



# Architectural Review Board Minutes

## November 1, 2023 – 3:00 P.M.

### ADMINISTRATIVE

---

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

#### 1. Roll Call

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

**Members Present:** Abby Davis, Catarina Echols, Stephen Howle, Cameron Pfeiffer-Traylor, and Jennifer Roselius

**Members Absent:** Cartledge Blackwell, Karrie Maurin, Stephen McNair, and Barja Wilson

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

#### 2. Approval of Minutes from October 4, 2023

Ms. Roselius moved to approve the minutes from the October 18th meeting.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Howle and approved unanimously.

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

Ms. Echols brought to the Board's attention a mid-month COA granted by Staff for 202 S. Georgia Avenue, which had received a complaint from a neighbor in opposition to the construction of a storage shed on the property. The Board was provided with the particulars of the project and the details of the complaint. The project was found to be in compliance with the *Guidelines*.

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

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

## MID-MONTH APPROVALS - APPROVED

---

1. **Applicant:** Coulson Roofing & Sheet Metal Contractors Inc.  
**Property Address:** 1409 Government Street  
**Date of Approval:** 10/10/2023  
**Project:** Reroof in-kind with modified rubber roof
2. **Applicant:** City of Mobile Real Estate Management  
**Property Address:** 200 Government Street  
**Date of Approval:** 10/10/2023  
**Project:** Recaulk perimeter and reglaze windowpanes on 2nd, 3rd, and 4th floors
3. **Applicant:** All Weather Roofing & Construction LLC  
**Property Address:** 61 N. Reed Avenue  
**Date of Approval:** 10/11/2023  
**Project:** Remove existing asbestos tile roofing. Reroof with shingles in Pewter color.
4. **Applicant:** Lipford Contruction, LLC  
**Property Address:** 100 Beverly Court  
**Date of Approval:** 10/11/2023  
**Project:**

  1. Remove metal stairs and door to 2nd floor area above the garage at back of house. Fill door opening with siding to match existing.
  2. Remove and replace in-kind one (1) six-over-six aluminum window on 2<sup>nd</sup> floor of south elevation.
  3. Remove one (1) 3'-0" x 4'-0" aluminum window on the south end of the east (rear) elevation. Replace with a 3'-0"x5'-0" one-over-one aluminum window (for egress requirements).
  4. Remove second floor door on brick portion of the east (rear) elevation and replace with one (1) six-over-six aluminum window.
5. **Applicant:** Advanced Service Plus Plumbing Co  
**Property Address:** 203 S. Georgia Street  
**Date of Approval:** 10/11/2023  
**Project:** In-kind repairs to front porch to include: roof and flashing repair; beadboard ceiling repair and replacement; decking repair and replace in-kind. Repaint with like colors.
6. **Applicant:** The Roof Doctor of Alabama Inc.  
**Property Address:** 960 Government Street  
**Date of Approval:** 10/12/2023  
**Project:** Work to be done only on the flat roof portion of the building that joins the two rear projections: Reroof in-kind using TPO membrane roofing.

7. **Applicant:** Robert/Helen Chapelle  
**Property Address:** 1254 Selma Street  
**Date of Approval:** 10/12/2023  
**Project:** Replace existing wooden gate on west side of house with a metal gate. Height and width measurements to match existing gate.
8. **Applicant:** All Weather Roofing & Construction LLC  
**Property Address:** 260 S. Ann Street  
**Date of Approval:** 10/13/2023  
**Project:** Reroof in-kind with galvalume 26-gauge v-crimp metal roof.
9. **Applicant:** Bryan Olson  
**Property Address:** 1802 Old Government Street  
**Date of Approval:** 10/13/2023  
**Project:** Replace in-kind previously existing porch railings, per submitted design.
10. **Applicant:** Sheri Fisher  
**Property Address:** 262 S. Broad Street  
**Date of Approval:** 10/16/2023  
**Project:**
  1. Remove and replace in-kind two (2) windows and one (1) entry door on west (rear) elevation.
  2. Repair and rebuild window sashes as needed using matching materials.
  3. Replace or repair in-kind brick mold and glass tops where needed.
11. **Applicant:** Superior Fence & Rail of Pensacola LLC  
**Property Address:** 1008 Government Street  
**Date of Approval:** 10/16/2023  
**Project:**
  1. Install a 3'-0" high wood picket fence along the south (front) property line, the east property line, and 53'-0" north along the west property line.
    - a. Install a 5'-0"-wide swing gate along the south property line at the walkway.
    - b. Install a 13'-0"x3'-0" high automated wood gate across the existing driveway.
  2. Install a 6'-0"-high wood privacy fence along the west property line and behind the building's front plane, abutting the wood picket fence on its south end and running to the northwest corner of the lot. It will run 81' along the north (rear) property line, then run 130'-0" along the east property line where it will abut the picket fence and sit behind the front plane of the building.
    - a. Install a 16'-0"x6'-0" high automated wood gate along the north (rear) portion of the privacy fence.
    - b. Extend two portions of 6'-0" privacy fence on the west property line

8'-0" eastward (with the first beginning at the north end of the privacy fence) to conceal and secure the HVAC unit on the west elevation of the home. Each 8'-0" portion of fence will consist of (from west to east) 4'-0" of fence and a 4'-0" wood swing gate.

c. Install a third 6'-0" high portion of privacy fence 30'-0" eastward off the west property line and abut the west elevation of the building's rear projection. The 30'-0" would consist of 25'-0" of fence and a 5'-0" swing gate.

12. **Applicant:** Partner Architecture PC  
**Property Address:** 1225 Dauphin Street  
**Date of Approval:** 10/17/2023  
**Project:** Remove section of existing wood fencing starting at the rolling gate on S. Georgia Avenue and ending at the adjacent lot, 1158 Caroline Avenue. Replace with metal fencing formerly used at parking lot at southeast corner of Ann and Caroline (removed for science building construction), per submitted plans.
13. **Applicant:** The City of Mobile Real Estate  
**Property Address:** 6 S. Joachim Street  
**Date of Approval:** 10/17/2023  
**Project:** Install 6'-high aluminum fence and gate at alley entrance between rear of 6 S. Joachim Street and 273 Dauphin Street (Jackson Street side), per submitted plans.
14. **Applicant:** Kim Hall  
**Property Address:** 53 S Hallett Street  
**Date of Approval:** 10/17/2023  
**Project:**  
1. Repair and replace front porch decking with in-kind materials.  
2. Reroof in-kind with shingles. Color: Black
15. **Applicant:** Kim Hall  
**Property Address:** 55 S. Hallett Street  
**Date of Approval:** 10/17/2023  
**Project:**  
1. Repair and replace porch decking with in-kind materials.  
2. Repair and replace (where necessary) brick front porch steps.
16. **Applicant:** Pools on the Gulf, LLC  
**Property Address:** 106 S. Georgia Street  
**Date of Approval:** 10/17/2023  
**Project:** Install an inground gunite pool measuring 14'-5"x28'-0" at the northwest corner of the lot and adjacent to the existing garage/pool house. Install decking around the pool.

17. **Applicant:** Kevin Loper  
**Property Address:** 161 S. Cedar Street  
**Date of Approval:** 10/18/2023  
**Project:** Install hurricane fabric anchors at three (3) windows on rear (east) elevation and two (2) windows towards east end of north elevation, per submitted specs. All windows are new and part of previously approved addition.
18. **Applicant:** Francis Holdings, LLC  
**Property Address:** 202 S. Georgia Street  
**Date of Approval:** 10/19/2023  
**Project:** 1. Construct an accessory storage structure at the northwest (rear) corner of the lot to the rear of the main dwelling.  
a. The structure will be rectangular in shape and will measure 16'x 12", with a height of 8'.  
b. The structure will be topped with a gable roof clad in shingles (color: Charcoal).  
c. All elevations will be clad in LP Smart Siding (engineered wood) painted a blue-grey color to match the existing dwelling. Trim (also engineered wood) will be painted white.  
d. The structure will sit on a raised cinder block foundation, with cinder blocks to be either parged in stucco or brick veneered.
19. **Applicant:** Fast Signs of Mobile  
**Property Address:** 7 N Claiborne Street  
**Date of Approval:** 10/23/2023  
**Project:** Install a double-sided hanging blade sign.  
a. The sign will measure 39" wide by 36" high.  
b. The sign will consist of vinyl letter and logo applied to .080 aluminum face and will read "Alabama Court Reporters/Outside Chief Legal".  
c. Colors will be black and white.  
d. The sign will be mounted to an existing decorative post and blade.
20. **Applicant:** Mobile Bay Roofing LLC  
**Property Address:** 258 Roper Street  
**Date of Approval:** 10/23/2023  
**Project:** Reroof in-kind with shingles. Color: Weathered Wood

## APPLICATIONS

---

### 1. 2023-55-CA

**Address:** 453 Dauphin Street  
**Historic District:** Lower Dauphin Street Commercial  
**Applicant / Agent:** Douglas Kearley on behalf of Hunter Adams  
**Project:** Construct a full-width cast iron gallery

**APPROVED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

### 2. 2023-56-CA

**Address:** 34 S. Reed Avenue  
**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way  
**Applicant / Agent:** Reilly Terrell  
**Project:** After-the-fact: Install replacement windows that do not match muntin profile of original windows, as original COA provided

**APPLICATION TABLED FOR DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING -  
CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

## OTHER BUSINESS

---

The next ARB meeting is scheduled for December 6, 2023.



# Agenda Item #1

## Application 2023-55-CA

### CERTIFIED RECORD

#### DETAILS

---

**Location:**

453 Dauphin

**Summary of Request:**

Construct a full-width cast iron gallery

**Applicant (as applicable):**

Douglas Kearley

**Property Owner:**

Hunter Adams

**Historic District:**

Lower Dauphin

**Classification:**

Contributing

#### Summary of Analysis:

- The proposed construction of a gallery is appropriate to the historic character of the structure and the district.
- The proposed design and materials of the gallery are acceptable under the *Guidelines* and are appropriate to the building and the streetscape.
- The proposed fenestration change does not impair the current fenestration pattern and is responsive to evidence of a previous fenestration condition.

#### Report Contents:

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

## PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

---

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

453 Dauphin Street is a two-story brick commercial building with stucco veneer on the first floor. The building was completed for John Toulme in 1855. The adjacent building at 451 Dauphin was constructed contemporaneously. The 1904 and 1924 Sanborn maps indicate that wooden galleries fronted both 451 and 453 Dauphin Street. The building underwent several alterations during the 20<sup>th</sup> century. According to Historic Development files, the galleries were removed by the 1970s, and awnings were installed above the first floor. Photographs from the 1970s show a stucco façade. By 1994, the brick was exposed at the second story level. In 2004 the awning was removed.

Records show that this property has appeared before the Architectural Review Board seven times. In 2003, a Certificate of Appropriateness was issued to repair a canopy and replace the roof. A request to remove a canopy was approved in 2004. In July of 2008, an application to carry out extensive repairs to windows, brickwork, and other architectural elements was granted a COA. A COA was granted in August of 2008 to renovate the façade and construct a cast iron balcony. The installation of aluminum storm windows was granted a COA in October 2008. In 2010, post and mid-construction approval was granted for the installation of French doors, window replacement and refacing the façade with stucco. In 2018 an application to construct a gallery and install French doors at an existing window opening was approved.

## SCOPE OF WORK

---

1. Construct a full width cast iron two-story gallery on the façade.
  - a. The gallery would measure 7'-0" deep approximately 12'-8" high at the second story porch floor, and an additional 8'-0" high to the top of second story gallery columns. The gallery would stretch approximately 28'-6" across the width of the façade.
  - b. The gallery would be supported on the first floor by four 4" pipe columns with cap and base. The distance between the outer columns and inner columns would be 9'-6". The inner columns would be 8'-4" apart.
  - c. The second-story porch would be topped by a standing seam metal hipped roof supported by four pairs of 1'x1" cast iron bars infilled with decorative iron panels. These would be set at intervals across the façade matching those of the first-floor columns. Decorative cast iron scrolled brackets would flank the tops of each bar and panel element.
  - d. A 42" high iron railing consisting of 1'x1" solid bars topped by a decorative frieze would be installed around the perimeter of the second story porch.
  - e. The second-story porch floor would be comprised of wood decking.
2. Remove third second story window (from east) and replace with full height French doors.
  - a. The existing window opening would be widened to approximately 4'-0" to accommodate the width of the proposed pane and panel French doors.
  - b. The proposed French doors would measure 4'-0" wide by approximately 9'-4" high.

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

---

- **7.14** Where replacement of a balcony or gallery is required, replace it in a fashion that preserves the key character-defining features of a historic building.
  - Replace a historic balcony or gallery where documentation exists of its previous existence.
  - Design a replacement balcony or gallery to reflect the design of the original building. The ARB will consider modern balconies.



- **7.18** Preserve and repair an original detail or ornamentation on a historic commercial building.
  - Maintain the original space patterns and location of windows. Most display windows have a bulkhead below and a transom above.
  - Preserve the size and shape of an upper story window.
  - Consider maintaining a Carrara glass or glass block storefront if it has attained historic significance as an alteration.

## STAFF ANALYSIS

---

The property at 453 Dauphin is a contributing resource within the Lower Dauphin Historic District. The application under review proposes alterations to the façade which include the construction of a full-width two-story cast iron gallery and the replacement of a second story window with French doors.

Documentary evidence reveals that the subject building was historically fronted by a gallery. According to the *Guidelines'* standard for balconies and galleries on a commercial building, the replacement of a previous gallery is appropriate practice. Further, in accordance with the *Guidelines*, the proposed design is in keeping with the historic character of the building and the character of the streetscape. (7.14)

The replacement of a second-story window with French doors would not disrupt the existing fenestration pattern on the façade. The doors would allow for access to the balcony. Further, there appears to be evidence on the façade of the existing interior second-story windows having previously been door openings, which seems reasonable considering an earlier existence of a second-story gallery, access to which would have been required. (7.18)

## PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Douglas Kearley was present to represent the application. He presented the project.

There was no public comment.

## BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Roselius commented that the plans included the removal of a street light and asked the applicant if this had been approved. Mr. Kearley responded that the Consolidated Review Committee had reviewed and approved the removal of the street light.

Ms. Roselius stated that the application included reference to a transom above the proposed French doors. Mr. Kearley clarified that there is no such transom; that the reference was a mistake.

## FINDING FACTS

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

Ms. Roselius 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 subject property or the district and should be granted a Certificate of Appropriateness.

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



# Agenda Item #2

## Application 2023-56-CA

### CERTIFIED RECORD

#### DETAILS

---

**Location:**

34 S. Reed Avenue

**Summary of Request:**

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

**Applicant (as applicable):**

Reilly Terrell

**Property Owner:**

same

**Historic District:**

Old Dauphin Way

**Classification:**

Contributing

**Summary of Analysis:**

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

**Report Contents:**

Property and Application History ..... 2

Scope of Work..... 2

Applicable Standards ..... 2

Staff Analysis..... 3

Attachments ..... 4

## PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

---

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

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

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

## SCOPE OF WORK

---

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

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

---

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

### ACCEPTABLE WINDOW MATERIALS

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

- Wood sash
- Steel, if original to structure

- Custom extruded aluminum
- Aluminum clad wood
- Windows approved by the National Park Service

#### UNACCEPTABLE WINDOW MATERIALS

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

## STAFF ANALYSIS

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Mr. Reilly Terrell was present to represent the application. He presented the project, stating that when the main issue with this project was the windows, which were too far gone for repair. He stated that due the ARB, the windows have become the most expensive part of the project and had cost him over \$25,000. He stated that there was a lot of back and forth with the Board during which he proposed all kinds of windows and there was no give on the Board's part. He added that the windows are aluminum clad, which he believed was an in-kind replacement. He stated that three weeks ago it was brought to his attention that they are not compliant. He added that he understands that the house has to be restored in character and stated that he is not clear on what a muntin profile is and why the installed windows' muntins are not compliant. He commented that changing out the existing windows due to a muntin profile would create a significant impact to both the cost and completion of the project. Ms. Dawson explained what "muntin profile" means and that the width of the installed windows' muntins is very close if not identical to that of the original windows.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Ms. Roselius stated that in her opinion, there are other significant issues of concern with the project besides the muntin profile.

Ms. Davis asked the applicant to clarify the location of the single pane window discussed in the Staff report. Mr. Terrell stated that, in regard to the single-light window on the façade where there had been a double-light window, his crew just installed a single-light window.

Ms. Roselius questioned the installation of the French doors on the second story. Mr. Terrell commented that he thought the French doors were included in the original plans. Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor asked Staff to clarify this matter. Ms. Dawson stated that Staff has no record of the doors being included in the project's plan or approval of such doors.

Ms. Roselius stated that, per the Board's notes, the COA issued in 2021 includes no reference to replacing 2<sup>nd</sup> story windows with French doors, nor is it included in the February 2022 COA issued for the demolition of a rear addition. Ms. Dawson confirmed that there is no record of request for French doors.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor questioned Staff if the same is true concerning the removed window in the attic. Ms. Dawson confirmed that there is no record of a request to remove the window in the attic, nor any approval of such.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor asked the applicant the reason for the removal of this window. Mr. Terrell stated that the attic window was rotted out, and the space is largely inaccessible and thus unuseable.

Ms. Echols asked how the attic is now being vented. Mr. Terrell responded that roof vents have been installed along the top of the roof, which were approved and permitted.

Ms. Roselius asked the applicant if had anything he wanted to add.

Mr. Terrell stated that the intent was to execute the project in the right way and what he believes is a good job. Due to other reasons, the project was put on hold and has been a slow process. He added that he obviously should have had the doors approved, stating that the intention was not to take away from the historical look but to take pride in the house. He commented that he French door is an improvement from a functional standpoint as previously, there was no access to the second floor porch except by through a window. He added that if plans for the French doors were submitted, that he is confident they would have been approved.

Ms. Echols stated that Mr. Terrell's point is taken and added that in regard to the windows, the more concerning issue is the method of installation with lack of or inappropriate trim, over the muntin profile. Mr. Terrell stated that the carpenters who installed the windows are highly skilled, adding that before, the windows and trim were rotted

out. Ms. Echols noted that the framing has not been executed properly, that the trim should be installed over the siding. Ms. Davis added that the purpose of trim around window openings is to accept the siding; that this is considered best practice to properly divert water.

Mr. Terrell commented that now the issue has shifted to window installation and stated that the siding had warped, causing it to move forward of the window trim.

Mr. Howle stated that the issue isn't installation; it is trim.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor stated that the Board is very familiar with the proper practices for trimming out windows on historic homes. She asked the applicant if, at the time of the issuance of the original COA, he understood the meaning of "replace rotten windows with wood or clad windows to match in light pattern and muntin profile."

Mr. Terrell asked if the light pattern of the installed windows are correct.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor responded that they are, but the installation of trim over siding is standard practice in historic districts and is part of replacing windows to match. She added that originally, access to the second story porch would have been through a jib or box window. In addition, the height of the doors do not match the height of the windows. The installed doors and single-pane window on the first floor dramatically disrupt the symmetry and historic fenestration rhythm. The French doors and the single-pane window on the first floor are significantly divergent; it is expected that replacements on historic facades are in-line with what was previously there.

Ms. Davis proposed discussing with Mr. Terrell what he was willing to do in regard to mitigating the most impactful issues. She added that these issues include the need for a transom over the front window and to address the inappropriate installation of the French doors on the second floor. She offered that the French doors be removed and to go back with a single door and a window to restore the original fenestration pattern. She stated that in her opinion, the inappropriate muntin profile on the replacement windows are secondary, and their replacement would be costly.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor asked Staff for their opinion concerning the muntin profile.

Ms. Dawson stated that the north and west elevations, where the subject windows have been installed, are less visible from the street and are not considered critical as compared to the façade.

Ms. Roselius stated that the trim on these windows do need to be considered.

Ms. Davis agreed and reemphasized that the existing trim around the windows is not necessarily an aesthetic issue, but is not best practice for functionality and sustainability.

Ms. Roselius stated that the trim around the window on the façade's first story also needs correcting. Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor asked if a piece of trim could be placed over what is existing. Mr. Howle stated that something could be milled.

Ms. Echols added that a piece could possibly be added to the sides but not the sills.

Ms. Roselius asked the applicant if the original opening in the attic gable was a window or a vent. Mr. Terrell responded that it was a window.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor stated that the Board appreciates that Mr. Terrell feels frustrated by the situation, but to keep in mind that the Board is tasked with making sure approved projects keep in line with the issued COA, that they have guidelines that must be followed, but that the Board is solution driven. She asked Mr. Terrell to share his thoughts on mitigating these issues.

Mr. Terrrell stated that in his estimation the corrections would cost approximately \$10,000.00 and four months.

Ms. Roselius pointed out that the applicant incurred all the costs by executing inappropriate alterations which were not approved with a COA. She suggested a Design Review Committee be appointed to come to an accepted compromise.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor commented that these inappropriate alterations are critical to the front façade and agreed that a Design Review Committee would be useful.

Ms. Echols explained to the applicant that through a Design Review Committee, members of the Board and Staff can work with him to find a solution quickly.

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Ms. Roselius moved to table the application pending a meeting of a Design Review Committee with the applicant to find a solution to the non-compliant components of the project.

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

**OTHER BUSINESS**

---

Ms. Dawson stated that there are no applications for the November 15<sup>th</sup> agenda; therefore, the ARB meeting for that date will be canceled.

ARB attorney, Bruce McGowin gave an update on a previous meeting with Staff to review the processes for issuing mid-month COA approvals at an administrative level. He stated that after discussion, the established processes were found to work well and no changes are proposed at this time.

Ms. Echols agreed with this decision.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:52 pm.