

**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES**  
**May 3, 2023 – 3:00 P.M.**  
**Auditorium, Government Plaza**  
**205 Government Street**

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

1. The acting Chair, Mr. Jim Wagoner, called the meeting to order at 3:02 pm. Christine Dawson, Historic Development staff, called the roll as follows.

**Members Present:** Janelle Adams (alternate), Cart Blackwell (alternate), Bob Allen, Karrie Maurin, Andre Rathle, Craig Roberts, and Jim Wagoner

**Members Absent:** Abby Davis, Catarina Echols, Kimberly Harden, Kathleen Huffman (alternate), Joseph Rodrigues, and Gypsie Van Antwerp

**Staff Members Present:** Annie Allen, Christine Dawson, Marion McElroy, Flo Kessler, John Sledge, Kim Thomas, and Meredith Wilson

2. Mr. Roberts moved to approve the minutes from the April 19, 2023 meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Blackwell and approved unanimously.
3. Mr. Roberts moved to approve the Mid-Month COAs granted by Staff. The motion was seconded by Mr. Blackwell and approved unanimously.

**B. MID-MONTH APPROVALS - APPROVED**

**1. Applicant: Pools on the Gulf LLC**

- a. Property Address: 221 South Dearborn Street
- b. Date of Approval: 04/11/2023
- c. Project: Install 12'x16' inground pool immediately south of residence.

**2. Applicant: Global South Holdings**

- a. Property Address: 1420 Government Street
- b. Date of Approval: 04/11/2023
- c. Project: Repaint in-kind the backside upper porch deck; spot paint wrought iron hand railing.

**3. Applicant: New Hand Signs LLC**

- a. Property Address: 757 Government Street
- b. Date of Approval: 04/13/2023
- c. Project: 1. Install a single-sided wall sign.
  2. Sign will be mounted with toggle bolts to the panel above the windows and roughly centered on the structure.
  3. Sign will measure 7' wide x 3' high for a total of 21 square feet.
  4. Sign will be composed of routed wood and hand painted elements and read "LUSH Florist & Gifts".

**4. Applicant: New Hand Signs LLC**

- a. Property Address: 202 St. Michael Street
- b. Date of Approval: 04/13/2023
- c. Project: 1. Install a single-face wall sign.
  2. The sign will be mounted using masonry screws directly to the building's façade.

3. The sign will be centered on the existing panel above the storefront.
4. The sign will measure 12' wide by 1' high for a total of 12 square feet.
5. The sign will be composed of routed cypress wood and paint.
6. The sign will read "Mercantile"

**5. Applicant: Melissa Mutert**

- a. Property Address: 254 Dexter Ave
- b. Date of Approval: 04/13/2023
- c. Project: Replace in-kind rotten wood on exterior. Repaint to match existing.

**6. Applicant: Lillian Thomas**

- a. Property Address: 263 South Cedar Street
- b. Date of Approval: 04/13/2023
- c. Project: Repaint exterior of home, shutters and trim to match existing.  
Repaint existing privacy wall to match existing.

**7. Applicant: Daisy Grant**

- a. Property Address: 1413 Church Street
- b. Date of Approval: 04/14/2023
- c. Project:
  1. Remove rotten deck from rear of the structure. Replace with covered porch.
  2. The new porch will measure 14'-2" wide by 24'-0" deep and be topped with a gable roof which will be clad in architectural shingles to match the existing dwelling and will be supported by wooden posts set at regular intervals.
  3. The porch will sit on a raised foundation supported by concrete piers, to match the height of the existing structure.

**8. Applicant: Jerry Jackson**

- a. Property Address: 1353 Dauphin Street
- b. Date of Approval: 04/14/2023
- c. Project: Remove vinyl siding from mansard roofs and reroof with architectural shingles.

**9. Applicant: Valerie Sheaffer**

- a. Property Address: 116 Parker Street
- b. Date of Approval: 04/17/2023
- c. Project: Remove existing asbestos roofing. Reroof with shingles in charcoal color.

**10. Applicant: ASF Contracting LLC**

- a. Property Address: 110 Bush Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 04/17/2023
- c. Project: Remove existing asbestos roofing and reroof with architectural shingles.

**11. Applicant: Franchise Management Services Inc**

- a. Property Address: 309 Michigan Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 04/17/2023
- c. Project: Remove existing asbestos roofing. Reroof with Certainteed Landmark shingles.  
Color: Charcoal

**12. Applicant: Douglas Kearley**

- a. Property Address: 967 Elmira Street
- b. Date of Approval: 04/17/2023
- c. Project:
  1. Remove secondary front door and transom. Relocate both to existing door opening on west elevation. Close door opening with clapboards to match existing.
  2. Install a 72" wood privacy fence on the east and south property lines.
  3. Install a 3'-0" picket fence along the west property line.
  4. Install a new gravel drive with brick edging measuring 10'-0" wide at the existing curb cut on the west side of the property. A parking area of the same

- materials will abut the driveway on its north side.
- 5. Install a brick terrace on the eastern side of the south (rear elevation) and , will measure 19' wide by 14' deep.
- 6. Repair and repaint in-kind windows, siding, eaves, etc.
- 7. Install new wood balustrades to flank front and western entry steps.
- 8. Install wood lattice panels as foundation infill between existing brick piers.

- 13. Applicant: Middlebay Land LLC**
- a. Property Address: 210 South Washington Avenue
  - b. Date of Approval: 04/19/2023
  - c. Project: Paint north, south, and west elevations of building. All colors Sherwin Williams. Body: Mindful Gray; Trim: Iron Ore

- 14. Applicant: All Weather Roofing and Construction LLC**
- a. Property Address: 100 Espejo Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 04/24/2023
  - c. Project: Reroof in-kind with Landmark Architectural shingles. Color: Moire Black

**C. APPLICATIONS**

- 1. 2023-23-CA: 17 Macy Place**
- a. Applicant: Edward “Paul” Jones
  - b. Project: Demolish one-story single-family residence; construct one-story single-family residence

**APPROVED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

- 2. 2023-24-CA: Parcel R022906400002236 (NE corner St. Francis & N. Claiborne streets)**
- a. Applicant: Etsie Foreman
  - b. Project: Enclose existing parking area with fencing; landscaping

**APPROVED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

- 3. 2023-25-CA: 200 Marine Street**
- a. Applicant: Douglas Kearley on behalf of Mr. and Mrs. Bruce Pfeiffer
  - b. Project: Construct additions to house, extend deck, construct carport, and make site improvements

**APPROVED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

- 4. 2023-26-CA: 265 N. Joachim Street**
- b. Applicant: Cory Bronenkamp/195, LLC
  - b. Project: New construction: five (5) one-story, single-family residences

**WITHDRAWN - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

**D. OTHER BUSINESS**

- 1. The next ARB meeting is scheduled for May 17, 2023.

**Public comment** regarding items on this agenda will be accepted via e-mail ([mhdc@cityofmobile.org](mailto:mhdc@cityofmobile.org)) or USPS (Mobile Historic Development Commission, P.O. Box 1827, Mobile, AL 36633) until 5PM on Tuesday, May 2, 2023. Please include your name, home address, and the item number about which you are writing.

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**CERTIFIED RECORD**

<b>ADDRESS</b>	17 Macy Place	<b>APPLICATION NO.</b>	2023-23-CA
<b>SUMMARY OF REQUEST</b>	Demolish one-story single-family residence; construct one-story single-family residence		
<b>APPLICANT</b>	Edward Paul Jones	<b>OWNER, IF OTHER</b>	

<b>HISTORIC DISTRICT</b>	Old Dauphin Way	<b>MEETING DATE</b>	04/19/2023
<b>CLASSIFICATION</b>	Contributing	<b>REVIEWER</b>	Annie Allen

**DISTRICT/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.”

According to city directories, the house at 17 Macy Place was constructed c. 1926. It is a one-story bungalow with Spanish Revival stylistic detailing.

According to MHDC vertical files, this property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board (ARB).

**SCOPE OF WORK (per submitted application and plans and correspondence)**

1. Demolish existing structure.
2. Construct a one-story single-family residence.
  - a. The proposed residence would be a cottage form with Tudor Revival detailing. The three-bay façade would be located on the lot such that the front wall plane would sit 25’-0” back from the street front. The north and south side yards would measure 7’-0” and 4’-6” respectively.
  - b. The structure would be topped with a cross-gabled roof clad in shingles.
  - c. The proposed structure would be clad in brick veneer, painted in Benjamin Moore White Dove.
  - d. The proposed structure would sit on a raised foundation with continuous brick skirting. The ceiling height would be 9’, and the apex of the roof would be approximately 22’-6”.
  - e. Fenestration material: All doors would be wood. All windows would be aluminum clad wood. Doors would have soldier brick lintels, and windows would have soldier brick lintels and projecting brick sills.
  - f. Elevations would appear as follows:
    - 1) West façade (from north to south)  
One (1) double casement multi-pane window measuring 2’-4 ½” wide by 3’-0 ½” high; bricked chimney; one (1) double casement multi-pane window measuring 2’-4 ½” wide by 3’-0 ½” high; one (1) 3’-0” wide by 7’-6” high vertical paneled arched entry door with diamond shaped fixed glass pane; one (1) double casement multi-pane window measuring 3’-0” ¾” wide by 5’-0 ½” high; one (1) double casement multi-pane window measuring 3’-0 ¾” wide by 4’-0 ½” high. The front door would be accessed via four (4)

brick steps leading to an entry deck with cheek wall at the south side. Four (4) brick steps accessing the south side entry would be located where the elevation steps back to the southernmost bay.

2) East (rear) elevation (from south to north)

Two (2) blind window openings with brick infill and soldier course lintels equally spaced across the elevation of the southern bay; one (1) triple casement multi-pane window measuring 9'-2 3/4" wide by 5'-0 1/2" high, centered on the northern bay below a center gable; a raised brick terrace would project from this bay under the windows and be accessed from the interior by an entry door on the northern elevation; three brick steps would be centered on the east side of the terrace for access from the rear yard.

3) North elevation (from east to west)

One (1) twin casement multi-pane window measuring 6'-1 3/4" wide by 5'-0 1/2" high, centered on the western bay; one (1) casement multi-pane window measuring 1'-6 3/4" wide by 4'-0 1/2" high; one (1) multi-pane entry door measuring 3'-0" wide by 7'-6" high and accessed by a brick landing which would project northward with three (3) adjacent brick steps which would descend eastward; two (2) windows measuring 1'-6 3/4" wide by 4'-0 1/2" high, almost equally spaced across the third bay; two double casement multi-pane windows measuring 3'-0" 3/4" wide by 5'-0 1/2" high, equally spaced across the fourth most western bay.

4) South elevation (from west to east)

One (1) double casement multi-pane window measuring 3'-0" 3/4" wide by 5'-0 1/2" high; deck leading to the front door (on west elevation); one (1) casement multi-pane window measuring 1'-6 3/4" wide by 4'-0 1/2" high; one (1) blind window opening with brick infill and soldier course lintel; one (1) double casement multi-pane window measuring 3'-0" 3/4" wide by 5'-0 1/2" high; one (1) multi-pane entry door measuring 3'-0" wide by 7'-6" high and accessed by a brick landing which would project southward with three (3) adjacent brick steps which would descend westward; one (1) double casement multi-pane window measuring 3'-0 3/4" wide by 4'-0 1/2" high; two (2) casement multi-pane windows measuring 1'-6 3/4" wide by 4'-0 1/2" high, almost equally spaced across the fifth most eastern bay. A single multi-light casement window would be located in the western gable end.

## STAFF REPORT

### A. Applicable standards from the *Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts* (Guidelines):

#### Considerations Regarding Demolition

1. Consider the current significance of a structure previously determined to be historic.
2. Consider the condition of the structure in question. Demolition may be more appropriate when a building is deteriorated or in poor condition.
3. Consider whether the building is one of the last remaining positive examples of its kind in the neighborhood, county, or region.
4. Consider the impact that demolition will have on surrounding structures, including neighboring properties, properties on the same block or across the street, or properties throughout the individual historic district.
5. Consider whether the building is part of an ensemble of historic buildings that create a neighborhood.
6. Consider the future utilization of the site. (12)

## **B. Staff Analysis**

This application proposes the demolition of the contributing historic structure at 17 Macy Place, with the subsequent construction of a new one-story single-family residence.

The *Guidelines* state that when demolition is contemplated, the current significance of the structure should be considered. The subject house is considered a contributing property in the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The small flat roof Spanish Revival home represents a style which became widely popular in Mobile between 1900-1930. The modest interpretation of this style at 17 Macy Place is a character defining feature of Mobile's built heritage, and variations of it can be seen throughout the city's historic districts. Elements such as the arcaded entry porch with iron railing, casement windows, the double entry door with decorative grilles, and the "whipped" stucco technique used on the exterior wall surface serve to define the subject house as a significant example of the vernacular interpretation of Spanish Revival style in Mobile. The importance of this style to Mobile's historic built environment is further evidenced by a 1991 *Spanish Revival Residences in Mobile* National Register Multiple Property Listing which includes ten (10) properties that are considered the best remaining examples of the style in Mobile. (A.1)

Per the *Guidelines*, "the condition of the structure in question" should be considered. "Demolition may be more appropriate when a building is deteriorated or in poor condition." In the case of the subject property, the building has sustained some significant damage to the roof which has exposed a large portion of the interior to the elements over a period of time. A non-historic addition on the rear is in an advanced deteriorated state. Vegetation has overgrown the property and portions of the house. With the exception of the rear addition, the original house is of concrete block construction and appears to retain its structural integrity. The foundation does not appear to be impaired and there is no visual evidence that the house is unsound. A more in-depth analysis such as a structural engineering report would be required to demonstrate whether the house is structurally compromised. However, the aforementioned non-historic addition on the rear is of frame construction and is in ruins. Further, as commonly happens when newer additions to existing structures are not constructed in the same method or at the same standard as the original portion, the rear addition is negatively affecting the original portion of the house and should be removed. (A.2)

Whether the building in question is "one of the last remaining positive examples of its kind in the neighborhood, county or region" should be factored into any decision to allow or disallow demolition in a historic district. As stated above, the Spanish Revival style was enthusiastically embraced in Mobile during the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, as the colonial heritage and the climate was well suited to this architectural trend. Mobile is one of very few areas outside of Florida and the west coast – where this fad sprouted and mainly developed – to boast so many examples of the Spanish Revival style, both through landmark properties and more modest interpretations. Because of this, the demolition of an example of this style would contribute to an integral loss of part of Mobile's architectural story. (A.3, A.5)

Another consideration directed by the *Guidelines* is the impact that a demolition would have on surrounding structures. In this case, the applicant has submitted plans for the construction of a new single-family residence. These plans are compatible in size, massing, and scale with the property and the neighborhood. Further, the proposed design and materials for the new residence would be sympathetic to the architectural and historic character of the surrounding district. These factors serve to diminish the negative impact that the demolition of the existing historic structure would have on nearby structures. (A.4)

The *Guidelines* further instruct that the future use of a cleared site should be considered. (A.6) The applicant has provided plans for a proposed new single-family residence to be constructed on the site after the demolition.

### **C. Summary of Analysis**

- The house at 17 Macy place is a contributing structure within the Old Dauphin Way Historic District.
- The Spanish Revival style is an integral component of Mobile's built heritage.
- Although the original portion house has sustained significant damage, and interior finishes and features have been compromised due to exposure, the structure is of block construction and appears to be structurally sound and has maintained many of its character defining features.
- The non-historic addition on the rear of the structure is in ruins and is negatively impacting the original structure and therefore should be removed.
- Future plans for the site include the proposed construction of a one-story single-family brick cottage home with Tudor Revival detailing.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on Section B above, Staff believes the proposed demolition of the house at 17 Macy Place would impair the architectural and historic character of the surrounding district. Staff recommends denial of the application.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Mr. Paul Jones and Mr. Pete Vallas were present to discuss the application.

Mr. Jones presented Board members with a structural engineering report prepared by Barton & Shumer Engineering, LLC. He stated that he never anticipated that the residence would be salvageable when he purchased it. He added that he intends to live in the proposed new house which would be compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. He also provided a list of 40 signatures of neighbors who agree that the current house should be demolished. He stated that the house has been vacant for over four years, trees have fallen on the roof, and the previous owner abandoned the home.

Mr. Vallas stated that Mr. Jones was very particular in selecting the design of the new home; he selected details from existing vernacular English cottages to incorporate into the design of his house. He added that the engineering report determined that it would cost more than fifty percent more to restore the current structure than to demolish it and construct a new home.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Mr. Blackwell thanked the applicant for providing the professional engineer's report, stating that Staff is required to make their recommendation based off of what they can see.

Mr. Allen asked Staff if this property was one of the properties listed on the National Register Multiple Property Listing.

Ms. Allen responded that the subject property is not part of that listing.

Mr. Sledge added that the mentioned National Register listing included properties outside the local historic districts.

### **FINDING FACTS**

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

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

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

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

Mr. Blackwell motioned to amend the motion to reflect the facts of the structure's state of extreme decay, the high quality of the proposed redevelopment of the property, and the provision of the engineer's report.

Ms. Adams seconded the amended motion and it was approved unanimously.



**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**CERTIFIED RECORD**

<b>ADDRESS</b>	Parcel R022906400002236 (NE corner St. Francis & N. Claiborne streets)	<b>APPLICATION NO.</b>	2023-24-CA
<b>SUMMARY OF REQUEST</b>	Enclose existing parking area with fencing; landscaping		
<b>APPLICANT</b>	Ben Cummings	<b>OWNER, IF OTHER</b>	Etsie Foreman

<b>HISTORIC DISTRICT</b>	Lower Dauphin Street Commercial	<b>MEETING DATE</b>	05/03/2023
<b>CLASSIFICATION</b>	Vacant	<b>REVIEWER</b>	Annie Allen

**DISTRICT/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.

According to Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps, by 1891 the subject lot was designated as 312 St. Francis Street. The portion of the property which now comprises the subject lot remained empty until c.1924, as the 1924 Sanborn overlay depicts a two-story frame residence with a small, recessed porch on the western end of the façade fronting St. Francis and a rear projection with a side porch. The property was labeled 312 and 312 ½, as the building was a multi-family residence. This building appears to have been constructed around the same time as the extant building at 310 St. Francis. According to aerial photography, the building was demolished between 1952 and 1955. Since that time, the lot has remained empty.

This property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board.

**SCOPE OF WORK (per submitted application and plans and correspondence)**

1. Install a metal picket fence along the perimeter of the subject lot.
  - a. The metal fence would measure 6’-0” tall.
  - b. The fence would run east to west along the north property line of the subject lot and along the north property line of the lot adjacent to the east.
  - c. The portion of the fence which would run north to south along the west side of the lot would sit back 3’-0” from the west property line to allow for landscaping. Included in this portion of the fence would be a 20’-0” wide sliding gate which would be located at the northern end of the west property line.
  - d. The portion of the fence which would run east to west along the south property line would sit just behind the front plane of the existing building on the lot adjacent to the east.
2. Install landscaping and paving material.
  - a. New 3’-0” high shrubs would be installed in the setback area along the west and south sides of the lot to soften the visual impact of parking.
  - b. Crushed aggregate would be used to pave the surface of the existing lot.
  - c. Existing parking spaces will remain.

## STAFF REPORT

### A. Applicable standards from the *Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts*

#### (Guidelines):

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

- Install a painted wood picket fence.
- Install a simple wood or wire fence. Heights of wooden picket fences are ordinarily restricted to 36". Consideration for up to 48," depending on the location of the fence, shall be given. A variance might be required. Staff can advise and assist applicants with regard to a variance. If combined with a wall, the total vertical dimension of the wall and fence collectively should not exceed 36," or in some cases 48".
- For surface parking areas associated with commercial uses, size a perimeter parking area fence to not exceed 48" in height.
- Install a cast-iron or other metal fence not exceeding 48" in height if located in the front yard.
- Install a fence that uses alternative materials that have a very similar look and feel to wood, proven durability, matte finish and an accurate scale and proportion of components.
- Face the finished side of a fence toward the public right-of-way.
- Based on the chosen fence material, use proportions, heights, elements and levels of opacity similar to those of similar material and style seen in the historic district.

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

2. **10.7** Minimize the visual impact of parking.

- Locate a parking area at the rear or to the side of a site whenever possible.
- Use landscaping to screen a parking area.
- Minimize the widths of a paved area or a curb cut.
- If a curb cut is no longer in use, repair the curb. In some areas, granite curbs may be required.
- Do not use paving in the front yard for a parking area. Paving stones might be acceptable in certain instances.
- Do not create a new driveway or garage that opens onto a primary street.

ACCEPTABLE WALK AND PAVING MATERIALS Materials that have a similar character, durability and level of detail to walks and paved areas associated with historic properties in the district are acceptable. These often include:

- Gravel or crushed stone
- Shell
- Brick
- Cobblestone
- Grasspave or grasscrete (mix of grass and hard surface paving material that provides a solid surface)

3. **10.10** Provide a landscaped front yard for a residential property in a historic district.
- In commercial areas, consider using landscaping to screen and soften the appearance of surface parking areas. Use an internal and perimeter landscaping treatment to screen a fenced or walled parking area.
  - Do not use landscaping to hide a design feature that is inconsistent with these *Design Review Guidelines*.

### **B. Staff Analysis**

This application seeks approval for improvements, landscaping, and the installation a 6'-0" fence around the perimeter of the lot located on the northeast corner of St. Francis and North Claiborne Streets. The subject lot is adjacent to a multi-family residence to the east at 310 St. Francis. Both properties are owned by the applicant, and the vacant lot is currently being used for parking by the residents of 310 St. Francis. The owner's intent is to improve the appearance of the corner parking lot while providing enhanced security for the residents of 310 St. Francis.

The proposed design and material of the metal fence conforms with the *Guidelines'* instruction that a fence design is to be compatible with the architectural style of existing fences in the neighborhood. The submitted sample fence is very similar to metal fences seen in the Lower Dauphin Historic District. (A.1)

The Guidelines state that metal fences and those enclosing surface parking areas are restricted to a maximum of 48" in height. (A.1) Although at 72" high, the proposed metal fence would exceed this limit, it is worth noting that there are existing examples within the historic districts of ARB-approved metal fences surrounding corner parking areas that measure 72". A very similar arrangement to the subject property exists in DeTonti Square at 260 N. Joachim Street, which is on the southeast corner of N. Joachim and Congress Streets. The property consists of two lots. The lot to the south consists of a large building which was constructed as residential and is now used as an office building. The lot adjacent to the north is used as a parking lot and is surrounded by a metal fence with a low brick coping wall and brick columns. The parking lot and landscaping was granted ARB approval in 1989. The property at 753 St. Francis in the Lower Dauphin Historic District consists of a rear parking lot on the northeast corner of Dauphin and N. Bayou Streets which is enclosed by a wall/fence combination which also exceeds the 48" height limit. This design received ARB approval in 1998. Further, it should be considered that the higher fence height would provide better security for the parking lot.

As the subject lot relates to the residence at 310 St. Francis, the proposed parking lot meets the *Guidelines'* directive concerning location. The proposed landscape design would serve to further soften the visual impact of parking, also a condition outlined in the *Guidelines*. The crushed stone product proposed as pavement material is one approved for use in historic districts. (A.2 ,3)

### **C. Summary of Analysis**

- The application proposes the enclosure of an existing surface parking area with fencing and landscaping and improved paving materials.

- The fence conforms with the *Guidelines* in terms of placement and materials. Its proposed height exceeds the 48” maximum height limit outlined in the *Guidelines* for corner side fences.
- There are existing examples of corner parking lots enclosed with ARB approved fences which measure at least 72” in the historic districts.
- The proposed landscaping design and crushed aggregate paving material are in conformance with the *Guidelines*.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on Section B above, taking into account the extant examples of 72” enclosure fences within the surrounding districts, Staff believes the enclosure of the existing parking area with a 72” metal fence, the installation of landscaping and paving material would not impair the architectural and historic character of the surrounding district and recommends approval of the application.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Mr. Ben Cummings was present to discuss the application. He stated that the fence will sit behind the front plane of the façade of the adjacent building and will sit 3’ in along N. Claiborne Street. He added that the owner, Mr. Foreman, wishes to improve the appearance of the corner lot and make it safer for residents.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Ms. Maurin asked Mr. Cummings if he could specify what type of shrubbery will be placed on the lot. Mr. Cummings responded that the particular shrubbery has not been chosen yet but will probably be holly.

Mr. Blackwell commented that this enclosure is similar to the existing one at Dauphin and Washington Streets. He noted that at this location, there is no landscape to accompany the fencing and commended the applicant on the open fencing choice which improved visibility of the building and the addition of landscaping which both conceals the parking and softens the effect.

### **FINDING FACTS**

Mr. Roberts moved that, based on the evidence presented in the application, the Board finds the facts in the Staff’s report.

Mr. Blackwell motioned to amend the motion to note the open nature of the fence and existing examples of this type and height of fencing within local historic districts.

The amended motion was seconded by Ms. Adams and approved unanimously.

### **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Mr. Roberts moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, the installation of a 72” metal fence and landscaping at the NE corner St. Francis & N. Claiborne streets would not impair the architectural and historic character of the property or the district, and a Certificate of Appropriateness should be granted.

Mr. Blackwell motioned to amend the motion to note the open nature of the fence and existing examples of this type and height of fencing within local historic districts.

The amended motion was seconded by Ms. Adams and approved unanimously.

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**CERTIFIED RECORD**

<b>ADDRESS</b>	200 Marine Street	<b>APPLICATION NO.</b>	2023-25-CA
<b>SUMMARY OF REQUEST</b>	Construct additions to house, extend deck, construct carport, and make site improvements		
<b>APPLICANT</b>	Douglas Kearley	<b>OWNER, IF OTHER</b>	Mr. and Mrs. Bruce Pfeiffer
<b>HISTORIC DISTRICT</b>	Oakleigh Garden District	<b>MEETING DATE</b>	05/03/2023
<b>CLASSIFICATION</b>	Contributing	<b>REVIEWER</b>	Annie Allen

**DISTRICT/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 lot at 200 Marine Street sits on the corner of Marine and Palmetto Streets. The 1904 Sanborn Map depicts a one-story frame rectangular dwelling with a projection off the northeast corner and a front porch spanning the façade oriented to Marine Street. By the time of the 1925 survey, a more rectangular frame residence is represented, still with a full width front porch, but no side projection. An inset rear porch along the north façade is present. It is difficult to determine whether this representation is the same building which has been altered or a new structure. MHDC records are conflicting, some citing the extant structure’s construction date between 1915 and 1925 and another citing a construction date of 1945. At some point, a cross wing was constructed consisting of two porches, eliminating the porch facing Marine Street and reorienting the house towards Palmetto Street. However, this design could be a third structure that was constructed c. 1945. Further research is needed to clarify the evolution of this property.

According to the MHDC vertical files, this property has appeared before the Architectural Review Board (ARB) twice. In August 2003, an application requesting the enclosure of an existing porch and window alterations on the north elevation was approved. An application for the removal of asbestos shingle siding and replacement with cement fiber board siding, along with fenestration alterations was approved in November 2003.

**SCOPE OF WORK (per submitted application)**

1. Construct kitchen addition on west elevation.
  - a. The addition would measure 10’-4” wide by 15’-0” deep.
  - b. The southern wall of the addition would be an extension of the existing structure’s southern wall. The northern wall of the addition would project from the existing structure’s west end wall, beginning approximately 6’-0” south of the end wall’s northwest corner.

- c. This proposed addition would be topped with a gable roof which would be clad with fiberglass asphalt shingles to match the existing structure.
  - d. The addition would be clad in cement fiber board siding to match the existing structure. Corner boards would also match existing.
  - e. All fenestration (one entry door to replace existing on south elevation of addition) would be aluminum clad wood.
  - f. The proposed addition would sit on a 2'-0" raised foundation of masonry piers. Wood lattice panels are proposed for infill material between the piers.
  - g. Elevations would appear as follows:  
North elevation (from east to west)  
 No fenestration is proposed for this elevation.  
South elevation (from west to east)  
 One (1) multi-pane glass entry door measuring 2'-10" wide by 6'x8" tall would be centered on the elevation and topped by the proposed gabled roof walkway cover.  
West elevation (from north to south)  
 No fenestration is proposed for this elevation.
2. Install a new window on the north elevation.
    - a. A new three-over-one aluminum clad window would be centered on the fourth bay of the north elevation (from west to east).
    - b. The existing diamond shaped fixed window would be removed.
    - c. Cement fiber board siding which matches the existing siding would be 'feathered' in around the new window and in the place of the removed window.
  3. Construct bedroom addition which would project from the existing south elevation.
    - a. This addition would measure 15'-0" wide by 32'-6" deep.
    - b. The east wall of this addition would be stepped back approximately 12'-0" from the western end of the existing southern wall.
    - c. This proposed addition would be topped with a gable roof clad with fiberglass asphalt shingles to match the existing structure.
    - d. The addition would be clad in cement fiber board siding to match the existing structure. Corner boards would also match existing.
    - e. All fenestration for this addition would be aluminum clad wood. Windows would have a lite configuration of three-over-one.
    - f. The proposed addition would sit on a 2'-0" raised foundation of masonry piers. Framed wood lattice panels are proposed for infill material between the piers.
    - g. Elevations would appear as follows:  
West elevation (from north to south)  
 One (1) 2'-8" wide by 5'-8" high three-over-one window would be located just south of where the proposed deck abuts the elevation.  
East elevation (from south to north)  
 One (1) 2'-0" wide by 3'-0" high three-over-one window; one (1) 2'-8" wide by 5'-8" high three-over-one window; one (1) 2'-8" wide by 5'-8" high three-over-one window, equally distributed across the elevation.  
South elevation (from west to east)  
 One (1) 5'-0" wide by 2'-0" high three-lite casement window would be centered high on the elevation.
  4. Extend existing deck on south elevation.
    - a. The existing deck would be extended on the east and west sides by approximately 6'-0" and 1'-6", respectively.
    - b. The proposed materials used for the extension would match the existing wood.
    - c. Five (5) wood steps measuring approximately 5'-0" wide would be constructed on the far west end of the deck's south side.

- d. Handrails matching existing handrails would flank the proposed steps, and a railing matching the existing railing would run along the perimeter of the deck.
5. Construct a covered walkway which would connect the house to the proposed carport.
  - a. The proposed covered walkway would measure 5'-6" wide by approximately 23'-0" long.
  - b. The covered walkway would project from the proposed entry door on the south elevation and would abut the north side of the carport.
  - c. The walkway would be covered by a gable roof clad in fiberglass asphalt shingles to match those of the existing structure.
  - d. The covered walkway would be supported by three (3) pairs of 10" wood square columns, evenly distributed across the length of the walkway and measuring 8'-0" tall. .
6. Construct a carport/storage structure.
  - a. The proposed carport would measure 25'-8" deep by 20'-0" wide. The structure would consist of an open carport area which would measure 20'-6" deep, and an enclosed storage area on the west end of the structure which would measure 5'-8" deep.
  - b. The carport/storage structure would be located behind the residence on the southwest corner of the lot. It would be situated to allow for a 6'0" set back from both the south and west property lines.
  - c. The proposed structure's foundation would be slab on grade with a sloped concrete apron on the east entry to the open carport portion.
  - d. The proposed structure would be topped by a gable roof clad in fiberglass asphalt shingles to match those of the existing house and would be supported by four (4) 10" wood square columns on the open carport portion.
  - e. The enclosed storage portion would be clad in cement fiber board siding and would consist of one (1) galvanized steel door measuring 3'-0" wide by 6'-8" tall, which would be centered on the east elevation.
7. Construct a new driveway.
  - a. A new 10'-wide driveway would extend westward from an existing curb cut on Marine Street.
  - b. The existing curb cut and driveway on Palmetto Street would be removed.
  - c. Material of driveway to be determined later and approved by Staff.

## **STAFF REPORT**

### **A. Applicable standards from the *Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts* (Guidelines):**

1. **6.9** Place an addition so that it is subordinate to the historic residential structure.
  - Place and design an addition to the rear or side of the historic building wherever possible.
  - Place a vertical addition in the rear so it is not visible from the street.
2. **6.10** Design an addition to be compatible in massing and scale with the original historic structure.
  - Design the massing of an addition to appear subordinate to the historic building.
  - Where feasible, use a lower-scale connecting element to join an addition to a historic structure.
  - Where possible, match the foundation and floor heights of an addition to those of the historic building.
3. **6.11** Design the exterior walls of an addition to be compatible in scale and rhythm with the original historic structure.
  - Design the height of an addition to be proportionate with the historic building, paying particular attention to the foundation and other horizontal elements.
  - Design the addition to express floor heights on the exterior of the addition in a fashion that reflects floor heights of the original historic building.
4. **6.12** Clearly differentiate the exterior walls of an addition from the original historic structure.

- Use a physical break or setback from the original exterior wall to visually separate the old from new.
  - Use an alteration in the roofline to create a visual break between the original and new, but ensure that the pitches generally match.
5. **6.13** Use exterior materials and finishes that are comparable to those of the original historic residential structure in profile, dimension and composition. Modern building materials will be evaluated for appropriateness or compatibility with the original historic structure on an individual basis, with the objective of ensuring the materials are similar in their profile, dimension, and composition to those of the original historic structure.
    - Utilize an alternative material for siding as necessary, such as cement-based fiber board, provided that it matches the siding of the historic building in profile, character and finish.
    - Use a material with proven durability.
    - Use a material with a similar appearance in profile, texture and composition to those on the original building.
    - Choose a color and finish that matches or blends with those of the historic building.
    - Do not use a material with a composition that will impair the structural integrity and visual character of the building.
    - Do not use a faux stucco application.
  6. **6.14** Design a roof of an addition to be compatible with the existing historic building.
    - Design a roof shape, pitch, material and level of complexity to be similar to those of the existing historic building.
    - Incorporate overhanging exposed rafters, soffits, cornices, fascias, frieze boards, moldings or other elements into an addition that are generally similar to those of the historic building.
    - Use a roofing material for an addition that matches or is compatible with the original historic building and the district.
  7. **6.15** Design roofs such that the addition remains subordinate to the existing historic buildings in the district.
    - Where possible, locate a dormer or skylight on a new addition in an inconspicuous location.
    - In most cases, match a roof and window on a dormer to those of the original building.
  8. **6.16** Design doors and doorways to an addition to be compatible with the existing historic building.
    - If a historic door is removed to accommodate the addition, consider reusing it on the addition.
    - Design a door and doorway to be compatible with the historic building.
    - Use a door material that is compatible with those of the historic building and the district.
    - Use a material with a dimensionality (thickness) and appearance similar to doors on the original historic building.
    - Design the scale of a doorway on an addition to be in keeping with the overall mass, scale and design of the addition as a whole.
  9. **6.19** 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.
  10. **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.
11. **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.
12. **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.
13. **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)
14. **10.7** Minimize the visual impact of parking.
- Locate a parking area at the rear or to the side of a site whenever possible.
  - Use landscaping to screen a parking area.
  - Minimize the widths of a paved area or a curb cut.
  - If a curb cut is no longer in use, repair the curb. In some areas, granite curbs may be required.
  - Do not use paving in the front yard for a parking area. Paving stones might be acceptable in certain instances.
  - Do not create a new driveway or garage that opens onto a primary street.
- ACCEPTABLE WALK AND PAVING MATERIALS** Materials that have a similar character, durability and level of detail to walks and paved areas associated with historic properties in the district are acceptable. These often include:
- Gravel or crushed stone
  - Shell
  - Brick
  - Cobblestone

- Grasspave or grasscrete (mix of grass and hard surface paving material that provides a solid surface)

## **B. Staff Analysis**

The application under review includes proposed additions off of the west and south elevations, the extension of an existing rear deck, the construction of a covered walkway, and the construction of a carport/storage structure on the southwest corner of the property. Additional proposed alterations include the removal of a small, fixed window on the north elevation and the installation of a new window, and the relocation of the driveway to the south end of the property.

The *Guidelines* offer instruction on designing compatible additions to existing historic structures, stating that additions should be secondary to the historic residence in location and should be designed to be compatible in massing and scale to the original structure. The two additions proposed at 200 Marine Street would project from the rear and from the side of the building, both subordinate locations. The combined square footage of the additions would double that of the original structure. However, this square footage is divided between two varyingly sized additions which are located on different elevations. Furthermore, the addition to the rear (south) would have very little visual impact on the building's massing. Therefore, the distribution of the massing in the proposed design maintains the appearance of inferiority to the original structure. (A.1 ,2)

According to the *Guidelines*, the exterior walls of the additions should be compatible in rhythm and materials with the existing structure, but they also should be clearly distinguishable. The exterior walls of the subject additions, which would be clad in fiber cement siding to match the existing structure and would also continue the established rhythm (wall to windows/doors) of the other elevations of the house. As instructed by the *Guidelines*, the proposed additions would also be distinguished from the original structure in multiple areas. First, the addition on the west elevation would be narrower than the existing residence's west end wall. The roof height of this addition would also be subordinate to the existing roof height. Likewise, the gable roof of the rear addition is lower in height than that of the original building. This addition's perpendicular projection from the south elevation further differentiates the new construction from the original. (A.3, 4, 5)

The *Guidelines* encourage the use of roofs on additions that are compatible with existing roofs in shape, pitch, level of complexity, covering, and details. The proposed additions would each have a gable roof, matching that of the existing dwelling. (A.6) The *Guidelines* further instruct that the roofs of additions should remain subordinate to the existing historic buildings in the district. The apex of each addition's roof is 16' high, demonstrating its subordinate height to the existing roof and therefore to those in the immediate vicinity. (A.7)

Regarding foundations under additions, the *Guidelines* state that they should be compatible with those of the existing structure by matching its material and height. The proposed continuation of the masonry pier foundation with wood lattice infill would match the existing house's foundation both in material and height. (A.9)

Further, the *Guidelines* state that the windows and doors of additions should be in character with the original historic building in regard to size, spacing, material and design. The proposed three-over-one wood windows on the additions and the three-over-one new window proposed for the north elevation match many of the existing windows in size and lite configuration and are compatible in place and space with the original structure. (A.11) Likewise, the proposed door for the west addition conforms to the character of the original structure and is constructed of a material found acceptable by the *Guidelines*. (A.8) The details of the windows, along with the matching cornice, frieze and roof design for each addition contribute to the compatibility of the additions with the historic building, as directed by the

*Guidelines.* (A.10)

The placement of the proposed carport/storage building at the rear of the lot complies with the directive in the *Guidelines* to place accessory buildings at the rear of the lot. (A.12) The lower stature of the carport (15' at the apex of the roof) versus the primary structure and its smaller footprint (approximately 514 square feet versus approximately 1277 square feet) make the accessory structure clearly subordinate to the residence. All proposed materials for the carport/storage structure are compliant with the *Guidelines*. (A.13) The proposed installation of a driveway on the south end of the property would serve to minimize the visual impact of parking and would be constructed of an approved material for Mobile's historic districts. (A. 14)

### **C. Summary of Analysis**

- The application involves the construction of two additions, a covered walkway, a new carport, and other minor alterations.
- Both additions are found to be in compliance with the Guidelines in regard to placement, size, scale, materials, and design.
- The proposed carport structure also conforms with the applicable Guidelines.
- The proposed alterations do not impair the character of the existing structure or district.
- The proposed driveway respects the parameters set out in the Guidelines in regard to site considerations.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on Section B above, Staff believes the proposed additions, alterations, and new carport at 200 Marine Street would not impair the architectural and historic character of the original structure or of the surrounding district and recommends approval of the application.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Mr. Douglas Kearley was present to discuss the application. He stated that he had nothing to add.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board had no comments.

### **FINDING FACTS**

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

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

### **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Mr. Roberts moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, the construction of additions and a carport structure, the extension of the deck, and other site improvements would not impair the architectural and historic character of the property or the district, and a Certificate of Appropriateness should be granted.

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

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**CERTIFIED RECORD**

<b>ADDRESS</b>	265 N. Joachim Street	<b>APPLICATION NO.</b>	2023-26-CA
<b>SUMMARY OF REQUEST</b>	New construction: five (5) one-story, single-family residences		
<b>APPLICANT</b>	Cory Bronenkamp/ 195, LLC	<b>OWNER, IF OTHER</b>	
<b>HISTORIC DISTRICT</b>	DeTonti Square	<b>MEETING DATE</b>	5/3/2023
<b>CLASSIFICATION</b>	Vacant	<b>REVIEWER</b>	C. Dawson

**DISTRICT/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.

The 1878 Hopkins ward map of Mobile reveals the subject property was occupied that year by a sidehall with rear service wing residence owned by S.A. Mountain. Seven years later, the 1885 Sanborn map depicts a two-story brick house with an identical footprint on the property. A frame porch occupied the southwest corner of the house (at the rear of the main block and south of the service wing), and a one-story frame outbuilding labeled “Old” was located at the rear (west end) of the lot. The property’s street number at that time was 3411. The property was unchanged in the 1891 and 1924 Sanborn maps, and the property was known as 265 Joachim by 1891. By the time the 1924 Sanborn map was prepared, the rear outbuilding had disappeared, but the dwelling remained unchanged. Aerial photographs demonstrate that the house persisted through at least 1967. However, its absence from a 1979 survey file photograph and no mention of the property (as contributing, conditionally contributing, or non-contributing) in the 1974 DeTonti Square National Register nomination, suggest that the dwelling was demolished at some point between 1967 and 1974.

The property at 265 N. Joachim Street has not appeared previously before the Architectural Review Board (ARB).

**SCOPE OF WORK (per submitted application, plans, and correspondence)**

1. Construct five (5) one-story single-family residences facing Congress Street, each comprising 550 square feet. All five houses would be set back approximately seven (7) feet from the Congress Street right-of-way (ROW) and six (6) feet from their east and west property lines. The outer side yards (to the east and west of the easternmost and westernmost houses, respectively) would be 10’. The rear setback (south side) would be approximately two (2) feet.
2. All five houses would be rectangular in shape, with short sides to the north and south, and would have either hipped or front-gabled roofs clad in five v-crimp metal roofing.
3. Each house would measure 16’-0” wide by 28’-0” deep with a 5’-4” deep front porch. The ceiling height would be 10’, and porches would be accessed via two wooden steps measuring 5’-3 ½” wide and located directly in front of front doors.

4. All five houses would be clad in Hardieplank 4” lap siding with a smooth finish. Models A201, A202, A204, and A206 would be clad in horizontal siding, and model A203 would be clad in vertical board-and-batten style siding.
5. All windows would be aluminum-clad two-over-two. Front doors would be either wood or painted metal.
6. All houses would rest on brick-clad pier foundations.
7. Porch posts, stair railings, window and door trim, and cornices, would be composed of wood. Cornerboards and base trim would be of smooth finish Hardieboard.
8. The east, west, and south elevations of each house would appear as follows. (Because the houses would be less than 24” from grade, porch railings are not required under the building code. The submitted elevations depict railings and balusters if the ARB requires them, but the applicant prefers to omit them.)
  - a. East, from south to north: two (2) evenly spaced windows; front porch support post; front steps
  - b. West, from north to south: front porch steps; front porch support post; two (2) evenly spaced windows
  - c. South: mini-split wall-mounted conditioner toward west end
9. The north elevations of the houses would vary as follows. (As noted above, because the houses would be less than 24” from grade, porch railings are not required under the building code. The submitted elevations depict railings and balusters if the ARB requires them, but the applicant prefers to omit them.)
  - a. Model A201 would have a front-gabled roof with a rectangular vent at the center of the gable end. The facade, from east to west: 6” square porch support column with cap and base; pane-and-panel door; two (2) two-over-two windows; 6” square porch support column
  - b. Model A202 would have a front-gabled roof with a rectangular vent at the center of the gable end. The facade, from east to west: 6” square porch support column with cap and base; pane-and-panel door; one (1) two-over-two window; 6” square porch support column
  - c. Model A203 would have a front-gabled roof with a rectangular vent at the center of the gable end. The façade, from east to west: 6” square porch support column with base and cap; pane-and-panel door; 6” square porch support column with base and cap; one (1) two-over-two window; 6” square porch support column with base and cap; one (1) two-over-two window; 6” square support column with base and cap
  - d. Model A204 would have a front-gabled roof with a shed-type eave over the northernmost portion of the porch. The facade, from east to west: 6” square porch support column with cap and base; pane-and-panel door; 6” square porch support column with cap and base; one (1) two-over-two window; 6” square porch support column
  - e. Model A206 would have a hipped roof at the north elevation and a gabled roof at the south elevation. A cross-gable would project over the eastern third of the north elevation, sheltering that portion of the porch. The facade, from east to west: 6” square porch support column with cap and base; pane-and-panel door; one (1) two-over-two window; 6” square porch support column; one (1) two-over-two window; 6” square porch support column

## STAFF REPORT

### A. Applicable standards from the *Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts (Guidelines)*:

1. Maintain the visual line created by the fronts of buildings along a street.

- Where front yard setbacks are uniform, place a new structure in general alignment with its neighbors.
  - Where front yard setbacks vary, place a new structure within the established range of front yard setbacks on a block. (6.34)
2. Maintain the side yard spacing pattern.
    - Locate a structure to preserve the side yard spacing pattern on the block as seen from the street.
    - Provide sufficient side setbacks for property maintenance.
    - Provide sufficient side setbacks to allow needed parking to occur behind the front wall of the house. (6.35)
  3. Design the massing of new construction to appear similar to that of historic buildings in the district.
    - Choose the massing and shape of new construction to maintain a rhythm of massing along the street.
    - Match the proportions of the front elevations of a new structure with those in the surrounding district. (6.36)
  4. Design the scale of new construction to appear similar to that of historic buildings in the district.
    - Use a building height in front that is compatible with adjacent contributing properties.
    - Size foundation and floor heights to appear similar to those of nearby historic buildings. (6.37)
  5. Design exterior building walls to reflect traditional building patterns of nearby historic structures.
    - Use a ratio of solid to void that is similar in proportion to those of nearby historic buildings.
    - Reflect the rhythm of windows and doors in a similar fashion on all exterior building walls.
    - Use steps and balusters in a similar fashion as nearby historic structures.
    - Design building elements on exterior building walls to be compatible with those on nearby historic buildings. (6.38)
  6. Use exterior building materials and finishes that complement the character of the surrounding district.
    - Use material, ornamentation, or a color scheme that blends with the historic district rather than making the building stand out.
    - Use a material with proven durability in the Mobile climate that is similar in scale, character, and finish to those used on nearby historic buildings.
    - Materials that are compatible in character, scale, and finish to those used on nearby historic buildings are acceptable. These often include
      - Stucco
      - Brick
      - Stone
      - Wood
      - Concrete siding
      - Cement fiber board siding
      - Skim stucco coat
    - Materials that are incompatible in character, scale, and finish to those used on nearby historic buildings are unacceptable. These often include
      - metal siding
      - vinyl siding

- unfinished concrete block
  - plywood
  - Masonite
  - Vinyl coatings
  - Ceramic coatings
  - Exterior insulation and finishing system (EIFS) wall systems (6.39)
7. Design a roof on new construction to be compatible with those on adjacent historic buildings.
    - Design the roof shape, height, pitch, and overall complexity to be similar to those on nearby historic buildings.
    - Use materials that appear similar in character, scale, texture, and color range to those on nearby historic buildings. (6.40)
  8. Design a door and doorway on new construction to be compatible with the historic district.
    - Place and size a door to establish a solid-to-void ration similar to that of nearby historic buildings.
    - Place a door in a fashion that contributes to the traditional rhythm of the district as seen in nearby historic buildings.
    - Incorporate a door casement and trim similar to those seen on nearby historic buildings.
    - Place and size a special feature, including a transom, sidelight, or decorative framing element, to complement those seen in nearby historic buildings.
      - Use a door material that blends well with surrounding historic buildings. Wood is preferred. Paneled doors with or without glass are generally appropriate. (6.41)
  9. Design a porch to be compatible with the neighborhood.
    - Include a front porch as part of new construction if it is contextual and feasible.
    - When designing a porch, consider porch location, proportion, rhythm, roof form, supports, steps, balustrades, and ornamentation relative to the main building and porches in the district. (6.42)
  10. Design piers, a foundation, and foundation infill to be compatible with those of nearby historic properties.
    - Use raised pier foundations. (6.43)
  11. Use details and ornamentation that help new construction integrate with the historic buildings in the district.
    - Use decorative detail in a manner similar to those on nearby historic buildings. A modern interpretation of a historic detail or decoration is encouraged.
    - Do not use a decorative detail that overpowers or negatively impacts nearby historic buildings. (6.44)
  12. Locate and design windows to be compatible with those in the district.
    - Locate and size a window to create a solid-to-void ratio similar to the ratios seen on nearby historic buildings.
    - Locate a window to create a traditional rhythm and a proportion of openings similar to that seen in nearby historic buildings.
    - Use a traditional window casement and trim similar to those seen in nearby historic buildings.
    - Place a window to match the height of the front doorway.
    - Place a window so that there is proportionate space between the window and the floor level.
    - Do not place a window to directly abut the fascia of a building.
    - Use a window material that is compatible with other building materials.

- Materials that are similar in character, profile, finish, and durability to those used on nearby historic buildings are acceptable. These often include
  - Wood
  - Vinyl-clad-wood
  - Aluminum-clad customized wood
  - Extruded aluminum
- Materials that are not acceptable in character, profile, finish, and durability to those used on nearby historic buildings are unacceptable. These often include
  - Mill finish metal windows
  - Snap-in or artificial muntins
  - vinyl (6.45)

13. Visually connect the street and building.

- Maintain or install a walkway leading directly from the sidewalk to the main building entry. (10.4)

## **B. Staff Analysis**

This application concerns the new construction of five (5) single-family residences at the southwest corner of Congress Street and N. Joachim Street. Several items are taken into account for new construction residences. They should be compatible with adjacent historic buildings in scale, massing, materials, and overall design. Elements of compatibility include siting, orientation, spacing, landscaping, and distance among adjacent buildings. A successful compatible design will also consider the distinctive architectural character of the street, the neighborhood, and the district.

With regard to placement, two components are considered – setback from the street and distance between buildings. The “Design Review Guidelines for New Residential Construction in Mobile’s Historic Districts” state that new buildings should be responsive to and maintain the alignment of traditional façade lines (A.1), as well as the rhythm of side and rear setbacks. (A.2) The property under review, a corner lot, is in the vicinity of a handful of contributing buildings. In accordance with *Design Guidelines*, the setbacks reflect the historical character of the contributing aspects of the built landscape. The proposed placement of front planes approximately 7’ from the Congress Street ROW and the eastern elevation of the easternmost house at 10’ from the North Joachim Street ROW negotiates the placement of the contributing buildings located within 150’ of the site, which are located between approximately 8’ (Harris House, 260 N. Joachim Street) and approximately 16’ (Greig House, 263 N. Joachim Street) from the ROWs. The Quigley Houses at 258 and 260 Congress Street make up the middleground with approximate 10’ setbacks from the ROW.

The *Design Review Guidelines* state that mass - the relationship of the parts of the larger whole comprising a building - for new construction should be in keeping with arrangement and proportion of surrounding historic residences. (A.3) The proposed residences adopt the massing of shotguns in a neighborhood that includes one- and two-story single-family residences and apartment buildings and single-story commercial buildings. Gabled and hip-gabled combination roofs would top the buildings. The outward massing of the buildings, rectangular blocks, is similar to massing found in the neighborhood. (A.7) The height of the foundations is similar to the foundation heights of nearby historic structures. (A.4) The massing of the structures, the ceilings being approximately 10’ in height, is compatible with the architectural context of the contributing landscape in which they would be situated. (A.4)

Scale refers to a building’s size in relationship to other buildings. The “Design Review Guidelines for New Residential Construction” state that new construction should be in scale with nearby historic buildings. (A.4) Although shotgun type houses are not common in DeTonti Square, a couple of examples



of more embellished shotguns exist (317 N. Joachim Street and 203 Adams Street). Furthermore, Sanborn maps reveal frame dwellings of modest footprint within the DeTonti Square area in 1885, 1891, and 1904. The adjacent lot to the west is vacant, as is the one to the west of that at the corner of North Jackson and Congress streets. The residences across the street to the north are non-contributing, as is the residence catty-corner to the northeast at 300 N. Joachim Street; there is a parking lot immediately across Joachim Street to the east. The house adjacent to the south, 263 N. Joachim Street, is two stories in height, but non-historic buildings to the south of that property are one story in height.

With regard to building components, the *Guidelines* call for responsiveness to traditional design patterns. (A.5, 6) The shotgun house is familiar to residents of Mobile, and the simple pane-and-panel doors employed for the front entrances reflect doors seen on historic residences in the district. The use of two-over-two sashes would be typical for the shotgun type. (A.8, A.12) The wall treatments are visually compatible with the surrounding architectural and historical context. (A.6) The proposed window spacing on the facades (fronts) mimic traditional solid-to-void ratios, as are the fenestration patterns on the sides of all five models. (A.12)

The proposed porch designs are appropriate to both the shotgun building type and are compatible with the neighborhood. The porches' locations, proportions, rhythm, roof forms, supports, and steps relate well to other residences in the district.

The building materials blend with those employed in the past and in immediate surroundings. (A.6, A.8, A.12) Cement fiber siding (Hardieplank) is an acceptable building material within Mobile's historic districts, as are aluminum-clad windows, wood trim and porch elements, and five v-crimp roofing. The *Guidelines* recommend using a door material that "blends well with surrounding historic buildings." While wood is preferred, there are no historic buildings within a block to the east or west of the proposed front elevations of the dwellings, and painted metal doors would not be obviously different. Therefore, either wood or metal doors would blend with the surrounding buildings.

The *Guidelines* instruct that new buildings should be visually connected to the street via a walkway leading directly from the sidewalk to the main building entry. (A.13) The application proposes concrete walkways between the sidewalk of Congress Street and the houses fronting them.

### **C. Summary of Analysis**

- This application proposes the new construction of five (5) single-family residences at the southwest corner of Congress Street and N. Joachim Street, a lot previously occupied by a two-story sidehall house with rear service wing but vacant since at least 1979.
- The proposed houses would be compatible in setback, scale, massing, design, and materials to historic and non-historic residences in the district and in other districts in Mobile.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on Section B above, Staff believes that the proposed construction of five (5) single-family residences on the subject property would not impair the architectural and historic character of the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of the application.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Mr. Cory Bronenkamp was present to discuss the application. He stated that the intention for the development was to mimic the seven houses constructed off of Jackson Street but to cater to those looking for a smaller, more efficient footprint but also want to live in DeTonti Square. He added that since the application was submitted, a more accurate survey was completed. He also commented that an arborist from the city defined a critical root zone of 15' around the five live oak trees in the right of way which will preserve the trees.

Mr. Tommy Lee, a realtor and buyer of one of the units at the development on Jackson Street was present to comment on the application. He stated that he doesn't think the houses are compatible with the district and can't imagine that they are something that is in demand in DeTonti Square. He stated that he is not opposed to new construction in the district and understands that there is an affordable housing crisis, but that this particular development does not match the district, and he would be amenable to a design that is more compatible in scale with the surrounding structures.

Ms. Johnna Rogers, a resident of DeTonti Square and member of the DeTonti Square Neighborhood Association, stated that the proposed structures were not shotgun style houses as the application claims [Note: neither the application nor the staff report make that claim], noting that the structures have no back doors as shotguns do. She added that there are no residences of this scale in DeTonti Square. She further discussed the code issues with the proposed kitchens, commenting that she doesn't think anyone would want to live there. She stated that the proposed structures are more like rentals and that the property values of nearby residences need to be considered. She also noted the parking issues associated with this project, stating that the project at State Street and Jackson Street provides parking for each resident. She added that the proportions of the proposed structures are not consistent with shotgun form houses.

Lee Weissinger, a resident of DeTonti Square, stated that the proposed design is for short-term rentals, not single-family homes, or long-term rentals. She added that the Guidelines' description of DeTonti Square describes primarily 2-story residential structures with medium to large footprints, and the subject structures are not consistent with this description. She urged the Board to deny the application as its incompatibility would devalue the district.

Mr. Douglas Hunter, a resident of DeTonti Square, stated that he is opposed to the subject project. He added that he has spent years renovating his home in DeTonti Square and that the vacant parking lot mentioned in the application [Note: The vacant lot is not mentioned in the application. It is mentioned in the staff analysis to illustrate there being no structures on the block front to which the proposed buildings could be compared.] is his property and not available for use by the residents of the proposed development. He also urged consideration of the crowns of the mentioned live oak trees, not just their roots.

Mr. Bronenkamp addressed these comments. He clarified that the only proposed parking would be on-street parking in front of the premises. He stated that he welcomed the comments from the DeTonti Square residents and would like to solicit constructive feedback to revise the project, if possible, to make the plans more palatable and bring a more amenable application back to the Board.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Mr. Roberts asked Staff if the massing as discussed in the Staff report included the development as a whole or each individual building, because each individual building at less than 500 square feet each is not compatible in massing to most structures in DeTonti Square. Ms. Dawson replied that Staff was considering the combined square footage of the whole development.

Mr. Allen asked about parking considerations. Mr. Bronenkamp stated that the current zoning of the lot did not require parking, that parking would be on-street.

Ms. Maurin asked if the intention was to sell or lease the units. Mr. Bronenkamp stated that the plan is to sell the units, which would be equipped on the interior with high-end finishes.

Mr. Allen asked if the project required Planning Commission approval. Mr. Bronenkamp replied no, that the subdivision that is taking place goes through the Planning & Zoning Department but not to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Allen asked if there is another regulatory body that this project is going through. Mr. Bronenkamp responded that yes, the Planning Department is reviewing the subdivision of the property to allow for five residences. As it sits, the current T-4 zoning allows for three residences on one lot.

Mr. Allen asked if, when subdivided, the lots will be around 1200 square feet. Mr. Bronenkamp responded that yes, they would be approximately 1200 square feet.

Mr. Allen asked if there is a minimum lot size. Mr. Bronenkamp responded that there is, but he is unsure of what the measurement is off the top of his head. He added that he did have a pre-development meeting with Planning department and that the proposed lot sized met threshold for the minimum.

Mr. Allen asked if there are setback requirements, commenting that the rear elevations of the subject structures seem to be against the rear property line. Mr. Bronenkamp replied that in the T-4 zone, there are no setback requirements, but that Staff could confirm regarding the historic overlay which he believes takes precedence. Ms. Dawson commented that the Downtown Development District setback regulations apply to all four sides of a structure.

Mr. Allen stated that the Board shouldn't approve projects which are concurrently being reviewed by other regulatory bodies that could deny the project because it doesn't make sense to approve applications that cannot be constructed.

Mr. Bronenkamp clarified that, per changes the Urban Development Code, the subdivision issue is being reviewed at a Staff level, and the project is not going before the Planning Commission.

Mr. Blackwell commented that he appreciates Mr. Bronenkamp's openness to neighborhood feedback. He added that reducing the number of structures and increasing the square footage would make the project more like something that the neighborhood would like to see in the district.

Ms. Maurin suggested that the project be amended to include on-site parking.

Mr. Bronenkamp thanked the Board and asked if there was a way to put off the application to provide time to confer with residents of DeTonti Square for input.

Mr. Wagoner informed Mr. Bronenkamp of his option to withdraw the application.

Mr. Bronenkamp then withdrew the application.

*Mr. Blackwell departed the meeting at 4:15 p.m.*

*Mr. Wagoner and Mr. Roberts departed the meeting at 4:21 p.m.*

#### **D. OTHER BUSINESS**

Attorney Mr. Bruce McGowin addressed the Board concerning the City's revisions to the preservation ordinance.

*Ms. Adams departed the meeting at 4:30 p.m.*

*Mr. Rathle departed the meeting at 4:40 p.m.*

Mr. Allen stated a concern with the seven historic districts' recommendations to the mayor for nominations to the Architectural Review Board. He stated his concern that bodies such as the Historic

Mobile Preservation Society won't have the same "strength" that they have had in the past regarding preservation efforts through the ARB. He cited two examples which heavily impacted preservation for the better in Mobile through collaborative initiatives from agencies including the Historic Mobile Preservation Society and the Mobile Historic Development Commission, etc., one concerning a proposed raised interstate over Water Street and one concerning the demolition of the Battle House.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:41.