



Architectural Review Board Minutes

October 18, 2023 – 3:00 P.M.

ADMINISTRATIVE

The meeting was called to order by the Chair Catarina Echols at 3:04 p.m.

1. Roll Call

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

Members Present: Cartledge Blackwell, Stephen Howle, Karrie Maurin, Stephen McNair, Jennifer Roselius, and Barja Wilson

Members Absent: Abby Davis and Cameron Pfeiffer-Traylor

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

2. Approval of Minutes from October 4, 2023

Ms. Roselius offered the following correction to the October 4th minutes: “Douglas attorney” under *Staff Members Present* should read “Douglas Fink”

Mr. Blackwell moved to approve the minutes, with correction, from the October 4th meeting.

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

3. Approval of Mid-Month COAs granted by Staff

Mr. McNair 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:** Yu Chen
Property Address: 406 Michigan Avenue
Date of Approval: 09/26/2023
Project:
 1. Reroof in-kind with shingles.
 2. Rebuild rotted wood elements of front porch (front-gabled roof, square porch columns, and railings) in-kind (materials, designs, and measurements to match existing).
2. **Applicant:** Weather Tech Roofing LLC
Property Address: 106 N. Pine Street
Date of Approval: 09/26/2023
Project: Reroof in-kind with architectural shingles in Rustic Black color.
3. **Applicant:** Integrity Maintenance LLC
Property Address: 1201 Springhill Avenue
Date of Approval: 09/27/2023
Project: Install metal handrail on existing handicap ramp at rear of building.
4. **Applicant:** Yu Chen
Property Address: 1507 Farmer Street
Date of Approval: 09/27/2023
Project: Reroof in-kind with architectural shingles in Weatherwood color.
5. **Applicant:** Miller Contracting and Remodeling Inc
Property Address: 1050 New St. Francis Street
Date of Approval: 09/28/2023
Project:
 1. Repair original wood columns currently stored on site and reinstall.
 2. Install A/C condenser unit on side of property and screen with wood picket enclosure to match existing picket fence.
 3. Remove existing rear door in poor condition. Rebuild wood door to match existing and reinstall.
6. **Applicant:** Mobile Bay Roofing LLC
Property Address: 350 Charles Street
Date of Approval: 10/02/2023
Project: Reroof in-kind with shingles in Sunrise Cedar color.
7. **Applicant:** The Creel Company, Inc
Property Address: 209 S. Washington Avenue
Date of Approval: 10/02/2023
Project:
 1. Reroof in-kind with asphalt shingles to match existing color. Re-use existing copper eave metal.

2. Remove and replace in-kind 4 aluminum dormer windows on the southernmost block of the building.
3. Reroof in-kind, with EPDM roofing, 4 existing flat roof areas in front of dormers.

8. **Applicant:** Alabama Iron Works
Property Address: 1260 Elmira Street
Date of Approval: 10/02/2023
Project: Install a pole-mounted blade sign on an ornamented metal pole measuring 8'-11 1/2" high. Sign will be a double-faced aluminum measuring 2'-0" high by 3'-0" wide and read "St. Joan of Arc Church."

9. **Applicant:** Cardinal Roofing & Restoration LLC
Property Address: 1556 Blair Avenue
Date of Approval: 10/04/2023
Project: Reroof in-kind with shingles in Weathered Wood color.

10. **Applicant:** David T McConnell General Contractor
Property Address: 52 N. Monterey
Date of Approval: 10/05/2023
Project:
 1. Remove damaged/rotten wood at bases of porch columns; replace with new wood to match existing in dimension and profile. Paint to match existing.
 2. Replace damaged/rotten wood porch decking with wood to match existing in dimension and profile; will require removing one column and supporting roof to install new decking.
 3. Reinstall columns. Paint columns and porch decking to match existing.

11. **Applicant:** David T McConnell General Contractor
Property Address: 305 State Street
Date of Approval: 10/05/2023
Project:
 1. Remove rotten and split siding. Replace damaged and missing siding with 1/2" x 6" Old Mobile pine to match existing. Paint white to match existing siding.
 2. Repair loose portions of porch railing. Paint white and Old Mobile Green to match existing.

12. **Applicant:** Watermark Design Group
Property Address: 251 Government Street
Date of Approval: 10/06/2023
Project:
 1. Install canvas awnings over the three westernmost windows on the north elevation. Awnings to be attached to the building with standard aluminum framing and hardware, per submitted plans.
 2. Installation of sconces to either side of main entry door on north elevation, per submitted manufacturer's cut sheet.

3. Install exterior building lighting to include up-lighting of wide masonry band between 10th and 11th floors and up-lighting of masonry band between 2nd and third floors, per submitted rendering.

13. **Applicant:** David T McConnell General Contractor
Property Address: 52 N. Monterey Street
Date of Approval: 10/06/2023
Project: Remove non-original decorative cast-iron detail between porch columns. Make any necessary repairs to damage caused by removal from the porch columns and soffit.

14. **Applicant:** MM & K Construction LLC
Property Address: 1165 Texas Street
Date of Approval: 10/06/2023
Project: 1. Reroof in-kind with black shingles.
2. Remove and replace in-kind rotten wood siding, trim, and fascia boards.
3. Paint exterior: Body - Georgia Avenue Yellow; Trim - Government Street Olive

APPLICATIONS

1. 2023-52-CA

Address: 363 West Street
Historic District: Leinkauf
Applicant / Agent: Knowles Development Group, Inc.
Project: New construction: one-story single-family residence

APPLICATION DEFERRED TO A LATER MEETING - APPLICANT NOT PRESENT

2. 2023-53-CA

Address: 2304 DeLeon Avenue
Historic District: Ashland Place
Applicant / Agent: Anastasia Etheredge
Project: One-story addition to east elevation, measuring approximately 717 sq. ft.

APPROVED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

3. 2023-54-CA

Address: 1225 Selma Street
Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Applicant / Agent: Anne Read
Project: Two-room addition to non-historic ancillary building

APPROVED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED



Agenda Item #2

Application 2023-53-CA

Certified Record

DETAILS

Location:

2304 DeLeon Avenue

Summary of Request:

Construct an addition to the east elevation.

Applicant (as applicable):

Anastasia Etheredge

Property Owner:

Brie and Grant Zarzour

Historic District:

Ashland Place

Classification:

Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The proposed addition's placement, massing and scale is compatible with the original structure.
- The materials and design complement those of the historic building and the district.

Report Contents:

Property and Application History	2
Scope of Work	2
Applicable Standards	2
Staff Analysis	4
Attachments	5

PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

Ashland Place Historic District was listed in the National Register in 1987 under Criteria A (community planning) and C (architectural significance). The neighborhood initially was platted in 1907 and centered around land once occupied by the Augusta Evans Wilson homestead. The neighborhood was an early streetcar suburb along the Springhill Avenue trolley line. The district is significant for its concentration of architectural types and styles popular between 1900 and 1955, including Georgian and Federal Revivals, Colonial and Classical Revivals, Craftsman, Mission Revival, and Tudor Revival.

The property at 2304 DeLeon Avenue is a two-story frame dwelling constructed c. 1908. *The Mobile Register's* Trades Edition of 1908 attributes the design to Mobile architect George B. Rogers. The property's present-day footprint closely resembles that expressed on the 1925 Sanborn map, which is a square structure with a long rectangular rear projection, a side porch on the east elevation and small second story gallery which spans the west side of the façade. Also represented on this overlay is an L-shaped accessory structure, labeled as part domestic and part garage sitting on the rear northwest corner of the lot. This ancillary structure has undergone alterations including a 2016 rehabilitation, when it was expanded and incorporated into a modern two-car garage and connected to the main dwelling by a hyphen.

According to Historic Development vertical files, this property has appeared before the Architectural Review Board once before. In 2016 a Certificate of Appropriateness was granted to restore and make improvements to the dwelling's principal entrance; construct a porch off the west elevation; alter fenestration on the east, north, and west elevations; construct a rear addition; and construct fences and gates on the site.

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Construct a one-story addition to the north end of the east elevation.
 - a. The proposed addition would measure 25'-6" deep by 29'-8" wide.
 - b. The addition would be topped by a hipped roof clad in dark gray shingles to match the existing structure.
 - c. Ceiling height would be 10'-0", which matches the existing dwelling's first floor ceiling height.
 - d. The simulated raised foundation would be clad in brick veneer and would match the height of the main dwelling's existing foundation.
 - e. The proposed addition would be clad in wood siding.
 - f. The six (6) aluminum-clad double hung nine-over-one windows proposed for the north, south, and east elevations of the addition would each measure 3'-2" wide by 5'-8" high. Wood louvered shutters with iron shutter dogs would flank the windows on the south elevation.
 - g. The elevations would appear as follows:
 - South elevation (from west to east)
Two (2) nine-over-one windows regularly placed across the elevation, each flanked by louvered shutters.
 - North elevation (from east to west)
Three (3) nine-over-one windows regularly dispersed across the elevation.
 - East elevation (from south to north)
One (1) nine-over-one window placed $\frac{3}{4}$ down the length of the elevation from the south end.

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. **6.19** 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.
 9. **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.
10. **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 application under review proposes the construction of a one-story addition which would project from the north end of the east elevation.

The *Guidelines* call for an addition to an existing historic structure to be subordinate to the main structure in placement, along with massing and scale. This application achieves these objectives with the placement of the one-story addition towards the rear and to the side of the property, which does not disrupt the existing massing and scale of the property. The footprint, which measures 756 square feet, would be approximately 30% of the footprint of the historic mass of the house. In addition to the raised slab foundation matching the existing floor height, it would be clad in brick veneer to be compatible with the historic house. (6.9 - 6.11, 6.19)

As stated above, a portion of the proposed addition projects from an elevation which is not part of the original structure. However, the addition is further differentiated from the original structure by its perpendicular placement to the original rear projection. (6.12) All exterior materials intended for the addition either match the original historic structure, or are compatible alternatives, such as the aluminum-clad windows. (6.13) Likewise, the hipped roof planned for the addition is appropriate, in that it matches the shape of that of the original building's, would be clad in the same material, and implements similar elements such as overhanging exposed rafters. (6.14, 6.15, 6.21) The plans call for other comparable elements and details which maintain and complement the historic character of the property such as matching the windows' size and lite configuration to those of the original and installing louvered shutters similar to those extant on the historic facade. (6.20, 6.21)

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Pete Vallas was present to represent the application. He presented the project, adding that he had designed the previous renovation at this property and has now designed this one for the owner's growing family.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Maurin and Mr. Blackwell both commented on the project's tasteful design and how well it complements the original dwelling.

Mr. Vallas responded that the L-shape of the building allowed for an addition that doesn't affect the historic appearance of the house from the street. He noted that the project will match all original materials of the George Rogers design, and that it calls for the reuse of some of the original windows.

FINDING FACTS

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

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Ms. Maurin 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.

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



Agenda Item #3

Application 2023-54-CA

Certified Record

DETAILS

Location:

1225 Selma Street

Summary of Request:

Two-room addition to non-historic ancillary building

Applicant (as applicable):

Ann and Hastings Read

Property Owner:

Same

Historic District:

Oakleigh Garden

Classification:

Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The proposed addition would maintain acceptable setbacks.
- The proposed addition would use materials which match the existing accessory structure and maintain roof lines and ceiling heights.

Report Contents:

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

PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

Oakleigh Garden Historic District was initially listed in the National Register in 1972 under Criteria A (historic significance) and C (architectural significance) for its local significance in the areas of architecture, landscape architecture, and planning and development. The district is significant for its high concentration of 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 structure at 1225 Selma is a frame Craftsman bungalow with classical detailing which was constructed c. 1910. It appears on both 1904 and 1924 Sanborn maps. In 2006, a screen porch and raised walkway were added at the rear of the structure, along with a dormer which was installed on the west elevation. In 2010 a small teahouse structure was constructed on the lot behind the residence.

According to Historic Development records, this property has previously appeared twice before the Architectural Review Board. In 2010 an application to reroof the house with a metal roof was denied. In 2006, a Certificate of Appropriateness was granted for the construction of a teahouse to the rear of the lot, to build a screen porch and raised walkway at the rear and west side of the residence; to reroof the main structure; to add an egress rated skylight at the east and west side; and to add a dormer to the west elevation.

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Construct an addition to the east end of the non-historic tea house located to the rear of the residence.
 - a. The proposed addition would measure 8'-0" wide by 16'-0" deep. The depth would match the depth of the existing building.
 - b. The addition's height would match that of the existing building.
 - c. The existing gable-on-hip roof would be extended to the addition. The extended portion of the roof would be clad in shingles which match the existing.
 - d. The proposed siding, cornice, corner boards, and trim would also match the existing in materials, design, and profile. The new siding would be "feathered in" to the existing siding.
 - e. Two existing windows on the current east end wall of the structure would be relocated and installed in the same positions on the new east end wall created by the proposed addition. No further fenestration is proposed.

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

1. **9.1** Design an accessory structure to be subordinate in scale to that of the primary structure.
 - If a proposed accessory structure is larger than the size of typical historic accessory structures in the district, break up the mass of the larger structure into smaller modules that reflect traditional accessory structures.
2. **9.2** Locate a new accessory structure in line with other visible accessory structures in the district.
 - These are traditionally located at the rear of a lot.

ACCEPTABLE ACCESSORY STRUCTURE MATERIALS

Materials that are compatible with the historic district in scale and character are acceptable. These often include:

- Wood frame
- Masonry
- Cement-based fiber siding
- Installations (Pre-made store-bought sheds, provided they are minimally visible from public areas)

UNACCEPTABLE ACCESSORY STRUCTURE MATERIALS

Materials that are not compatible with the historic district in scale and character are unacceptable. These often include:

- Metal (except for a greenhouse)
- Plastic (except for a greenhouse)
- Fiberglass (except for a greenhouse)

STAFF ANALYSIS

The application under review proposes an addition to a non-historic accessory building located to the south (rear) of the main building at 1225 Selma Street. The existing accessory building is a non-historic tea house which was granted approval for construction by the ARB in 2006.

The proposed addition does not change the location of the structure and would maintain appropriate rear and east side yard setbacks of 8'-0" and 11'-0" respectively. With the addition, the building would retain its inferior size in relation to the main building (proposed 618 square feet footprint vs. approximate 2,780 square feet footprint). Further, the proposed plans would match the height of the addition and all materials to the existing approved structure. Therefore, with the proposed addition, the accessory structure would remain in compliance with the *Guidelines'* standards for new accessory structures. (9.1, 9.2)

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Hastings Read was present to represent the application. He presented the project, stating that the ARB had previously approved it. He added that the purpose of the addition is to provide a more useful space for visitors.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Maurin commented on the good design of the project.

FINDING FACTS

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

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

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

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Discussion: procedures regarding mid-month (administrative) approvals

Mr. McGowin recommended that Staff should meet soon to discuss potential amendments to procedures regarding mid-month (administrative) approvals.

Ms. Dawson commented that Staff would meet and develop a plan to present to the Board.

2. Ms. Dawson gave an update on an issue presented by a citizen, Ms. Katharine Flowers of 922 Conti

Street, at the October 4th meeting regarding a fence installed between 920 and 922 Conti Street.

Ms. Dawson stated that since the October 4th meeting, Ms. Flowers and the neighbor at 920 Conti had spoken, and an agreement on the fence had been reached.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:25pm.

