



# Architectural Review Board Minutes

October 4, 2023 – 3:00 P.M.

## ADMINISTRATIVE

---

The meeting was called to order by the Co-Chair Cartledge Blackwell at 3:00 p.m.

### 1. Roll Call

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

**Members Present:** Cartledge Blackwell, Abby Davis, Stephen Howle, Karrie Maurin (arrived at 3:05pm), Stephen McNair, Cameron Pfeiffer-Traylor, and Jennifer Roselius

**Members Absent:** Catarina Echols and Barja Wilson

**Staff Members Present:** Annie Allen, Christine Dawson, Douglas Fink, Kim Thomas, and Meredith Wilson

### 2. Approval of Minutes from September 20, 2023

Ms. Roselius moved to approve the minutes from the September 20<sup>th</sup> meeting.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Abby Davis and approved unanimously.

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

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

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

## MID-MONTH APPROVALS - APPROVED

---

1. **Applicant:** JE Mizell General Contracting  
**Property Address:** 359 Tuttle Avenue  
**Date of Approval:** 09/13/2023  
**Project:** Reroof in-kind with architectural shingles in charcoal color.
2. **Applicant:** Sheri Fisher  
**Property Address:** 262 S. Broad Street  
**Date of Approval:** 09/14/2023  
**Project:**  
1. Replace in-kind the existing 6'-high privacy fence.  
2. Extend fence 25' to east along southern property line, per submitted plans.  
3. Extend fence enclosure with gate 16' to east along northern property line, per submitted plans.
3. **Applicant:** All Weather Roofing & Construction LLC  
**Property Address:** 316 Weinacker Avenue  
**Date of Approval:** 09/14/2023  
**Project:** Reroof in-kind with shingles in Moire Black color.
4. **Applicant:** All Weather Roofing & Construction LLC  
**Property Address:** 314 Weinacker Avenue  
**Date of Approval:** 09/14/2023  
**Project:** Reroof in-kind with shingles in Moire Black color.
5. **Applicant:** Mobile Bay Roofing LLC  
**Property Address:** 351 Charles Street  
**Date of Approval:** 09/14/2023  
**Project:** Reroof in kind with shingles in Georgetown Gray.
6. **Applicant:** Guy Brothers Roofing Inc.  
**Property Address:** 22 Macy Place  
**Date of Approval:** 09/15/2023  
**Project:** Reroof detached garage with shingles in Castle Gray color.
7. **Applicant:** Bert Park  
**Property Address:** 901 Government Street  
**Date of Approval:** 09/15/2023  
**Project:** Remove and replace in-kind stained-glass window on west elevation.
8. **Applicant:** Phoenix Restoration Services, Inc  
**Property Address:** 19 S. Conception Street  
**Date of Approval:** 09/15/2023

- Project:** Reroof in-kind with modified bitumen.
9. **Applicant:** Bennett Barnett  
**Property Address:** 1050 New Saint Francis Street  
**Date of Approval:** 09/18/2023  
**Project:** 1. Repaint exterior in-kind.  
2. Repair and replace siding boards in-kind where needed.
10. **Applicant:** Diversified Roofing Service Inc.  
**Property Address:** 919 Dauphin Street  
**Date of Approval:** 09/18/2023  
**Project:** Reroof with mechanically attached .060 mil TPO flat roof system in White
11. **Applicant:** Murphy Bishop II  
**Property Address:** 1410 Government Street  
**Date of Approval:** 09/18/2023  
**Project:** 1. Remove exterior window on the north end of west elevation (rear).  
2. Install pane-and-panel wood entry door at location of window opening.  
3. Install six wood steps (painted white) descending from new door.
12. **Applicant:** Howard Stallworth  
**Property Address:** 955 Selma Street  
**Date of Approval:** 09/18/2023  
**Project:** Install single-hung six-over-six aluminum clad wood windows to fit existing openings.
13. **Applicant:** Integrity Maintenance LLC  
**Property Address:** 55 N. Georgia Avenue  
**Date of Approval:** 09/18/2023  
**Project:** Repaint exterior in the following colors: Body - Fort Conde Grey Beige; Trim DeTonti Square Off White; Porch Deck - Battleship Grey; Front Door – Monterey Dark Blue
14. **Applicant:** Diversified Roofing Service Inc.  
**Property Address:** 202 S. Catherine Street  
**Date of Approval:** 09/19/2023  
**Project:** Reroof in-kind with architectural shingles. Color: Pewter Grey
15. **Applicant:** Mobile Bay Roofing LLC  
**Property Address:** 160 S. Georgia Avenue  
**Date of Approval:** 09/19/2023  
**Project:** Reroof in-kind with shingles in Georgetown Gray color
16. **Applicant:** Langan Construction Co Inc  
**Property Address:** 501 Church Street

- Date of Approval:** 09/19/2023  
**Project:**
  1. Remove and replace in-kind wood siding and trim elements on north and west elevations.
  2. Detach and reset existing light fixture on north elevation.
  3. Repaint the north and west elevations, including the front porch, to match existing.
  4. Reglaze 6 windows on north elevation.
  5. Reglaze 8 windows on west elevation.
  6. Remove and replace in-kind 4 windows on first floor, northwest corner.
  7. Remove and replace in-kind 4 windows in second floor, northwest corner.
17. **Applicant:** Kingdom of Faith  
**Property Address:** 1714 Virginia Avenue  
**Date of Approval:** 09/19/2023  
**Project:** Replace a few boards to match existing, repaint to match. Where?
18. **Applicant:** Professional Roofing & Construction LLC  
**Property Address:** 107 Dearborn Street  
**Date of Approval:** 09/19/2023  
**Project:** Reroof in kind with architectural shingles in Weathered Wood color.
19. **Applicant:** Historic Mobile Preservation Society  
**Property Address:** 1115 Palmetto Street  
**Date of Approval:** 09/20/2023  
**Project:**
  1. Install framed wood lattice between foundation piers of Cox-Deasy Cottage.
  2. Repaint in kind front porch and railings.
  3. Power wash walkway/sidewalk.
20. **Applicant:** Barter & Associates, Inc.  
**Property Address:** 407 Dauphin Street  
**Date of Approval:** 09/20/2023  
**Project:** Emergency COA: Shore up and brace fire-damaged brick facade per submitted plans.
21. **Applicant:** John Williams  
**Property Address:** 10 S. Lafayette Street  
**Date of Approval:** 09/21/2023  
**Project:**
  1. Demolish existing rear deck.
  2. Construct full-width, rear-gabled porch, per submitted plans.
    - a. Roofing will be gray architectural shingles to match the house.
    - b. The porch roof will be supported by 8"x8" wood columns: 2 on north and south elevations, 4 on west elevation. Porch will be enclosed by 2x4 or 2x6 wood railing and 2" square pickets.
    - d. Porch will rest on continuous cement foundation with stucco or brick

veneer.

e. Porch will be accessed from rear yard by 3 10'-wide wooden steps with railing to match porch.

22. **Applicant:** Howard Stallworth  
**Property Address:** 955 Selma Street  
**Date of Approval:** 09/22/2023  
**Project:** Repair/replace rotten siding to match original in material, profile and
23. **Applicant:** Robert Dobson, III  
**Property Address:** 1063 Elmira Street  
**Date of Approval:** 09/25/2023  
**Project:** Reroof in-kind using architectural shingles. Color: Charcoal
24. **Applicant:** Chad Comingore  
**Property Address:** 106 S. Georgia Avenue  
**Date of Approval:** 09/25/2023  
**Project:**  
1. Repair and repaint in-kind of front column on south end of porch. Rotten wood to be replaced in-kind where needed.  
2. Repair in-kind missing spindle on upper balcony.  
3. Repaint front porch and front door to match existing.
25. **Applicant:** Warren T. McCrory  
**Property Address:** 1214 Texas Street  
**Date of Approval:** 09/25/2023  
**Project:** Repair and replace in-kind porch roof and ceiling board. Repaint in-kind.
26. **Applicant:** SOCO Services Inc.  
**Property Address:** 17 Common Street  
**Date of Approval:** 09/25/2023  
**Project:**  
1. Remove and replace in-kind damaged roofing, beaded decking, and fascia board.  
2. Paint all exposed woodwork to match existing as closely as possible.  
3. Reroof in-kind.

## APPLICATIONS

---

### 1. 2023-50-CA

**Address:** 261 N. Joachim Street  
**Historic District:** DeTonti Square  
**Applicant / Agent:** Douglas Kearley on behalf of Douglas Hunter  
**Project:** Install 10'-high longboard and trellis fence along north side of property. Extend existing 4'-high brick wall along south property line and connect 4'-high brick wall to 8'-high brick wall with 6'-8' high triallage.

APPROVED

-

CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

## 2. 2023-51-CA

**Address:** 167 S. Georgia Avenue  
**Historic District:** Oakleigh Garden  
**Applicant / Agent:** Stephen Howle  
**Project:** After the Fact: Infill of kitchen window on northern elevation with blind shutter.

**APPROVED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

## 3. 2023-44-CA

**Address:** 1212 New Saint Francis Street  
**Historic District:** Old Dauphin Way  
**Applicant / Agent:** Satsuma Rental  
**Project:** After-the-Fact: Replace all windows with vinyl sash windows; replace south-facing front door; remove and side over opening for west-facing front door

**APPROVED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

## OTHER BUSINESS

---

The next ARB meeting is scheduled for October 18, 2023.



# Agenda Item #1

Application 2023-50-CA

## Certified Record

### DETAILS

---

**Location:**

261 N. Joachim Street

**Summary of Request:**

Install 10'-high longboard and trellis fence along north side of property. Extend existing 4'-high brick wall along south property line and connect 4'- high brick wall to 8'-high brick wall with 6'-8' high treillage.

**Applicant (as applicable):**

Douglas Kearley

**Property Owner:**

Douglas Hunter

**Historic District:**

DeTonti Square

**Classification:**

Contributing

**Summary of Analysis:**

- The proposed wall, privacy fence and treillage are consistent with the subject structure and surrounding neighborhood in regard to design, material and placement.
- A fence of 96" can be considered due to zoning district and adjacent commercial property. The *Guidelines* do not allow for a 120" high fence between properties.
- The *Guidelines* call for the fence intended for the north property line to be set behind the front plane of the dwelling.

**Report Contents:**

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

## PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

---

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

261 N Joachim Street is a two-story brick side-hall entrance town house with Greek Revival detailing and an ornate two-story cast iron gallery. Historic Development records state that it was constructed c. 1860 for Thomas Lyon.

According to Historic Development files, this property has never before appeared before the Architectural Review Board.

## SCOPE OF WORK

---

1. Extend existing 4'-0" high brick wall approximately 20'-0" along the south property line.
  - a. The brick used for the wall would match that of the existing.
2. Construct a wood treillage which would consist of alternating 6'-0" lattice panels and 8'-0" high box columns between the extended 4'-0" high brick wall and the existing 8'-0" high brick wall on the south property line.
  - a. From west to east, the proposed lattice treillage would consist of the following: 4" x 4" post; 6'-0" high by 2'-4" wide rectangular lattice panel; three (3) 8'-0" high by 3'-8" wide lattice panels with inset arch and raised keystone, flanked by 1'-0" capped box columns with diagonal lattice detail ( a total of four); 6'-0" high by 2'-4" rectangular lattice panel; 4" x 4" post.
3. Construct a 10'-0" high by 45'-0" long longboard and lattice privacy fence along the north property line.
  - a. The proposed fence would consist of 1"x6" vertical boards topped by a 1'-6" lattice panel, with 8"x8" capped posts set at 8'-0" intervals.
  - b. Two 2'x6" boards would run along the top and bottom of the lattice panel, and a third along the base of the vertical boards.

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

---

1. **10.2** Design a fence to be compatible with the architectural style of the house and existing fences in the neighborhood.

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.
2. **10.3** Design a wall to be compatible with the architectural style of the house and existing walls in the district.
  - When building a solid wall, use a finish and material that is similar in texture, mass and durability to historic walls in the neighborhood.

### ACCEPTABLE FENCE MATERIALS

Materials that have a similar character, durability and finish to those of fences of historic properties in the district are acceptable. These often include:

- Wood picket
- Wood slat



- Wood lattice
- Iron or steel
- Historically appropriate wire fences
- Aluminum that appears similar to iron.

#### UNACCEPTABLE FENCE MATERIALS

Materials that do not have a similar character, durability and finish to those of fences of historic properties in the district are unacceptable. These often include:

- Chain link
- Stockade
- Post and rail
- Masonite
- PVC
- Plywood or asbestos paneling
- Razor wire
- Barbed wire

ACCEPTABLE WALL MATERIALS Materials that have a similar character, durability and finish to those of fences of historic properties in the district are acceptable. These often include:

- Brick
- Stone
- Stucco over masonry

UNACCEPTABLE WALL MATERIALS Materials that do not have a similar character, durability and finish to those of fences of historic properties in the district are unacceptable. These often include:

- Unstuccoed concrete block

## STAFF ANALYSIS

---

The subject property is a contributing resource within the DeTonti Square District. The application under review includes extending the existing 4'-0" brick wall approximately 20'-0" westward along the south property line; constructing a wood lattice treillage which would also be located along the south property line between the extended 4'-0" wall and existing 8'-0" wall; and the construction of a 10'-0" high wood privacy fence which would sit in line with the front plane of the dwelling and run 45'-0" westward along the north property line.

The *Guidelines* direct that newly constructed walls and fences be appropriate in design to the architectural style of the house and be compatible with existing walls and fences in the surrounding area. The proposed wall and fences meet this guideline in regard to design. Brick walls and wood lattice fences are acceptable materials for historic districts and are commonly seen in DeTonti Square. (10.2, 10.3)

*Guideline 10.2* further specifies that fences must be located behind the front building plane and should not exceed 72" in height, unless the property abuts a multi-family residential or commercial property; in such case, a height of 96" will be considered. In terms of placement, the privacy fence proposed for the north should sit slightly behind the front plane of the building. The proposed height for the fences intended for the north and south property lines would be 120" and 96" high respectively (with columns on the south treillage reaching 106"). The subject property and surrounding lots are zoned T-4, and a business occupies the structure at the adjacent property to the south. Therefore, an argument can be made for a 96" fence which sits behind the front plane of the building and runs between the adjacent lots, though the proposed fencing higher than 96" would not conform to the *Guidelines*.

## PUBLIC TESTIMONY

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

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Mr. McNair asked if the project was now in compliance with the CRC regulations. Mr. Kearley replied that reducing the height of the 10'-0" on the north side of the property mitigated all issues presented by the CRC.

Mr. McNair asked the applicant to clarify where the lattice fence would be located to the south of the property. Mr. Kearley demonstrated the location in a photo, pointing out an existing gap in the masonry wall. He stated that the new fences were for only the north and south property lines, and that no changes were intended for the property line along Joachim Street.

Mr. McNair asked Staff if the report had been amended to reflect the recent changes to the proposal.

Ms. Allen responded that it had. She added that one new issue to be considered by the Board is the now 6'-0" fence which is replacing the formerly proposed 4'-0" masonry wall will extend beyond the building's front plane.

Ms. Roselius asked if, when decision was made to switch to the lattice, 4'-0" was considered

Mr. Kearley responded that the 6'-0" corresponds to the treillage and is adjacent to a parking lot.

Ms. Roselius asked the applicant to clarify the dimensions of the proposed gate on the south side.

Mr. Kearley stated that the gate would be 3'-0" wide by 6'-0" high.

Ms. Davis asked Staff if the treillage placement and heights are in compliance with the *Guidelines* considering the commercial nature of the adjacent property.

Ms. Dawson responded that the *Guidelines* state that a 6'-0" fence between residential and commercial is allowed in historic districts, but that placement of a 6'-high fence extending in front of the front plane of a residential structure adjacent to a commercial property is not specifically spelled out in the *Guidelines*; this would be up to the discretion of the Board.

Ms. Roselius asked the applicant how far the fence would extend forward of the front plane of the building.

Mr. Kearley responded that the fence would extend roughly 10 to 13 feet in front of the building's front plane.

## **FINDING FACTS**

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

## **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Ms. Davis moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, the 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. Howle seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.



# Agenda Item #2

Application 2023-51-CA

## Certified Record

### DETAILS

---

**Location:**

167 S. Georgia Avenue

**Summary of Request:**

Infill of kitchen window on northern elevation.

**Applicant (as applicable):**

Stephen Howle

**Property Owner:**

Same

**Historic District:**

Oakleigh Garden

**Classification:**

Contributing

**Summary of Analysis:**

- The location of the removed window is minimally visible toward the east end (rear) of the north elevation.
- The applicant proposes the installation of louvered shutters to simulate the presence of a window.

**Report Contents:**

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

## PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

---

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

The structure at 167 S. Georgia Street is a two-story frame rectangular dwelling which boasts classical and Craftsman stylistic elements. The three-bay façade consists of a recessed porch spanning the northern bay and a one-story projection off the south elevation. According to Historic Development records, it was constructed c. 1914 by Pearl and Browne Dawson. The 1925 Sanborn map reveals that the building has retained its original form.

Per the vertical files of the Historic Development Department, this property has appeared twice before the Architectural Review Board (ARB). In 2007, an application to add a one-story pergola over the back patio was approved. In 2008 a COA was issued to replace a wood privacy fence and gate with a brick and metal fence and gate.

## SCOPE OF WORK

---

1. Remove existing window opening on east end of north elevation.
2. Close the resulting opening with louvered wood shutters to simulate window opening.

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

---

1. **5.20** 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.
  - Repair, rather than replace, frames and sashes, wherever possible.
  - For repair of window components, epoxies and related products may serve as effective solutions to material deterioration and operational malfunction.

## STAFF ANALYSIS

---

The property under review is a contributing structure in the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. The application seeks after-the-fact approval of the removal of an existing historic window located on the first-story level at the east end of the north elevation.

Though the *Guidelines* do not specifically address the presented circumstance, they do state that the functional and decorative features of a historic window should be preserved (5.20) In reviewing this application, the following should be considered. The reason for the proposed window removal is due to an interior kitchen remodel. The window to be removed is located on a secondary elevation towards the rear of the structure and is not visible from the street. The homeowner has installed louvered shutters on hinges, similar to those on the façade to simulate a window opening, which maintains the established fenestration pattern on the elevation.

*Mr. Howle recused himself from consideration of this application.*

## PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Howle was present to represent the application. He presented the project and explained that the window removal was part of an ongoing renovation project at the home which required removal of the window to permit wiring of a

new stove.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Ms. Roselius asked Mr. Howle if the removed window was original. Mr. Howle replied that he was not certain.

Mr. Blackwell asked if the window opening is behind the lattice screening located on the north side of the property, towards the back of the house. Mr. Howle replied that it was.

#### **FINDING FACTS**

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

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

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

Mr. McNair 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.



## Agenda Item #3

Application 2023-44-CA

### Certified Record

#### DETAILS

---

**Location:**

1212 New St. Francis Street

**Summary of Request:**

1. After-the-fact: Replace all windows with vinyl sash windows
2. Replace/Install new siding.

**Applicant (as applicable):**

Satsuma Rental

**Property Owner:**

Same

**Historic District:**

Old Dauphin Way

**Classification:**

Contributing

**Summary of Analysis:**

- The current windows match the original window openings and are of an appropriate light configuration.
- Vinyl is considered an unacceptable window material for Mobile’s historic districts.
- The wood lap siding present on the building’s façade appears to be in reparable condition.
- Wood lap siding is an appropriate replacement for all elevations of the building, with Hardie plank siding being an appropriate replacement material for all non-primary elevations.
- The Design Review Committee agreed on a modified scope of work.

**Report Contents:**

Property and Application History ..... 2

Scope of Work..... 2

Applicable Standards ..... 2

Staff Analysis..... 3

Attachments ..... 5

## PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

---

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

The dwelling at 1212 New Saint Francis Street is a two-bay frame one-story cottage with restrained Victorian detailing. According to MHDC vertical files, the structure was constructed c. 1900. The 1904, 1925, and 1956 Sanborn Insurance Map overlays depict a frame dwelling, matching the rectangular form of the current structure, and consisting of the same recessed front porch spanning the west bay. In 2007, a rear porch was added along with two gabled dormers on the east elevation.

According to Historic Development Department records, this property has appeared twice before the Architectural Review Board (ARB). In 2007, work at the property was approved which included adding two gabled dormers on the east elevation, construction of a rear porch, repairing damaged elements, and reroofing the structure. The current application initially appeared before the ARB on September 6, 2023 and was tabled for discussion at a Design Review Committee meeting.

## SCOPE OF WORK

---

1. (After-the-fact) Replace all windows (and install where windows are missing) with Atrium single-hung vinyl windows to fit existing window openings.
2. Replace siding on all elevations with wood lap siding to match existing or Hardie plank lap siding.

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

---

1. 5.4 Preserve original building materials.
  - Repair deteriorated building materials by patching, piecing-in, consolidating or otherwise reinforcing the material.
  - Remove only those materials which are deteriorated, and beyond reasonable repair.
  - Do not remove original materials that are in good condition.
2. 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.
  - The ARB will consider the use of green building materials, such as those made with renewable and local resources to replace damaged materials on a nonprimary façade if they do not impact the integrity of the building or its key features.
  - Use alternative or imitation materials that match the style and detail of the original material to replace damaged non-primary building materials.
  - Replace exterior finishes to match original in profile, dimension and materials.
3. 5.20 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.
  - Repair, rather than replace, frames and sashes, wherever possible.

- For repair of window components, epoxies and related products may serve as effective solutions to material deterioration and operational malfunction.
4. 5.21 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 windows shall match the existing as per location, framing, and light configuration.
  - Use any salvageable window components on a primary elevation.

5. ACCEPTABLE WINDOW MATERIALS

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

- Wood sash
- Steel, if original to structure
- Custom extruded aluminum
- Aluminum clad wood
- Windows approved by the National Park Service

UNACCEPTABLE WINDOW MATERIALS

Materials that do not appear similar to the original in texture, profile and finish are unacceptable.

These often include:

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

## STAFF ANALYSIS

---

The subject property is a contributing resource within the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The application under review seeks after-the-fact approval of the installation of new vinyl windows which fit the existing window openings, and the proposal of new wood lap siding on the façade and Hardie plank lap siding on side and rear elevations.

The one-over-one vinyl windows were recently installed in all extant window openings on the structure. Photos show that prior to installation, window openings on the east elevation were covered with plywood. Earlier photographic evidence reveals deterioration and empty window openings on this elevation with extant wood windows on the south (façade) and west elevations. According to the applicant, these extant windows were in an extreme deteriorated state, and although there was evidence of inferior efforts to maintain the windows, the windows were not salvageable. Historic Development Department records show that two-over-two wood windows with true divided lights were approved for installation in the gables on the east elevation; however, it is unclear if these windows were ever installed. If they were installed, satellite imagery reveals that they were no longer extant by 2011.

The *Guidelines* recommend that historic windows that are intact and in repairable condition be retained and repaired, and those that are not repairable be replaced with new windows that are consistent with the existing in location, framing, and light configuration. (5.20, 5.21) The one-over-one vinyl replacement windows are compatible with existing window openings, and although photographs demonstrate evidence of a previous two-over-two light configuration, the one-over-one configuration is appropriate to the design and style of the building. The *Guidelines* further note that vinyl is not an acceptable window material for contributing properties within Mobile's historic districts. (5.21)

The *Guidelines* direct that original building materials be repaired rather than replaced, when possible, and that original materials that are in good condition remain in place. On non-primary elevations, the *Guidelines* allow for



the consideration of green materials that imitate the original in profile and dimension, such as Hardie plank, as acceptable replacement materials providing they sustain the integrity of the building. (5.4, 5.7) The wood lap siding extant on west bay of the façade appears to be in good or repairable shape. New wood lap siding that matches the existing in profile and dimensions would be a fitting and compliant replacement material for the east bay under the porch and around the entry door. The non-primary elevations currently have minimal siding and could be re-clad in either new wood lap siding or an appropriate Hardie plank material.

The subject application was tabled at the public meeting of the ARB on September 6<sup>th</sup>, in order that a Design Review Committee be formed to discuss and mitigate the application. The committee and the applicant consulted on September 18<sup>th</sup> and agreed on the following modifications:

1. Three (3) vinyl windows to be removed (one on the façade and the southernmost window on both the east and west elevations)
  - a. The removed windows are to be replaced with wood two-over-two windows which are extant on the property.
  - b. All windows will be trimmed to match original window dimensions, including a 1"x 4" on each side and a 1"x 6" on top with a trim piece above.
2. Wood lap siding matching the existing is to be installed on the façade.
  - a. The secondary front door opening is to be filled with wood lap siding.
3. Hardie siding matching as closely as possible the dimensions of the existing siding on the facade is to be installed on all secondary elevations.
4. A wood handrail is to be installed on front porch.
  - a. The handrail will consist of a simple balustrade with turned posts which match the style of the house.
5. A new pane-and-panel front door matching the historic character of the house is to be installed.
  - a. The front door is of stain grade fiberglass with a simulated wood grain which is to be stained dark to be compatible with the character of the house.
  - b. The door would fit the existing door and transom opening.
6. The beadboard and louvered vent on the front gable is to be repaired and/or replaced in-kind.
7. The rear porch is to be finished out with approved materials.

#### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Josh Wilson was present to represent the application. He discussed the modifications to the project as a result of the Design Review Committee meeting. He was available to discuss the application.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Ms. Maurin clarified that the three windows to be replaced are the original or previous wood windows, with all other windows to remain vinyl. Mr. Wilson responded that this is correct.

Ms. Roselius commented that this decision was made by the Design Review Committee because only three historic (or historic replication) windows remain extant in the home. The chosen placement is the most visible and appears most cohesive from the street. She added that these wood windows were removed prior to the current owner taking possession of the property.

Ms. Maurin asked if one of the original entry door openings would be eliminated and filled with siding, with no implication that a door opening was once there. Mr. Wilson replied that this is correct.

Mr. Blackwell asked Staff if the vinyl windows reflect the dimensionality that one would find originally. Ms. Allen responded that the vinyl windows are a higher quality model with a lite configuration compatible with the character of the house which will blend in the best possible way given the circumstances. She added that Mr. Wilson has been very willing to work with Board members and Staff to resolve the situation in the best way.

Ms. Roselius added that the windows have a wider casing, which is good, and that the Design Review Committee noted

that all windows would be trimmed to match the original window openings.

#### **FINDING FACTS**

Ms. McNair 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. 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.

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

#### **OTHER BUSINESS**

---

Ms. Katherine Flowers inquired about an "after-the-fact" approval of a fence installed between 920 and 922 Conti Street due to the existing fence being higher than that permitted under the design guidelines. Ms. Dawson explained that the owner of the fence had not applied for after-the-fact approval; therefore, it could not be considered by the ARB. Ms. Roselius asked if the ARB could be updated on the situation at a later meeting.

There being no further business, Ms. Roselius moved to adjourn the meeting at 3:34pm.

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