedar is found to be in a deteriorated state. A visual inspection performed by Staff and photos provided by the applicant reveal missing windows, peeling paint, rotten framing and siding, openings created by missing soffit boards and framing materials, boarded-up openings in exterior walls due to deleted additions, etc. Historic Development Department vertical files show that, due to collapse, both the rear porch and carport were removed in 2017. Records further contain a structural engineering inspection report which states that the structure is unsalvageable and should be demolished, along with a notice from Municipal Enforcement

informing the owner of the deteriorated state of the dwelling. It has become apparent that the owners (Ms. Morrison, Ms. Hobbs, and Ms. Boykin) are not motivated and/or do not have the capacity to rehabilitate the house. Relocation may be an appropriate last option action to safeguard this historic structure from falling into irreparable ruin.

Impact on the Street and District

The *Guidelines* state that 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 involving the removal of a structure within a historic district. As stated above, the shotgun house, such as the one located at 54 N. Cedar, is common to this region, and the prevalence of its form is a defining feature of Mobile's historic built environment. Although many can still be seen throughout Mobile's historic districts and beyond, a substantial number have been and continue to be lost. While the contributing dwelling did not originate at this location, it contributes to the district as a historic structure, as it has sat at 54 N. Cedar for over fifty years, and well before the district was listed on the National Register. Previously, a large one-story brick commercial building sat on the lot from at least 1885. Since 1955, widespread demolition along adjacent properties and surrounding blocks mainly to the north, has resulted in vacant lots and the construction of new, large commercial structures. Included in the vacant lots are the two lots directly across N. Cedar from the subject property, along with the abutting lot to its north. Currently, 54 N. Cedar is one of two remaining residential properties on the immediate block.

The *Guidelines* further instruct that the impact of a structure's demolition on surrounding structures, including neighboring properties, properties on the same block or across the street, or properties throughout the individual historic district should be taken into account. The immediate vicinity has historically been a mix of commercial and residential, consisting of larger commercial and multi-tenant structures, and smaller one- or two-story single-family and duplex cottage dwellings, mostly of frame construction. Because most of the residential structures along North Cedar Street north of St. Francis Street have been removed, 54 N. Cedar creates a boundary that contributes to safeguarding the historic interpretation of the immediate block, which includes the Bettie Hunter home (part of the Dora Franklin Finley African American Heritage Trail) at 504 St. Francis, to the southeast. Along the adjacent block to the south (bounded by St. Francis and Dauphin Streets), the historic pattern of mixed residential and commercial remains mostly intact on the west side of N. Cedar, whereas all of the residential buildings formerly on the east side are no longer extant. Therefore, the location of the subject dwelling, also on the east side of N. Cedar, helps to underpin the historic built pattern of the street and the district.

Nature of proposed development at the origination property

The *Guidelines* instruct that the future use of a cleared site should be considered. No plans for future development of the lot at 54 N Cedar were submitted with this application. Conceptual plans for a pocket park were submitted as attachments to the applicant's Consolidated Review Committee (CRC) application, but those plans were not submitted for ARB consideration.

Relocation Guidelines: New location

In regard to the receiving location, the *Guidelines* state, "Consider whether or not a structure will be relocated within the same district and in a similar context. Relocation may be more appropriate when the receiving site is in the district. Relocated buildings shall be placed in situations that do not impair the architecture or the historic character of the surrounding buildings and district." The receiving site, 265 N. Dearborn, is not located in a historic district, which would place a contributing historic building outside the purview of the ARB, meaning any exterior changes or demolition proposed for the property in the future would not be subject to review under the City's preservation ordinance.

The subject lot on N. Dearborn Street is located two blocks west and four and a half blocks north of 54 N. Cedar Street. Historically, the architectural context of the proposed new location was similar to the one to which the subject structure currently belongs. The Sanborn map reveals that there were several houses of the same massing and form as 54 N. Cedar. The structure previously extant at 265 N. Dearborn was a frame double shotgun form with a full-width front porch. Aerial photography shows this structure present on the lot through 1985. It is not

extant in the subsequent 1997 photo. Like the area around 54 N. Cedar, both the east and west sides of the receiving block on N. Dearborn have witnessed high rates of building loss, with only four houses remaining out of the sixteen to eighteen that existed on the block between 1904 and 1955. The block is now comprised predominantly of vacant lots.

The lot at 265 N. Dearborn is owned by Historic Mobile, LLC a non-profit subsidiary of Main Street Mobile (MSM) and is part of a redevelopment initiative by MSM to repopulate and preserve eight home sites on the west side of N. Dearborn Street between Congress and State Streets, which has experienced extensive disinvestment. Currently, this infill and preservation initiative has resulted in the current rehabilitation of the two extant historic structures remaining on this section of the street, and four out of the remaining six lots are under development agreements with Historic Mobile, LLC for new construction projects, two of which have already begun at 269 and 261 N. Dearborn. All of the projects proposed for these eight sites are required to obtain the approval of the Consolidated Review Committee, as they are located in the Downtown Development District.

The lot at 265 N. Dearborn sits south of the historic home at 267 N. Dearborn, which is slated for rehab, and it sits north of a new single-family home under construction at 261 N. Dearborn. Like its historic context, the projected architectural context of the proposed new location would be comparable to the one which the building currently belongs to, i.e., modest frame single-family residences. Because of the reinvestment initiatives, the age of the surrounding houses would range from the turn of the twentieth century to new construction. There are four historic single-family homes extant on the east side of the street. The proposed location provides a suitable context for the historic structure at 54 N. Cedar, and its inclusion on the block would provide balance to the mix of historic and new construction on this section of the street, which appears to align with the goals of Historic Mobile, LLC's redevelopment project.

Although, as stated above, relocation might be a fitting option to preserve the historic resource at 54 N. Cedar, moving it to a location outside of a historic district is not compliant with the *Guidelines'* directives for relocation.

Relocation Guidelines: Building placement of the relocated building

The proposed new placement for the subject building would reflect its current placement and orientation on N. Cedar street. A proposed front setback of 16'-0" sits within the proposed setback range that will be established with the mix of existing historic properties and planned new construction. Likewise, the lot on N. Dearborn street is of a similar width but is significantly deeper. However, it is of an appropriate depth to accommodate the proposed additions for the rear of the original structure and would appear of a comparable size from the street, as directed in the *Guidelines*.

All repairs proposed for the structure are in-kind replacements which are in conformance with the *Guidelines*. The application also proposes the installation of a new two-over-two wood sash window to fit the existing opening. This replacement would not impair the established fenestration pattern on the elevation. (5.6-5.17, 6.5-6.8)

The *Guidelines* call for an addition to an existing historic structure to be subordinate to and compatible with the main structure in placement, massing, scale, and rhythm. This application achieves these objectives with the placement of the one-story addition to the rear of the property, which does not disrupt the existing massing and scale of the property. The footprint of the addition would increase the original structure's square footage to 1514, which is almost double its original footprint of approximately 800 sf. The roof design proposed for the addition would be appropriately incorporated to the existing roof design, and the change would be minimally visible from the street. Foundation and ceiling heights proposed for the addition match those of the existing house. (6.9 - 6.11, 6.14, 6.15, 6.19)

All exterior materials intended for the addition match the original historic structure and are of appropriate design, to include the wood siding, wood windows, and trim, along with matching masonry foundation piers and lattice infill panels. (6.13, 6.19, 6.21)

Site improvements proposed for 265 N. Dearborn include a brick walkway linking the front steps to the sidewalk, and a concrete driveway located to the north of the house. Both the walkway and driveway would be created in accordance with the *Guidelines*. (10.2, 10.5, 10.7)

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Douglas Kearley was present to speak to the application and stated that the house was moved to Cedar Street in the 1950s, when the decorative iron work was probably added to the front porch.

Mr. Bob Allen came forward to speak against the application, expressing his concern that the relocation of the house outside of a historic district would be another "acceptable mistake", noting that this phrase was coined by Councilman Carroll in his opposition to a previous application. He added that moving the subject house would place it outside of the purview of the ARB. He stated that the ARB is being asked to approve the move of this historic structure outside the district instead of enforcing the demolition by neglect portion of the ordinance, which seems like the most sinister of the "acceptable mistakes" that could be made. He urged the Board to not approve the relocation of the building.

Ms. Danielle Williams, representing Church Street East Historic District, came forward to speak against the application, stating that moving the house would remove any protective oversights to ensure that the home would be preserved, sets a dangerous precedent, and requested that the Board deny the application.

Mr. Bill Boswell of the Government Street Collaborative addressed the Board. He stated that the issue of this particular home has waited too long to be discussed in an open forum. He added that neither the City nor the Downtown Mobile Alliance has done its duty to enforce the ordinance to make sure owners maintain their historic properties and that more needs to be done to ensure that historic homes are maintained. He recognized that maintaining a historic home can be expensive and difficult for those who are economically challenged. He conveyed that he had a discussion with the Downtown Mobile Alliance, during which it was explained that the house, once moved to the new lot, would come under the protection of Historic Mobile, with certain deed restrictions which would require the repairs to be completed adequately and in a timely manner. If the work is not completed so, the property would be pulled from the owner, and the DDD guidelines would protect it better than the ARB. Mr. Boswell posed the question: where was the DDD when the house at Cedar Street deteriorated for decades? He stated that nothing was done and noted his concern about setting a negative precedent of moving buildings out of districts. He added that in this case some protection is present at the receiving lot, but that a precedent would allow for homes to be moved where there are no such protections.

Mr. Fred Rendfrey, representing Historic Mobile, spoke in favor of the application. As a representative of the receiving lot, he described the eight-lot redevelopment initiative in place on the block at N. Dearborn, which includes new construction and renovation projects. He noted that the owner of the property at 54 N. Cedar is not willing to sell and has applied for a demolition permit; he pointed out that the house, if not moved, would fall down. He requested that the Board approve the application.

Mr. Kearley spoke again in rebuttal, stating that the house has been neglected for many years and is no longer in a residential neighborhood. He recognized that the presented relocation is not the best way, but that it is the only way at this point to save the house and make it a useable residence.

Six (6) written comments were received.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Roselius inquired into the context of the property, asking Mr. Carroll if it is the case that the owner has been unable or willing to preserve and is also not willing to sell the lot.

William Carroll, the applicant/contractor came forward to respond. He stated that if it is not moved, it will be torn down or will fall down. He added that the owners want to keep the "dirt", yet they have no way to keep the house, which has a rich history, having been owned by the fifth king of MAMGA.

Ms. Roselius asked Mr. Carroll to elaborate on the requirements that Historic Mobile would impose on the property at its receiving lot. Mr. Carroll stated that the requirements would be similar to the ARB and expanded on the benefits of repairing and rehabilitating the subject structure.

Karrie Maurin asked the applicants if there are drawings and plans for the proposed rehabilitation of the house once moved. Ms. Allen explained that plans were submitted by the applicant but were deemed irrelevant to the application, considering that the house would be moved out of the purview of the ARB; therefore, any future plans would not come under the Board's review.

Catarina Echols and Ms. Maurin agreed that the plans for proposed rehabilitation are important for the review because they provide context.

Cameron Pfeiffer-Traylor offered that, in her opinion, once the structure leaves the district, the ARB is not engaged, that the only thing the Board is looking at is what happens to the vacant lot after the house is removed. She stated that there should be plans for the development of the resulting vacant lot and noted that a conceptual plan for a private park had been mentioned in relation to this property.

Ms. Roselius stated that in looking at the Staff report, it appears the plans were submitted by the applicant. Ms. Allen confirmed that the plans were submitted, and made a suggestion that Mr. Rendfrey speak to what restrictions will be placed on the house once moved.

Mr. Rendfrey stated that the house will be governed by the City code and the development plans would have to be executed by the agreed upon date. This timeline would include six months to get a permit and 18 months to acquire a Certificate of Occupancy. He added that no short-term rentals would be allowed for five years and noted that the property would also be governed Downtown Development District (DDD) regulations.

Ms. Traylor asked who enforces the DDD regulations. Mr. Rendfrey replied that this falls under the City of Mobile Zoning Department.

Ms. Roselius stated for clarification that it is her understanding that the property would be moved to a lot within the DDD which has their own set of architectural guidelines and any alteration or changes to the building would be subject to review against those guidelines by the Consolidated Review Committee.

Mr. Blackwell clarified that the DDD does have standards in place that are based on the *Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts*. However, it is a code, not guidelines. Additions and new construction are considered in regard to placement, how the project relates to other nearby properties, etc. The project must meet the code or seek a variance. Additionally, he noted that this is a very difficult application which involves two parties: the city maintaining property values and safeguarding the historic districts and the individuals maintaining their properties. Mr. Blackwell referenced a nearby property that contained a derelict historic structure wherein multiple offers were made to purchase, but in the end the house was demolished due to neglect. He concluded that this could happen again given the circumstances surrounding the subject property. He recognized that the ARB must consider the impact on the district but warned that if the Board waits longer, the result would be another vacant lot.

Ms. Roselius stated that context is important and that approving applications will not set a precedent for future removals. She added that relocation is appropriate in this specific situation and that when relocation outside of a district is considered, context is important. In regard to precedent, Ms. Roselius stated that the ARB deals with each application on a case-by-case basis, where context matters. She summarized that in this case, the owner will not sell and is unable or unwilling to maintain the home. Therefore, if the house is allowed to remain, demolition by neglect would be the result, which is not desirable. She added that the house would be moving to a historic area and although the new location is outside of a district, it is an appropriate context. She recognized that the Board would have no say-so in what happens after the building is moved but that the receiving property does have some oversight by the CRC. She stated that the goal – although there is concern with leaving a vacant lot – is to preserve our historic resources. She concluded that it does not appear that can be accomplished leaving the structure where it is; therefore, in this very specific case and based on the context, this is one reason why the *Guidelines* state that relocation to a historic district is many times more appropriate but they do not state that moving a building outside of a district is not allowed.

Ms. Echols made note that this project could spur preservation in the new location and potentially bring back a whole district.

Mr. Blackwell was in agreement with Ms. Roselius and Ms. Echols and stated that it is important to know that the house was moved to its current site and that it is being moved to a place with certain protections.

Ms. Traylor stated that while the subject house was moved to Cedar Street, it has been in its location for over fifty years, a location that previously boasted many houses, followed by widespread demolition, which resulted in a gap-toothed appearance of some house, some vacant lots, and some commercial structures. She voiced her concern that allowing this type of demolition by removal could be construed as an acceptable path and followed with her hope that the City would be more proactive with enforcement and providing assistance and resources for homeowners in need so that it does not get to this juncture. She continued that although she values the attempt to preserve the building by relocation, her concern is that this action will become a remedy and therefore she is inclined to deny the application. She reiterated that hopefully more options would be provided by the City in the future so that this is not the only option before the Board.

Ms. Roselius added that the ARB has little power in preventing demolition by neglect and stated her hope that City officials and departments would get onboard in preventing these types of scenarios in the future.

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.

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Blackwell moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, that the application does not impair the architectural or historic character of the property, noting that the building is not original to its current site and would be going to a location outside of a district; this motion is contingent on the fact that there are restrictions in place at the new location which would preserve the building in its new landscape, and therefore should be granted a COA.

Ms. Roselius seconded the motion and it was approved by a 6:1 vote, with Ms. Traylor voting to deny.

Agenda Item #2
Certified Record 2024-18-CA

DETAILS

Location:
958 Augusta Street

Summary of Request:
Remove rear porch; construct a rear addition.

Applicant (as applicable):
Douglas Kearley

Property Owner:
Bill and Connie Knauf

Historic District:
Oakleigh Garden

Classification:
Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The porch proposed for removal is not historic.
- The proposed addition would add more living space on the rear of the house, a new rear porch, and gallery on the west elevation.
- The proposed addition is in compliance with the *Guidelines* in regard to placement, scale, materials, and details.

Report Contents:

Property and Application History 2
Scope of Work 2
Applicable Standards 3
Staff Analysis 5
Attachments 7

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 19th- and 20th-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 historic dwelling at 958 Augusta Street is a wood-frame gable roof shotgun home with a rear porch addition on its north elevation. Historic Development files record the construction date of this property as c. 1906. It does not appear on the 1904 Sanborn Map of the area but is represented on the subsequent overlay in 1925 much as it reads today, a rectangular form with a full-width front porch and small rear porch on the west end of the north elevation. The façade was extensively altered in the 1960s, when the front porch was enclosed and an aluminum window was installed. These alterations were reversed when the home was rehabilitated in the 1990s and the front porch was restored back to its traditional form with classical elements. In the late 1990s, a second rear porch spanning the width of the rear elevation was added.

Historic Development Department records show that this property has appeared once before the Architectural Review Board. In 2007, an application to extend rear fencing was approved.

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Demolish existing rear porch.
2. Construct an addition to the north (rear) elevation.
    a. The proposed addition would measure approximately 17’-2” wide by 45’-4” deep and would include an enclosed bedroom/bathroom, a rear screened porch, a landing and steps, and an open gallery along the west elevation, all described as follows:
        - The enclosed area would measure 12’-6” wide by 27’-0” deep. All fenestration proposed for this portion would be located on the west elevation and would include one (1) 3’-0” wide by 7’-0” high wood four-paneled door topped by a single-light transom, located near the north end of the elevation and one (1) two-over-two wood window which would be relocated from the existing rear elevation and be roughly centered on the west wall.
        - A 13 ‘-6” deep screened porch would span the width of the rear elevation. The porch would be supported by five (5) 8”x8” square wood columns matching the existing columns on the house. Three (3) columns would be regularly spaced across the rear elevation, one (1) would be centered on the porch’s east elevation, and one (1) would be centered on its west elevation.
        - The addition’s roof would run beyond the rear porch to cover a landing, steps, and area dedicated for a future lift system. This part of the roof would be supported by three additional 8”x 8” square columns resting on 16”x 16” brick pedestals which would each measure 2’-0” high to match the foundation level. An existing wood louvered vent would be reused in the gable. The landing, measuring approximately 4’-0” wide by 4’-0” deep would access a 3’-0” wide by 7’-0” high wood and screen door, which would sit slightly east of center on the rear elevation and lead to the rear porch. Five (5) 4’-0” wide wood steps would rise from west to east to the landing. A wood railing with squared spindles would rise along the north end of the steps and enclose the landing.
        - An unscreened gallery measuring approximately 5’-0” wide by 31’-10” deep would run along the west elevation of the addition and would access the rear porch by a 3’-0” wide by 7’-0” high wood and screen door. The gallery would be supported by four (4) 8”x 8” square columns to match those of the rear porch. Like the porch, a wood railing would run between

the columns, enclosing the gallery. An existing rear porch with matching column and railing would abut the proposed gallery on its south end.

b. The addition would be topped by a gable roof that would sit 1'-0" lower than the existing gable roof. Ceiling heights from finished floor level would measure 9'-4" high. The roof would be clad in shingles to match the existing roof.
c. The addition would be clad in lap siding to match existing, with the exception of the east wall, which would require a Hardieplank UL 1 hour rated wall.
d. The addition's proposed foundation of brick piers with framed wood lattice panels for infill would match that of the original house in design, materials, and height.
e. The existing house's rear corner boards would remain extant to distinguish the addition from the original block of the house on both the east and west elevations.

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

1. **6.9** Place an addition so that it is subordinate to the historic residential structure.
    - Place and design an addition to the rear or side of the historic building wherever possible.
    - Place a vertical addition in the rear so it is not visible from the street.
2. **6.10** Design an addition to be compatible in massing and scale with the original historic structure.
    - Design the massing of an addition to appear subordinate to the historic building.
    - Where feasible, use a lower-scale connecting element to join an addition to a historic structure.
    - Where possible, match the foundation and floor heights of an addition to those of the historic building.
3. **6.11** Design the exterior walls of an addition to be compatible in scale and rhythm with the original historic structure.
    - Design the height of an addition to be proportionate with the historic building, paying particular attention to the foundation and other horizontal elements.
    - Design the addition to express floor heights on the exterior of the addition in a fashion that reflects floor heights of the original historic building.
4. **6.12** Clearly differentiate the exterior walls of an addition from the original historic structure.
    - Use a physical break or setback from the original exterior wall to visually separate the old from new.
    - Use an alteration in the roofline to create a visual break between the original and new, but ensure that the pitches generally match.
5. **6.13** Use exterior materials and finishes that are comparable to those of the original historic residential structure in profile, dimension and composition. Modern building materials will be evaluated for appropriateness or compatibility with the original historic structure on an individual basis, with the objective of ensuring the materials are similar in their profile, dimension, and composition to those of the original historic structure.
    - Utilize an alternative material for siding as necessary, such as cement-based fiber board, provided that it matches the siding of the historic building in profile, character and finish.
    - Use a material with proven durability.
    - Use a material with a similar appearance in profile, texture and composition to those on the original building.
    - Choose a color and finish that matches or blends with those of the historic building.
    - Do not use a material with a composition that will impair the structural integrity and visual character of the building.
    - Do not use a faux stucco application.
6. **6.14** Design a roof of an addition to be compatible with the existing historic building.
    - Design a roof shape, pitch, material and level of complexity to be similar to those of the existing historic building.

- Incorporate overhanging exposed rafters, soffits, cornices, fascias, frieze boards, moldings or other elements into an addition that are generally similar to those of the historic building.
- Use a roofing material for an addition that matches or is compatible with the original historic building and the district.

7. **6.15** Design roofs such that the addition remains subordinate to the existing historic buildings in the district.
    - Where possible, locate a dormer or skylight on a new addition in an inconspicuous location.
    - In most cases, match a roof and window on a dormer to those of the original building.
8. **6.16** Design doors and doorways to an addition to be compatible with the existing historic building.
    - If a historic door is removed to accommodate the addition, consider reusing it on the addition.
    - Design a door and doorway to be compatible with the historic building.
    - Use a door material that is compatible with those of the historic building and the district.
    - Use a material with a dimensionality (thickness) and appearance similar to doors on the original historic building.
    - Design the scale of a doorway on an addition to be in keeping with the overall mass, scale and design of the addition as a whole.
9. **6.17** Design and place a new porch to maintain the visibility to and integrity of an original historic porch, as well as the overall historic building.
    - Do not expand an original historic front porch. Additions of new front porches or expansion of existing front porches are generally not appropriate.
    - Limit the height of a porch addition roofline so it does not interfere with second story elevations. Replace a rear porch where a previously existing rear porch is lost or enclosed.
    - Design a rear porch so that its height and slopes are compatible with the original historic structure.
10. **6.18** Design a new porch to be compatible with the existing historic building.
    - Design the scale, proportion and character of a porch addition element, including columns, corner brackets, railings and pickets, to be compatible with the existing historic residential structure.
    - Match the foundation height of a porch addition to that of the existing historic structure.
    - Design a porch addition roofline to be compatible with the existing historic structure. However, a porch addition roofline need not match exactly that of the existing historic building. For example, a porch addition may have a shed roof.
    - Use materials for a porch addition that are appropriate to the building.
    - Do not use a contemporary deck railing for a porch addition placed at a location visible from the public street.
    - Do not use cast concrete steps on façades or primary elevations.
11. **6.19** Design piers, foundations and foundation infill on a new addition to be compatible with those on the historic building.
    - Match the foundation of an addition to that of the original.
    - Use a material that is similar to that of the historic foundation.
    - Match foundation height to that of the original historic building.
    - Use pier foundations if feasible and if consistent with the original building.
    - Do not use raw concrete block or wood posts on a foundation.
12. **6.20** Use details that are similar in character to those on the historic structure.
    - Match a detail on an addition to match the original historic structure in profile, dimension and material.
    - Use ornamentation on an addition that is less elaborate than that on the original structure.

- Use a material for details on an addition that match those of the original in quality and feel.
- Match the proportions of details on an addition to match the proportions used on the original historic structure.

13. **6.21** Design a window on an addition to be compatible with the original historic building.
    - Size, place and space a window for an addition to be in character with the original historic building.
    - If an aluminum window is used, use dimensions that are similar to the original windows of the house. An extruded custom aluminum window approved by the NPS or an aluminum clad wood window may be used, provided it has a profile, dimension and durability similar to a window in the historic building.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The historic structure at 958 Augusta Street is a contributing resource within the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. The application under review includes the proposed demolition of an existing non-historic porch and the construction of a new rear addition.

The existing porch was constructed in the 1990s to accommodate a hot tub, and its removal would not impair the historic integrity of the property.

The *Guidelines* call for the placement of an addition to an existing historic structure to appear subordinate to the main structure. The footprint of the proposed addition, approximately 770 sf, is more than 60% of the structure's current square footage (approximately 1250sf); however, its placement to the rear of the dwelling and below a continuing yet lowered roof line, creates minimal visual impact, achieving the above-stated standard of the appearance of inferiority. In further compliance with the *Guidelines*, the scale and the rhythm of the proposed addition is in sync with that of the original structure in its preservation of consistent ceiling and floor heights, traditional fenestration patterns, and solid-to-void ratios. (6.10,6.11, 6.14,6.15) In addition to the lower roof height of the addition, retaining the existing corner boards on the north ends of the house would clearly differentiate the historic structure from the addition. (6.12)

The footprint of the addition would increase the original structure's square footage to 1514, which is almost double its original footprint of approximately 800 sf. The roof design proposed for the addition would be appropriately incorporated to the existing roof design, and the change would be minimally visible from the street.

The materials, finishes, and details proposed for exterior walls, roof, porches, fenestration, and foundation of the addition match or complement those of the original historic structure, maintaining its architectural integrity and visual character. Likewise, the design and placement of the proposed doors, along with the reuse of an existing historic window and louvered vent further increase the addition's harmony with the original building. (6.13, 6.16, 6.19-6.21)

The incorporation of the original rear porch on the west end of the rear elevation into the gallery and rear porch design, and the use of matching elements such as cornice profile, columns, and railings is an appropriate alteration which maintains three elements of historic integrity as outlined by the Secretary of the Interior: location, design, and feeling. (6.17,6.18)

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Douglas Kearley was present to discuss the application. He stated that the project involved removing a hot tub porch on the rear, then constructing a bedroom/bath addition and new rear porch. He added that all materials and foundation would match existing and that the addition's roof would sit lower than the original to differentiate.

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board had no questions or comments.

FINDING FACTS

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

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

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

Agenda Item #3
Certified Record 2024-19-CA

DETAILS

Location:
950 Elmira Street

Summary of Request:
Demolish rear porch and construct new rear addition; repairs and alteration to the original structure.

Applicant (as applicable):
Tim Spafford

Property Owner:
Bayleigh Thompson

Historic District:
Oakleigh Garden District

Classification:
Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The rear porch proposed for demolition is not original to the structure.
- The proposed addition is in conformance with the Guidelines' standards for compatibility in placement, massing, scale, and materials.
- The proposed repairs, replacements and alterations to the original structure do not impair its integrity or significance.
- The proposed new fence and parking are acceptable site improvements in regard to placement, dimensions, and materials.

Report Contents:

Property and Application History 2
Scope of Work 2
Applicable Standards 3
Staff Analysis 6
Attachments 7

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 19th- and 20th-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 contributing dwelling at 950 Elmira is a wood-frame cottage reflecting the Gulf Coast Cottage style, including features such as the full width front porch tucked under the side-gable roof and the classical symmetry expressed by the arrangement of architectural elements and fenestration patterns. Historic Development records date the house to c. 1905. It is represented on the 1904 Sanborn Insurance map with a form much like the current, though without the extant rear porch which runs along the west side of the rear elevation. On the 1925 overlay, the rear porch is present, along with a large one-story rectangular addition abutting the east side wall and sitting slightly forward of the original cottage, overlapping the northeast corner of Elmira and Marine Streets. This addition is labeled "S" for "Store" and is not represented on the subsequent 1956 overlay. It is also not present in a 1952 aerial photo.

Historic Development Department records show that the property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board.

SCOPE OF WORK

2. Remove existing rear enclosed porch which currently includes a bathroom and a vestibule area. Remove an existing cross-gable roof on rear of structure. Construct a new master bedroom, bath and laundry addition that encompasses the footprint of the removed rear porch.
    a. The existing cross-gable roof located on the east end of the structure would be removed. A proposed new cross-gable roof would extend northward from the center of the existing ridgeline of the side-gable roof and would cover the existing rear portion of the structure. This roof portion would measure 22'-1 ½ " at the ridge, matching that of the original roof.
    b. The proposed one-story addition would measure 292 sf and would be located to the rear of the original structure. The west side setback would remain the same as that of the original structure. The setback from the rear property line would be 5'-0".
    c. The proposed addition would be topped by a gable roof. This gable would sit subordinate to the rest of the roof structure. All proposed new roof portions would be clad in black shingles to match the existing.
    d. The ceiling height of the of the addition would match the original structure at 11'-2".
    e. The new addition would be clad in wood clapboard siding, painted Warm Eucalyptus by Valspar.
    f. The proposed addition would sit on a foundation of brick piers with framed wood lattice infill panels to match the original.
    g. All proposed new windows would be six-over-six aluminum clad wood windows to match existing. All would measure 2'-1" wide by 5'-2" high, with the exception of one window located on the far north end of the west elevation. This window would measure 2'-0" wide by 4'-6" high.
    h. Elevations of the proposed addition would appear as follows:
        - North (rear) elevation (from east to west)
          Side elevation of proposed new side porch, steps, and handrail; corner board; window centered on the east half of the original rear end wall; corner board of projecting wing addition; window centered on the wing; corner board.
        - West elevation (from north to south)

One 2’-0” wide by 4’-6” high window; two 2’-1” wide by 5’-2” high windows, all regularly spaced across the addition portion of the elevation; corner board.

- East elevation (from south to north)
  Window, located slightly south of center of the side wall; corner board

3. Proposed repairs and alteration to existing structure
   a. Repair and replace existing siding where needed with in-kind materials, painted to match existing.
   b. Repair existing windows where needed using matching materials. If replacement is needed, windows will be replaced with six-over-six wood sash windows to match existing in size and profile.
   c. Repair front porch decking where needed with tongue and groove decking.
   d. Install a suspended copper gas lantern on the front porch centered on the entry doorway.
   e. Replace existing non-original front porch columns with new 12”x12” square columns, each with cap and base.
   f. A new 36”-high wood balustrade would be installed on the front porch.
   g. Remove and replace existing concrete front porch steps with wood steps of the same width. The proposed new front porch steps would be flanked by a wood balustrade which would match the balustrade on the porch.
   h. Painted wood louvered shutters would flank the existing windows on the façade.
   i. On the east elevation, the fourth existing window from the front would be replaced with a 7’-0” high wood paneled door, painted white. A proposed new landing measuring 4’-0” wide by 6’-0” deep would extend eastward from the doorway and would be accessed by five wood steps. The landing would be topped by a gable roof supported by two 7’-2” high square posts, each with base and cap. The gable roof would be clad in shingles to match the existing roof. The steps would be flanked by a wood handrail and the landing enclosed by a wood balustrade to match that proposed for the front porch.
4. Proposed site improvements
   a. Remove existing chain link fencing.
   b. A 6’-0” high wood privacy fence would project from the east elevation, approximately 6” behind the front plane of the structure, and would extend to the east property line, then run north along the east property line to the northeast corner of the property, where it would abut an existing privacy fence. Along this elevation, a 20’-0” wide rolling gate would stretch across the existing driveway. The gate would match the privacy fence in materials and design. The existing curb cut will be moved to accommodate the entrance.
   c. A parking area would be created to the rear of the dwelling, on the east side of the property. This area would be paved with crushed limestone. The existing curb cut on the east ROW, adjacent to the proposed parking area, will be adjusted to accommodate the new widened entrance.

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

4. **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.
5. **5.7** When replacing materials on a non-primary façade or elevation, match the original material in composition, scale and finish.
   - Use original materials to replace damaged materials on a non-primary façade when possible.

6. **5.17** Preserve historic stylistic and architectural details and ornamentation.
    - Repair historic details and ornamentation that are deteriorated.
7. **6.5** Repair a porch in a way that maintains the original character.
8. **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.
9. **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.
10. **6.11** Design the exterior walls of an addition to be compatible in scale and rhythm with the original historic structure.
    - Design the height of an addition to be proportionate with the historic building, paying particular attention to the foundation and other horizontal elements.
    - Design the addition to express floor heights on the exterior of the addition in a fashion that reflects floor heights of the original historic building.
11. **6.12** Clearly differentiate the exterior walls of an addition from the original historic structure.
    - Use a physical break or setback from the original exterior wall to visually separate the old from new.
    - Use an alteration in the roofline to create a visual break between the original and new, but ensure that the pitches generally match.
12. **6.13** Use exterior materials and finishes that are comparable to those of the original historic residential structure in profile, dimension and composition. Modern building materials will be evaluated for appropriateness or compatibility with the original historic structure on an individual basis, with the objective of ensuring the materials are similar in their profile, dimension, and composition to those of the original historic structure.
    - Utilize an alternative material for siding as necessary, such as cement-based fiber board, provided that it matches the siding of the historic building in profile, character and finish.
    - Use a material with proven durability.
    - Use a material with a similar appearance in profile, texture and composition to those on the original building.
    - Choose a color and finish that matches or blends with those of the historic building.
    - Do not use a material with a composition that will impair the structural integrity and visual character of the building.
    - Do not use a faux stucco application.
13. **6.14** Design a roof of an addition to be compatible with the existing historic building.
    - Design a roof shape, pitch, material and level of complexity to be similar to those of the existing historic building.
    - Incorporate overhanging exposed rafters, soffits, cornices, fascias, frieze boards, moldings or other elements into an addition that are generally similar to those of the historic building.
    - Use a roofing material for an addition that matches or is compatible with the original historic building and the district.
14. **6.15** Design roofs such that the addition remains subordinate to the existing historic buildings in the district.
    - Where possible, locate a dormer or skylight on a new addition in an inconspicuous location.
    - In most cases, match a roof and window on a dormer to those of the original building

15. **6.19** Design piers, foundations and foundation infill on a new addition to be compatible with those on the historic building.
    - Match the foundation of an addition to that of the original.
    - Use a material that is similar to that of the historic foundation.
    - Match foundation height to that of the original historic building.
    - Use pier foundations if feasible and if consistent with the original building.
    - Do not use raw concrete block or wood posts on a foundation.
16. **6.21** Design a window on an addition to be compatible with the original historic building.
    - Size, place and space a window for an addition to be in character with the original historic building.
    - If an aluminum window is used, use dimensions that are similar to the original windows of the house. An extruded custom aluminum window approved by the NPS or an aluminum clad wood window may be used, provided it has a profile, dimension and durability similar to a window in the historic building.
17. **10.2** Design a fence to be compatible with the architectural style of the house and existing fences in the neighborhood.
    - Install a painted wood picket fence.
    - Install a simple wood or wire fence. Heights of wooden picket fences are ordinarily restricted to 36". Consideration for up to 48," depending on the location of the fence, shall be given. A variance might be required. Staff can advise and assist applicants with regard to a variance. If combined with a wall, the total vertical dimension of the wall and fence collectively should not exceed 36," or in some cases 48".
    - For surface parking areas associated with commercial uses, size a perimeter parking area fence to not exceed 48" in height.
    - Install a cast-iron or other metal fence not exceeding 48" in height if located in the front yard.
    - Install a fence that uses alternative materials that have a very similar look and feel to wood, proven durability, matte finish and an accurate scale and proportion of components.
    - Face the finished side of a fence toward the public right-of-way.
    - Based on the chosen fence material, use proportions, heights, elements and levels of opacity similar to those of similar material and style seen in the historic district.

    REAR AND NON-CORNER SIDE FENCES (LOCATED BEHIND THE FRONT BUILDING PLANE)
    - Design a fence located behind the front building plane to not exceed 72" in height. If the subject property abuts a multi-family residential or commercial property, a fence up to 96" will be considered.
    - An alternative fence material with proven durability, matte finish and an accurate scale and proportion of components is acceptable. A simple wood-and-wire fence is acceptable provided it is appropriate to the style of the house.
18. **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)

STAFF ANALYSIS

The subject property is a contributing structure to the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. The application under review proposes the construction of a one-story addition which would project from the west half of the north (rear) elevation.

The *Guidelines* call for an addition to an existing historic structure to be subordinate to and compatible with the main structure in placement, massing, scale and rhythm. This application achieves these objectives with the placement of the one-story addition to the rear of the property, which does not disrupt the existing massing and scale of the property. The footprint, which would measure 292 square feet, would be approximately 23% of the footprint of the historic mass of the house. The roof proposed for the addition also sits subordinate to the height of the existing roof. Foundation and ceiling heights proposed for the addition match those of the existing house. (6.9 - 6.11, 6.15)

As directed by the *Guidelines*, the proposed addition is differentiated by the alternation in roofline and roof height. On the north and east elevations, the projecting footprint would further distinguish the addition from the original structure. (6.12)

All exterior materials intended for the addition match the original historic structure or are approvable materials for additions to historic structures. These materials include wood siding, aluminum clad wood windows, and wood trim, along with matching brick foundation piers and lattice infill panels. (6.13, 6.19, 6.21) Likewise, the cross-gable roof configuration planned for the addition complements the original roof plan. The new roof would be clad in a matching material and adopt the same overhang depth as the existing roof. (6.14)

Repairs and replacement work proposed for the existing building include repairs to siding, windows, front porch decking, railing, shutters and foundation infill. All proposed replacement materials would match existing. The existing wood posts across the front porch are later additions that appear to have replaced larger and more substantial posts. The proposed 12”x 12” wood columns could be considered more comparable to the previous columns, and more compatible with the scale of the front porch. Installing shutters would be a fitting alteration also, as there is hardware evidence of earlier shutters flanking the front porch windows. The somewhat rudimentary railing currently enclosing the front porch does not appear to be original. The design and scale of the proposed porch balustrade would contribute to the classical rhythm expressed on this Gulf Coast cottage. Although it is unknown whether historically there was a railing on the porch, there are extant examples of this type of cottage with a front porch railing similar to the one proposed in the application. Both 1055 Augusta and 1013 Selma are both side-gable cottages with picket railings enclosing full-width front porches. There are also a number of structures in the more immediate vicinity along Elmira Street with a similar front porch railing design, including 952, 954, and 909 Elmira.

The design, proportions, and placement of the proposed gas lantern are fitting with the style of the historic cottage. The existing concrete steps leading to the front porch are not original. Photographic evidence reveals that wood steps were previously extant in that location. Therefore, going back with wood steps as proposed in the scope of work is an appropriate alteration. The replacement of a historic window with a wood panel door on the

rear end of the east elevation would not disrupt the established fenestration pattern and would allow access to the house from the rear parking area. Likewise, the covered landing and steps providing access to the side door echo the style of the front porch. (5.6, 5.7, 5.17)

The replacement of the chain link fence with a 6'-0" wood privacy fence and rolling gate brings this site element into compliance with the *Guidelines*. The proposed fence and rolling gate fit within the *Guidelines'* parameters in regard to material, size and placement. (10.2) The proposed parking area also follows the Guidelines' directive to place parking areas to the side or rear of a property to minimize the visual impact of parking. A new curb cut would be required for this alteration to be fully compliant. The applicant intends to make this adjustment, which may require a variance. (10.7)

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Timothy Spafford was present to discuss the application. He stated that the owner, Ms. Bailey Thompson, is renovating the property to make it her residence. He continued that the structure is a small house on a small lot, adding that the rear porch is not original and is in poor condition. He noted that all proposed materials and window sizes would be comparable to existing.

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Maurin asked Mr. Spafford to clarify the roof line of the addition on the west elevation. He stated that the roof of the addition would have a lower ridge and steps down from the existing roof.

Ms. Traylor asked if the new windows would be six-over-six. Mr. Spafford replied that they would.

Ms. Maurin asked if the shutters would be operable. Mr. Spafford relied that they would.

Ms. Maurin asked if the entire house is being re-sided. Mr. Spafford responded that only the addition would have new siding.

Ms. Maurin asked if there would be a corner board on the west elevation to denote the addition from the original part of the structure. Mr. Spafford replied that a corner board could be added.

Ms. Traylor asked Mr. Spafford to describe the gate. Mr. Spafford said it would be rolling gate due to lack of space on the lot.

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 include the addition of a vertical corner board on the west elevation.

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

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

Agenda Item #4
Certified Record 2024-03-CA

DETAILS

Location:
916 Church Street

Summary of Request:
New Construction: seven two-story single-family residences

Applicant (as applicable):
Corte Development, Inc.

Property Owner:
RGH Oakleigh LLC

Historic District:
Oakleigh Garden

Classification:
Vacant

Summary of Analysis:

- In regard to placement, mass, and size, the proposed new construction is compatible with the existing patterns and conventions seen in the immediate vicinity.
- The form of the proposed buildings is more akin to those seen in other cities and historic districts. However, other proposed building elements are compatible with those seen on nearby historic buildings and further afield.
- The proposed building materials are compatible with the historic character of the district.
- This application was granted conceptual approval in February 2024, with the caveat that the applicant, after meeting with a Design Review Committee would submit finalized plans to the ARB for final review.
- An addendum has been included in this report, detailing the outcome of the Design Review Committee and the applicant's resubmission.

Report Contents:

Property and Application History 2
Scope of Work 2
Applicable Standards 5
Staff Analysis 9
Attachments.....12

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 19th- and 20th-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 lot at 916 Church Street is currently vacant. The large lot was created by the combination of four previously residential lots. The 1878 Hopkins map shows three structures on three lots, one being a large center lot, spread across the site. The large center lot belonged to "Dr. Carter." The southwest corner lot was occupied by a large west-facing building with two rear wings. By the time of the 1891 Sanborn map, the southwest corner had been redeveloped with a frame house facing Church Street, and a smaller frame house had been constructed between the corner house and Dr. Carter's property. The 1904 Sanborn shows the two houses on either side of Dr. Carter's property had been expanded to the north; the footprints of the buildings on all four lots remained the same through the 1956 Sanborn map. However, two of the four houses had been demolished by the 1980 aerial photograph.

According to MHDC files, this property appeared four times before the Architectural Review Board (ARB). In August 1985, the ARB approved the creation of a parking lot on the site. In January 2021, approval in concept was granted for the first phase of a 14-unit, multi-family residential development. In February 2023, a COA was granted for the construction of nine two-story single-family residences. In January 2024, an application for new construction of seven single family homes was given conceptual approval.

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Construct seven two-story frame single family dwellings, ranging from approximately 4352 to 4464 square feet.
    a. The property would be divided into seven lots running north to south, all fronting Church Street.
    b. Four house plans are proposed: Royale, St. Francis, Oakleigh 4, and Oakleigh 5. All four plans would consist of rectangular, hip-roofed structures sheathed in fiber cement lap siding.
    c. All units would face Church Street (south). With the exception of Lot 7 (easternmost), each structure would sit close to the east lot line. The front yard setbacks would measure 25'-2 ½", with a side yard setback on the west side of approximately 10'-0".
    d. All windows would be Anderson 400 series double-hung vinyl clad wood.
    e. The front entry doors would be fiberglass. Door surrounds would be fiber cement board.
    f. All trim, including corner boards, soffits, fascia boards, etc. would be of fiber cement board.
    g. Brackets supporting the shed roof stoops would be of pressure treated wood.
    h. Front porch steps would be either of cement or brick.
    i. Side stoop steps would be of pressure treated wood.
    j. The houses would rest upon continuous brick foundations approximately 2'-8" above grade.
    k. The roofs would be clad in metal.
2. The proposed Royale model would simulate a shotgun type house with a camelback.

a. The footprint would measure approximately 18’-0” wide by 52’-8” deep, and the building would be approximately 30’-5” tall. The first floor would have a 10’-0” ceiling height, and the second floor would have a 9’-0” ceiling height.
b. The front elevation would consist of a one-story forward block with a two-story camelback located approximately 16’ behind.
    1) A front porch would span the width of the one-story forward block. The porch would be sheltered by a shed roof surmounted by a gable. The porch roof would appear to be supported by four (4) 10”x10” boxed columns of fiber cement board.
    2) The front porch would rest upon a continuous brick foundation and be accessed via three cement steps.
    3) The front porch would be lit by a single 21”x12” Faubourg hanging copper gas lantern.
    4) The fenestration on the first floor would be as follows, from left to right: two (2) full-height two-over-two windows flanked by louvered shutters; one paneled door with transom.
c. The “right” side elevation would consist of the one-story block at its left end and the two-story rear block at its center and right end.
    1) The first floor would appear as follows, from left to right: the “right” side of the front porch; stoop with pane-and-panel door sheltered by shed roof sheathed in standing-seam metal; two two-over-two windows; a single round, fixed window with four (4) lites; a pair of two-over-two windows; and a bump-out storage room advancing 4’, sheltered by a shed roof covered with standing-seam metal, and accessed by a paneled door.
    2) Fenestration on the second floor would consist of three (3) two-over-two windows clustered
    towards the front of the house.
d. The rear of the house would include no fenestration on the first floor. The second floor would have a pair of two-over-two windows at the center of the elevation,
e. The “left” side elevation would have four upper wall, single-lite windows on the second floor and no fenestration on the first floor.

3. The St. Francis model would emulate a side-hall townhouse.
a. The footprint would measure approximately 18’ wide by 52’-8” deep, and the building would be approximately 30’-5” tall. The first floor would have a 10’ ceiling height, and the second floor would have a 9’ ceiling height.
b. The front elevation would consist of a double gallery, full-width porch beneath an integral roof. Both levels of the porch would be supported by four (4) 6”x6” boxed columns of fiber cement board.
    1) The front porch would rest upon a continuous brick foundation and be accessed via three cement steps.
    2) The fenestration on the first floor would be as follows, from left to right: two (2) full-height two-over-two windows flanked by louvered shutters, one paneled door.
    3) The front porch would be lit by a single 21”x12” Faubourg hanging copper gas lantern.
    4) The fenestration on the second floor would match the first floor.
c. “Right” side elevation:

1) The first floor would appear as follows, from left to right: the “right” side of the front porch; stoop with pane-and-panel door sheltered by shed roof sheathed in standing-seam metal; two (2) two-over-two windows; a single round, fixed window with four (4) lights; a pair of two-over-two windows, and a bump-out storage room advancing 4’, sheltered by a shed roof covered with standing-seam metal, and accessed by a paneled door.
2) Fenestration on the second floor would consist of three (3) two-over-two windows centered on the elevation.

d. The rear of the house would include no fenestration on the first floor. The second floor would have a pair of two-over-two windows at the center of the elevation
e. The “left” side elevation would have five upper wall, single-light windows dispersed across the elevation on the second floor and no fenestration on the first floor.

4. The Oakleigh 4 model would emulate a side-hall townhouse.
f. The footprint would measure approximately 18’-0 ‘ wide by 88’-0” deep (including the garage), and the building would be approximately 30’-5” tall. The first floor would have a 10’-0” ceiling height, and the second floor would have a 9’-0” ceiling height.
a. An optional attached garage measuring 22’-8” wide by 24’-3” deep would project from the rear.
b. A side porch measuring 4’-8” wide by 29’-9” deep would project from the “left” side elevation, which would begin 33’-0” back from the front plane of the building and extend to the north end of the dwelling elevation. The porch would be topped by a hip roof and supported by four turned columns, each with capital and base.
c. The front elevation would consist of a double gallery, full-width porch beneath an integral roof. Both levels of the porch would be supported by four (4) 6” x 6” boxed columns of fiber cement board.
1) The front porch would rest upon a continuous brick foundation and be accessed via three brick steps.
2) The fenestration on the first floor would be as follows, from left to right, inclusive of optional garage: two (2) paneled doors; two (2) full height fixed eight-lite windows flanked by louvered shutters (material not specified).
3) The fenestration on the second floor would be as follows, from left to right: one (1) paneled door; two (2) full height four-over-four windows flanked by louvered shutters.
d. The “right” side elevation, from left to right, would consist of the “right” side of the front porch; five upper wall, single-lite windows dispersed across the elevation on the second floor, with no fenestration on the first floor; the blank right side wall of the garage.
e. The rear elevation would consist of a fiberglass overhead garage door centered on the elevation.
f. The “left” side elevation would appear as follows:
1) The first floor from left to right: the blank left side wall of the garage; porch column; a pair of two-over-two windows; a porch column; one two-lite fixed window; a porch column; a pane-and-panel door; a porch column; two pairs of two-over-two windows; “left" side of the front porch.
2) The second floor from left to right: a pair of two-over-two windows; a single two-over-two window; two pairs of two-over-two windows; the “left” side of the front porch.

5. The Oakleigh 5 model would emulate a shotgun type house with camelback.

a. The footprint would measure approximately 18’-0 ‘ wide by 88’-0” deep (including the garage), and the building would be approximately 30’-5” tall. The first floor would have a 10’-0” ceiling height, and the second floor would have a 9’-0” ceiling height.
b. An optional attached garage measuring 22’-8” wide by 24’-3” deep would project from the rear.
c. A side porch measuring 4’-8” wide by 29’-9” deep would project from the “left” side elevation, which would begin 33’-0” back from the front plane of the building and extend to the north end of the dwelling elevation. The porch would be topped by a hip roof and supported by four turned posts, each with capital and base.
d. The front elevation would consist of a one-story forward block with a two-story camelback located approximately 16’ behind.
    1) A front porch would span the width of the one-story forward block. The porch would be sheltered by a hipped roof which would appear to be supported by four (4) boxed columns of fiber cement board.
    2) The front porch would rest upon a continuous brick foundation and be accessed via three brick steps.
    3) The fenestration on the first floor would be as follows, from left to right, inclusive of optional garage: one paneled door; one paneled door with transom; two (2) full-height eight-light fixed windows flanked by louvered shutters (material not specified).
    4) There is no fenestration proposed for the front elevation of the second floor.
e. The “right” side elevation would consist of the one-story block at its left end, the two-story rear block at its center, and the attached garage on the right end. The elevation would appear as follows:
    1) The first floor, from left to right: the “right” side of the front porch; no fenestration proposed for this elevation.
    2) Fenestration on the second floor would consist of four upper-wall, single-lite windows regularly spaced across the ‘camelback’ portion of the elevation.
f. The rear elevation would consist of a fiberglass overhead garage door centered on the elevation.
g. The “left” side elevation would consist of the attached garage at its left end, the two-story rear block at its center, and the one-story block at its right end. The elevation would appear as follows:
    1) The first floor from left to right: the blank left side wall of the garage; porch post; a pair of two-over-two windows; a porch post; one two-lite fixed window; a porch post ; a pane-and-panel door; a porch post; two pairs of two-over-two windows; the “left” side of the front porch.
    2) The second floor from left to right: a pair of two-over-two windows; a single two-over-two window; a blind window simulating a pair of shuttered windows; a pair of two-over-two windows.

6. Optional rear garage
    a. An optional rear attached two-car garage is proposed for all house models but would not be available for lot 7 due to space constraints.
    b. The attached garage would measure 22”-8” wide by 24’-0” deep.
7. Site Improvements
    a. A 10’-0” driveway is proposed which would access Marine Street and provide access to the rear of the dwellings.

b. A white picket fence is proposed to run in between each home.

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. **6.42** 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.
10. **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
11. **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.

12. **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

13. **10.2** Design a fence to be compatible with the architectural style of the house and existing fences in the neighborhood.
    - Install a painted wood picket fence.
    - Install a simple wood or wire fence. Heights of wooden picket fences are ordinarily restricted to 36”. Consideration for up to 48,” depending on the location of the fence, shall be given. A variance might be required. Staff can advise and assist applicants with regard to a variance. If combined with a wall, the total vertical dimension of the wall and fence collectively should not exceed 36,” or in some cases 48”.
    - For surface parking areas associated with commercial uses, size a perimeter parking area fence to not exceed 48” in height.
    - Install a cast-iron or other metal fence not exceeding 48” in height if located in the front yard.

- Install a fence that uses alternative materials that have a very similar look and feel to wood, proven durability, matte finish and an accurate scale and proportion of components.
- Face the finished side of a fence toward the public right-of-way.
- Based on the chosen fence material, use proportions, heights, elements and levels of opacity similar to those of similar material and style seen in the historic district.

REAR AND NON-CORNER SIDE FENCES (LOCATED BEHIND THE FRONT BUILDING PLANE)

- Design a fence located behind the front building plane to not exceed 72" in height. If the subject property abuts a multi-family residential or commercial property, a fence up to 96" will be considered.
- An alternative fence material with proven durability, matte finish and an accurate scale and proportion of components is acceptable. A simple wood-and-wire fence is acceptable provided it is appropriate to the style of the house.

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

This application concerns the new construction of seven (7) single-family residences at 916 Church Street, located on the northeast corner of Church Street and Marine Street. Several items are taken into account for new construction residences including placement, mass, scale, and building components.

With regard to placement, two components are taken into account – setback from the street and distance between buildings. The "*Design Review Guidelines for New Residential Construction in Mobile's Historic Districts*" state that new buildings should be responsive to and maintain the alignment of traditional façade lines, as well as the rhythm of side and rear setbacks. (6.34, 6.35) The property under review, a corner lot, is in the vicinity of contributing buildings. In accordance with *Design Guidelines*, the setbacks reflect the historical character of the contributing aspects of the built landscape. The proposed placement of front planes approximately 25'-0" from the Church Street right-of-way (ROW) negotiates the placement of the buildings located within 150' of the site, which are located between 0' and 35' from the ROW. The driveway and interior parking would be respectful of traditional placement patterns.

The *Design Review Guidelines* state that mass - the relationship of the parts of the larger whole comprising a building - for new construction should be in keeping with arrangement and proportion of surrounding historic residences. (6.36) The proposed residences adopt the massing of shotguns and townhouses in a neighborhood that includes one- and two-story single-family residences and apartment buildings and single-story commercial buildings. Hipped roofs would top the buildings. The outward massing of the buildings, rectangular blocks, is similar to massing found in the neighborhood. (6.40) The height of the foundations is similar to the foundation heights of nearby historic structures. The massing of the structures, the first floors being approximately 10' ceilings below a 9' second story height, is compatible with the architectural context of the contributing landscape in which they would be situated. (6.37)

Scale refers to a building's size in relationship to other buildings. The "*Design Review Guidelines for New Residential Construction*" state that new construction should be in scale with nearby historic buildings. (6.37) The residence across the street to the south facing Church Street is one and one-half stories high on a raised foundation. It sits adjacent to a larger two and one-half dwelling. The house adjacent to the east of the subject property, facing Church Street, is one-story in height with a full-width front porch and side projection, also with a front porch. As mentioned in the preceding paragraph addressing massing, the height of the ceilings and pitches of the roofs combine to form a whole that would be compatible with surrounding architectural landscape.

With regard to building components, the *Guidelines* call for responsiveness to traditional design patterns. (6.44) The camelback shotgun house is more familiar to residents of New Orleans than Oakleigh Garden in Mobile, and the narrow townhouse is similarly referential of that city. The simple paneled doors employed for the front entrances reflect doors seen on residences in the district. The use of two-over-two sashes is compatible with the district and are typical for both the shotgun and townhouse form. (6.41, 6.45) The wall treatments are visually compatible with the surrounding architectural and historical context. (6.38, 6.39) The proposed window spacing on the façades (fronts) mimic traditional solid-to-void ratios; however, the fenestration patterns on some of the sides and rear elevations of all four models are atypical. (6.45) The use of a raised, continuous brick foundation is also a convention prevalent on surrounding historic buildings. (6.43). The design of the full-width front porch also contributes to the new construction's responsiveness to the surrounding historic construction practices. (6.42)

The building materials appear to blend with those employed in the past and in immediate surroundings (6.39, 6.41,6.45) It is unclear what material is proposed for the louvered shutters.

The application states that white picket fences are to be installed between the dwellings. However, no drawings, measurements or material descriptions of the proposed fencing were submitted with the application. (10.2)

The *Guidelines* instruct that the new buildings should be visually connected to the street via a walkway leading directly from the sidewalk to the main building entry. Likewise, a landscaped front yard must be installed which associates with the character of that seen in the district. (10.5, 10.10) The application proposes no connecting element between the buildings and street, nor does it provide a landscaping plan.

The application states that a 10'-0" wide driveway accessing Marine Street will provide access to the rear of the homes, and that, in addition to the two-car garage option, there would be a minimum of two (2) parking spaces to the rear of the structures. Therefore, parking for the houses would be at the interior of the property, in accordance with the *Guidelines*, which state, "*Minimize the visual impact of parking. Locate a parking area to the rear or to the side of a site whenever possible*." (10.7) However, no drawings or material description of the driveway or parking spaces were submitted with the application.

A single elevation and façade drawing intended for Lot 1 (on the corner of Marine Street and Church Street) were submitted with the application. However, this plan was incomplete, and the two drawings make it difficult to decipher specific design plans.

AMENDMENT TO STAFF REPORT

On January 17, 2024, the ARB voted to grant this application conceptual approval (in particular for type and placement of the building), with the caveat that a Design Review Committee be formed to work with the applicant to finalize details lacking in the current application and that the applicant would then present these more detailed plans to the Board for final approval and issuance of a COA.

On February 22nd, a Design Review Committee consisting of Board members Mr. Blackwell and Ms. Roselius and architectural historians from the Historic Development Meredith Wilson and Annie Allen, met with Mr. Corte to discuss details needed to finalize the application.

1. Below is a list of items requested of Mr. Corte by the Design Review Committee and subsequent information regarding what was included in the resubmission to the Historic Development office:
    - <u>Updated elevation and floor plan drawings (specifically including dummy windows on side walls)</u>
      Elevation drawings for all models are included.
      No floorplans were included in the resubmission

    - <u>Landscape plan to include fencing scheme and elevations</u>
      An updated landscape plan which includes fencing scheme and details for proposed picket fence is included.

- Door and window specifications
  Windows would be two-over-two Plygem Mira metal clad wood in white.
  A manufacturer's cut sheet is included.
  Dimensions are unknown.

- Roof material
  The roofs would be a Classic Rib metal roof.
  Manufacturer's cutsheet is included.

- Paint color options to create color scheme selection for homeowners
  A selection of colors from Mobile Paint BLP's Historic Mobile Collection is included.
  Regarding color schemes for the homes, the applicant intends to submit colors for Staff level approval, noting that the color selections will be chosen from the approved Mobile Paints BLP color chart. Beyond the color chart, white will be an option, as well as lighter shades of the BLP selections.

2. Additionally, the applicant also provided flyers for the Oakleigh, Bienville, St. Francs, and Royale plans; a spec sheet for a gas lantern proposed for the front porches, and the following information regarding materials, dimensions, and design:
   - Exterior doors – fiberglass, two panel, painted or wood, two panel, stained
   - Exterior lights – recessed lights in porch ceilings with copper lantern hanging from ceiling (see attached spec sheet)
   - Columns - will be 10" square with 1x10 bases and capitals
   - The porch rail pickets on Lot 6 will be simple 2"x2" spindles painted white as shown on ***Plan Flyer Oakleigh***
   - The porch rail pickets on Lot 1 will be simple 2"x2" spindles with "X's" painted white as shown on ***Plan Flyer Oakleigh with side porch***
   - Lot 3 will have columns but not porch rails and will be ***Plan Flyer Bienville***
   - Lot 7 will have brackets but not porch rails and will be ***Plan Flyer Royale***
   - The other lots will be submitted as the purchasers select their homes.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Trae Corte was present to represent the application. He stated that he is available to answer any questions.

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Howle recused himself from review of this application.

Mr. Blackwell thanked Mr. Corte for his cooperation throughout the review process.

Ms. Roselius asked if the light configuration and mullion plan is correct for the windows on the drawings because the cutsheets show a different configuration. Mr. Corte replied that the representation on the drawings is what is proposed.

Ms. Maurin asked Mr. Corte to discuss the proposed fence heights. Mr. Corte stated that the picket fences on each lot would be 36" white picket fence, with a 6'-0" privacy fence along the north and east property lines.

Ms. Traylor asked for the window and door dimensions. Ms. Allen noted that the dimension were on the floorplan drawings.

Ms. Maurin asked for clarification on the heights of the front porches and asked if the foundation would be a raised slab. Mr. Corte replied that the foundation would be a raised slab clad in brick veneer. He stated that the front foundation height would be approximately 2'-4", noting that the grade increases on the lot as you go back. He added that the finished floor elevation would be approximately 17'-3".

Ms. Maurin asked if this height would be in line with what is typical in the surrounding district. Mr. Blackwell explained that a variety of foundation heights can be observed in the surrounding landscape, including some lower sitting bungalows and some larger houses with full raised basements.

Roselius asked about altered setbacks. Mr. Corte stated that the porch depths were increased to 10'-0" and the front yard setbacks were altered to about 19'-0".

Mr. Blackwell stated that this was more historically appropriate for the area.

Ms. Roselius asked for clarification regarding which plans would be constructed on which lots. Mr. Corte gave the status of the lots as follows.
Lot 1 -reserved for the Oakleigh plan with wrap around porch.
Lot2 - Oakleigh
Lot 3 -Bienville
Lot 4 -Oakleigh
Lot 5- Oakleigh
Lot 6 -available
Lot 7 -available but is reserved for the Royale plan without garage due to smaller lot size.

Mr. Corte added that colors and details based on customer choice would be approved administratively as discussed in the Design Review Committee.

Ms. Roselius asked if restrictions could be added to the COA to ensure the Oakleigh plan is not built on the available Lot 6 to avoid monotony. Mr. Corte commented that he would rather not have that restriction but offered changing the color scheme, column, porch rail designs, and other details.

Mr. Blackwell commented that there is precedent in the district for two adjacent residences of the same design.

Ms. Roselius expressed concern about anti-monotony protection, stating that Mr. Blackwell commented having two same designs next to each other is acceptable but going beyond that poses an issue, as variation in trim, colors, and details can only go so far.

Ms. Traylor was in agreement with Ms. Roselius, stating that one of the most beloved aspects is the distinctive character of homes in a historic district, which new development should try to capture. She added that when monotonous infill is introduced, it can detract from that character and in the long-term can lower value. She noted, as Mr. Blackwell stated, that there is a precedent for two side-by-side homes of the same design, but more than two adjacent identical, newly constructed homes in a historic district could become critical mass that can take away from the integrity of the neighborhood.

Ms. Traylor agreed that Lot 6 should not be the same design as Lots 4 and 5.

Ms. Maurin suggested the option of changing the roof line to add more impactful variety to the same floorplan. An alternate gable roof was suggested. Mr. Corte was amenable to putting on a gable roof .

Ms. Roselius commended Mr. Corte's willingness to make changes, especially by making the porches deeper to match the neighborhood. She added that she would be in favor of granting a COA for the project, with details to be approved later by Staff. She recommended approving the plan for Lot 1, then giving approval to the other three plans, landscape and fencing, with final submission and approval to come through Staff for trim color, column design, and other differentiating details.

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.

Mr. Traylor 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, noting that Staff would have final approval of variations including roof forms.

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

OTHER BUSINESS

Ms. Allen gave an update to the Board regarding work at 34 S. Reed Avenue. She expressed that she and Ms. Wilson had conducted a site visit to evaluate the remaining work and the new turned posts Mr. Terrell had acquired to install for porch supports. Appropriate trim for the new façade fenestration was discussed. Ms. Allen specified that Mr. Terrell had chosen an appropriate post and indicated that the trim would be installed as directed by the Board. Ms. Allen requested approval for Staff to issue midmonth COA for these remaining items. The Board agreed.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:26.
These minutes were approved by the Architectural Review Board in their meeting on May 15, 2024.