

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
September 21, 2022 – 3:00 P.M.
Multi-Purpose Room, Government Plaza
205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Catarina Echols, called the meeting to order at 3:00pm. Christine Dawson, Historic Development staff, called the roll as follows.

Members Present: Janelle Adams (alternate), Bob Allen, Cart Blackwell (alternate), Abby Davis, Catarina Echols, Karrie Maurin, Andre Rathle, Craig Roberts, Gypsie Van Antwerp

Members Absent: Kimberly Harden, Joseph Rodrigues, Jim Wagoner and Kathleen Huffman (alternate)

Staff Members Present: Annie Allen, Chris Kern, Bridget Daniel, Christine Dawson, and John Sledge

2. Mr. Blackwell moved to approve the minutes from the September 7, 2022 meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Roberts and approved unanimously.
3. Ms. Van Antwerp moved to approve the Mid-Month COAs Granted by Staff. The motion was seconded by Mr. Roberts and approved unanimously.

MID-MONTH APPROVALS - APPROVED

1. **Applicant: Presley/Victory Roofing**
 - a. Property Address: 1051 Church Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 8/31/2022
 - c. Project: Reroof in-kind with Tamko Heritage architectural shingles in Rustic Black.
2. **Applicant: Grant Saltz**
 - a. Property Address: 551 Eslava Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/01/2022
 - c. Project: Install 10'x16' inground pool in rear yard.
3. **Applicant: FASTSIGNS of Mobile**
 - a. Property Address: 205 Saint Emanuel Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/01/2022
 - c. Project: Install a freestanding post and panel sign measuring 84" wide by 24" high. Sign will measure 3'0" from ground to top of sign. Posts will be black powder coated metal. "Alexander Shunnarah".
4. **Applicant: Mobile Bay Roofing LLC**
 - a. Property Address: 256 West Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/01/2022
 - c. Project: Reroof in-kind with architectural shingles in Driftwood color.
5. **Applicant: DEB Properties, LLC**
 - a. Property Address: 56 South Conception Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/06/2022
 - c. Project: 1. Sealcoat back parking lot; restripe parking lines.
2. Replace 10'x20' section of balcony roofing on northern balcony. Replace

any rotten wood in-kind. Repaint in-kind.

6. Applicant: SIGNCORP, INC.

- a. Property Address: 3 Dauphin Street
- b. Date of Approval: 9/07/2022
- c. Project: Install 24"x152" aluminum sign with channel-lit letters horizontally at top of west end of building. "Morgan & Morgan".

7. Applicant: SIGNCORP, INC.

- a. Property Address: 2 South Water Street
- b. Date of Approval: 9/07/2022
- c. Project: Install 29.39"x293.94" aluminum sign with channel-lit letters, installed vertically on Water Street side of building. "Morgan & Morgan".

8. Applicant: DBK Incorporated

- a. Property Address: 202 Marine Street
- b. Date of Approval: 9/08/2022
- c. Project: Reissue of COA originally issued on 03/18/2021:
New construction: Construct a one and one-half-story single-family residence.

9. Applicant: EZ-Roof & EZ-Restoration LLC

- a. Property Address: 38 Blacklawn Street
- b. Date of Approval: 9/08/2022
- c. Project: Reroof in-kind with asphalt arch shingle roofing in black.

10. Applicant: Amberley Marie Dearmon

- a. Property Address: 1211 Church Street
- b. Date of Approval: 9/08/2022
- c. Project: Reroof in-kind with architectural shingles in Driftwood color.

11. Applicant: Cartledge Blackwell

- a. Property Address: 107 Bradford Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 9/09/2022
- c. Project: Repair and, when necessary, replace exterior woodwork in-kind.
Repaint to match existing.

12. Applicant: Nicholas Fowler

- a. Property Address: 119 Garnett Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 9/09/2022
- c. Project: Reroof in-kind with composition shingles in Charcoal color. Resurface front deck under porch with new concrete, painted to match existing.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2022-50-CA: 4 Straight Street

- a. Applicant: Carlos Merlo on behalf of Diane Nematz
- b. Project: After-the-Fact: Replace existing wood windows with vinyl windows
APPROVED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

2. 2022-58-CA: 254 Roper Street

- a. Applicant: Douglas Kearley on behalf of Rick Twilley
- b. Project: Restore building exterior; construct rear addition; install new leak-proof eyebrow dormers
APPROVED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

3. 2022-59-CA: 1157 Spring Hill Avenue

- b. Applicant: David Miller

- b. Project: Remove non-historic rear addition; secure building
APPROVED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. The next ARB meeting is scheduled for October 5, 2022.

Public comment regarding items on this agenda will be accepted via e-mail (christine.dawson@cityofmobile.org) or USPS (Mobile Historic Development Commission, P.O. Box 1827, Mobile, AL 36633) until 5PM on Tuesday, September 20, 2022. Please include your name, home address, and the item number about which you are writing.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

ADDRESS	4 Straight Street	APPLICATION NO.	2022-50-CA
SUMMARY OF REQUEST	After-the Fact Approval: Replace wood windows with vinyl windows		
APPLICANT	Carlos Merlo	OWNER, IF OTHER	New Horizon Investments/ Jennifer Quesada

HISTORIC DISTRICT	Oakleigh Garden (local only)	MEETING DATE	09/07/2022
CLASSIFICATION	Contributing	REVIEWER	C. Dawson

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 19th- and 20th-century architectural types and styles and significant in the area of landscape architecture for its canopies of live oaks planted from 1850 to 1910. The district is significant in the area of planning and development as the location of Washington Square, one of only two antebellum public parks remaining in Mobile. The district was expanded in 1984, and an updated nomination was approved in 2016. The area in which the subject property is located was locally designated as part of the Oakleigh Garden district in 2016; it is not part of the National Register district.

The lot at 4 Straight Street currently is occupied by a three-bay wide bungalow type dwelling. The 1925 Sanborn map shows the property occupied by a narrow, rectangular frame dwelling with full-width front and rear porches. A one-room wide wing was located towards the west end of the south elevation; it had its own full-width front porch. The 1955 update to the map showed the same arrangement. The aerial photograph from 1967, though grainy, appears to show the house expanded to the south, filling out the formerly open area between the one-room wing and the front plane of the house. The 1980 and 1997 aerial photographs are equally grainy, but by 2004, the aerial photo clearly depicts the addition to the south side of the house, and the roofline indicates a rear addition. The footprint of the house does not appear to change through the 2019 aerial photograph. The survey file photo and Google StreetView images of the house show the windows in 2007 were three-over-one wood sashes on the front (east) and south elevations, and one of those windows was onsite at the time of an August 2022 site visit. The window under the porch on the façade was a 20-light fixed wood window, which did not appear to be original to the house. The existing roofline of the house substantiates the original one-room wing is extant, but the area to its east was infilled with an addition. The roofline also indicates the enclosure of a rear porch.

According to the MHDC files, this property has not appeared previously before the Architectural Review Board (ARB).

SCOPE OF WORK (per submitted application and communications)

1. Remove original wooden windows, replace with vinyl one-over-one sash, infilling with wood as necessary to accommodate the smaller replacements.

STAFF REPORT

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

1. Preserve the functional historic and decorative features of a historic window.
 - Where historic [wooden or metal] windows are intact and in repairable condition, retain and repair them to match the existing as per location, 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. (5.20)
2. When historic windows are not in a repairable condition, match the replacement window design to the original.
 - In instances where there is a request to replace a building's windows, the new windows shall match the existing as per location, framing, and light configuration.
 - Use any salvageable window components on a primary elevation. (5.21)
3. 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 the structure
 - Custom extruded aluminum
 - Aluminum clad wood

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) (5.22)

B. Staff Analysis

The subject property, 4 Straight Street, is located within the locally designated portion of Oakleigh Garden Historic District; it is not part of the National Register district. The application under review involves after-the-fact approval of the removal of historic wooden windows and their replacement with vinyl sash and wooden infill. The applicant mentioned the work while applying for a Certificate of Appropriateness for other, administratively approvable work.

When undertaking rehabilitation work on historic properties, the *Guidelines* emphasize preserving original building materials through repair and replacing materials only when they are too damaged or deteriorated to be reasonably repairable (A.2); using original materials to replace damaged materials on primary elevations (A.2); matching replacement materials to the original materials in composition, scale, and finish (A.2, A.3); and replacing missing historic windows on key walls with historically accurate replacements (A.3).

The condition of the majority of windows prior to their replacement is unknown; therefore, whether they could be repaired and reused is unknown. Further, whether the three-over-one windows shown in the 2007 survey photo were original is unknown; windows of that style were popular for residences from about 1920 to 1950, but the date of this house's original construction is unknown. The building has been expanded on at least two occasions, and the original windows may have been reused in the additions. However, this theory is unsubstantiated by documentary or pictorial evidence.

The property in question is located on a very narrow street with low visibility in an area of modest residences. The “key wall” in this case is the façade, or east elevation, where one standard size window opening is located. The one known surviving three-over-one window could conceivably be re-placed in this key wall, the primary elevation.

In reference to the historic wood windows replacement, the *Guidelines* state that repairable windows should be retained and repaired (A.1). If the existing windows are irreparably damaged or decayed, the *Guidelines* require that the replacement window match the design of the original’s location, framing, and light configuration. (A.1) The *Guidelines* further direct that any salvageable window components should be used on a primary elevation. (A.2) Clearly none of these guidelines were followed here.

C. Summary of Analysis

- The application requests after-the-fact approval of replacement of historic wood three-over-one windows and one (1) 20-light fixed window with one-over-one vinyl windows.
- The installed windows do not conform to the *Guidelines*.
- One historic window has been preserved on-site.

STAFF SUGGESTION

The subject property is not located within the boundaries of the Oakleigh Garden National Register District, but rather within a locally designated appendix to the district. Further, the property is located on a narrow street with low visibility and has been altered over its history. Given these extenuating factors, Staff suggests the applicant be required to re-install the remaining historic window on the façade (east elevation) of the house and maintain the existing vinyl windows on the south, west, and north elevations.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on Section B above, Staff believes the proposed after-the-fact approval of the replacement vinyl windows on the south, west, and north elevations of the house would not impair the architectural and historic character of the subject property or the surrounding district, provided the surviving historic window is reinstalled on the east elevation. Staff recommends approval of the application with this condition.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Ms. Jennifer Quesada was present (via phone) to discuss the application.

She stated that the vinyl windows were extant when she purchased the house, and she was unaware of the historic requirements.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Blackwell stated that he supported the Staff’s suggestion and its keeping with other recent decisions to prioritize the façades of historic structures.

Mr. Allen questioned if the mix of the one surviving historic window with the extant vinyl windows on the façade wouldn’t create a worse appearance.

Ms. Davis proposed that the pair of non-historic vinyl windows on the façade be replaced with windows of a more historically sensitive profile and of an acceptable material, which would create a more cohesive and traditional appearance on the façade. She then asked if the historic three-over-one window on the site was original to the dwelling.

Ms. Dawson stated that the three-over-one window is consistent with the style of the house and it is likely that it was original, but that there is no way to know for certain.

Mr. Blackwell asked the applicant, Ms. Quesada, if she would be amenable to installing both the on-site historic three-over-one window and replacing the pair of vinyl windows under the front porch on the façade with a pair of three-over-one windows in a material which meets the *Guidelines*.

Ms. Quesada stated that she was amenable.

FINDING FACTS

Mr. Blackwell moved that, based on the evidence presented in the application, the Board finds the facts in the Staff's report as amended to replace the pair of windows on the façade with a pair of three-over-one windows in a material which meets the *Guidelines*. Mr. Roberts seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Blackwell moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, the proposed replacement of vinyl windows on the façade and retention of the existing vinyl windows on the other three elevations at 4 Straight Street would not impair the architectural or historic character of the structure or the surrounding district, and a Certificate of Appropriateness should be granted.

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

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

ADDRESS	254 Roper Street	APPLICATION NO.	2022-58-CA
SUMMARY OF REQUEST	Construct rear addition; replace existing eyebrow dormers.		
APPLICANT	Douglas B. Kearley	OWNER, IF OTHER	Rick Twilley
HISTORIC DISTRICT	Oakleigh Garden	MEETING DATE	09/21/2022
CLASSIFICATION	Contributing	REVIEWER	A. 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 19th- and 20th-century architectural types and styles and significant in the area of landscape architecture for its canopies of live oaks planted from 1850 to 1910. The district is significant in the area of planning and development as the location of Washington Square, one of only two antebellum public parks remaining in Mobile. The district was expanded in 1984, and an updated nomination was approved in 2016.

The 1925 Sanborn map depicts the form of the c. 1925 frame one-story Craftsman bungalow at 254 Roper as it appears today. The exterior of this house seems to have changed little since its construction. This modest dwelling is a noteworthy example of Craftsman styling within the Oakleigh Garden Historic District.

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

SCOPE OF WORK (per submitted application)

1. Construct an addition to the west (rear) elevation of the existing structure.
 - a. The addition would measure 30'2" wide x 8'4" deep, with a center portion pushing out to a depth of 11'2".
 - b. The addition would include (from north to south) an 11'8"-wide rear porch portion and an 18'6"-wide enclosed portion. The enclosed section of the new elevation would comprise a 6'10"-wide projecting wall just south of the porch, which would project 2'10" beyond the proposed wall plane.
 - 1) The porch portion: The porch would be supported by one (1) 10" square wood Doric column at its northwestern corner; five (5) pretreated wood steps would provide access to the porch; a pair of relocated wood 24-lite French entry doors would be centered on this portion of the addition.
 - 2) The enclosed portion: One (1) relocated wood twelve-over-twelve window would be centered on the projected wall. The base of the wall would flare to match existing exterior walls.
 - c. The hipped roof of the existing structure would be extended to accommodate the proposed addition. The proposed integrated roof would be clad in dimensional fiberglass/asphalt

- shingles. The existing eave of the roof would be extended to the addition; and the new eaves would contain the decorative exposed rafters, fascia etc. to match the existing.
- d. The proposed foundation for the addition would be roughcast stucco over concrete block curtain wall.
 - e. The proposed addition would be clad in wood lap siding to match the existing structure; the roof would be clad in shingles to match the existing roof, and proposed fenestration would be wood.
2. Restoration work proposed for the exterior of the existing dwelling:
 - a. East façade
 - 1) Install a new two-panel exterior wood door with divided lite upper panel to fit existing opening.
 - 2) Restore the existing wall sconce, mounted street numbers and mail slot.
 - 3) Install new copper eyebrow dormer in place of existing with rain-proof louver blades and insect screen at interior.
 - b. South elevation:
 - 1) Restore and replace missing section of wood porch rail to match existing.
 - 2) Install new copper eyebrow dormer in place of existing with rain-proof louver blades and insect screen at interior.
 - 3) Repair, replace where needed, prime and repaint existing siding and windows.
 - c. North elevation:
 - 1) Install new copper eyebrow dormer in place of existing with rain proof louvered blades and insect screen at interior.
 - 2) Repair, replace where needed, prime and repaint existing siding and windows.
 3. Site Improvements:

Install a gravel driveway and a concrete sidewalk connecting the driveway to the existing walkway.

 - a. The proposed gravel driveway would measure 9'0" wide and run westward along the south elevation of the dwelling.
 - b. The proposed concrete sidewalk would measure 4'0" wide and run north to south along the west façade, connecting the driveway to the sidewalk leading to the existing porch steps.

STAFF REPORT

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

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. **5.6** Use original materials to replace damaged materials on primary surfaces where possible.
 - Use original materials to replace damaged building materials on a primary façade if possible. If the original material is wood clapboard, for example, then the replacement material should be a material that matches the original in finish, size and the amount of exposed lap. If the original material is not available from the site, use a replacement material that is visually comparable with the original material.
 - Replace only the amount of material required. If a few boards are damaged beyond repair, for example, then only they should be replaced, rather than the entire wall.

- Do not replace building materials on the primary façade, such as wood siding and masonry, with alternative or imitation materials unless it cannot be avoided.
 - Wholesale replacement of exterior finishes is generally not allowed.
3. **6.5** Repair a porch in a way that maintains the original character.
 4. **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.
 5. **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
 6. **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.
 7. **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.
 8. **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.
 9. **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.
 10. **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.
11. 6.17 Design and place a new porch to maintain the visibility to and integrity of an original historic porch, as well as the overall historic building.
 - Design a rear porch so that its height and slopes are compatible with the original historic structure.
 12. 6.18 Design a new porch to be compatible with the existing historic building.
 - Design the scale, proportion and character of a porch addition element, including columns, corner brackets, railings and pickets, to be compatible with the existing historic residential structure.
 - Match the foundation height of a porch addition to that of the existing historic structure.
 - Design a porch addition roofline to be compatible with the existing historic structure. However, a porch addition roofline need not match exactly that of the existing historic building. For example, a porch addition may have a shed roof.
 - Use materials for a porch addition that are appropriate to the building.
 - Do not use a contemporary deck railing for a porch addition placed at a location visible from the public street.
 - Do not use cast concrete steps on façades or primary elevations.
 13. 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.
 14. 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.
 15. 10.7 Minimize the visual impact of parking.
 - Locate a parking area at the rear or to the side of a site whenever possible.
 - Use landscaping to screen a parking area.
 - Minimize the widths of a paved area or a curb cut.
 - If a curb cut is no longer in use, repair the curb. In some areas, granite curbs may be required.
 - Do not use paving in the front yard for a parking area. Paving stones might be acceptable in certain instances. »
 - Do not create a new driveway or garage that opens onto a primary street.

ACCEPTABLE WALK AND PAVING MATERIALS

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

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

B. Staff Analysis

This application proposes the construction of a rear addition and restoration/repair work at 254 Roper Street. For contributing residences within Mobile's historic districts, the *Guidelines* mandate that additions be subordinate to the original structure and be compatible in massing and scale. The proposed addition represents roughly 15% of the original structure's depth; further, it would be adjoined to the existing rear elevation and would comprise matching foundation and floor heights to those of the original structure. Therefore, the addition would be subordinate to the existing dwelling. (A.4-5)

The proposed addition is differentiated on the north elevation by the rear porch. On the south elevation, the application proposes abutting new clapboard siding against the original to create a vertical joint seam. The proposed integration of the addition roofline with the original renders the old and new indistinguishable, contrary to the *Guidelines*' directive to use an altered roofline on an addition to create a visual break. (A.6) An argument can be made, however, that the architectural style and character of the existing Craftsman house do not readily lend themselves to the inclusion of a vertical wood element (beyond the proposed joint seam) or an alteration in the roofline, rendering the proposed design effective in this instance.

The materials proposed in the application, including wood lap siding, wood fenestration, fiberglass/asphalt shingles, and roughcast stucco, are all matched to the existing materials on the original structure, adhering to the *Guidelines*' call to use compatible and appropriate materials to the original structure and the district. Further, the matching of designs, elements and details to the original dwelling such as the foundation height, roof pattern, porch arrangement, and flared wall base; along with the use of relocated doors and window, are practices approved by the *Guidelines* for additions to historic residences. (A.7, 8, 10-14)

The proposed gravel driveway complies with the *Guidelines* in materials and proposed location at the side of the property to minimize the visibility of vehicles. Likewise, the concrete sidewalk is compliant in material and placement. (A.15)

The application's proposed repairs and replacements in kind where necessary to the noted areas on the historic structure are in line with the appropriate approach to maintaining and preserving the historic fabric and character of a building within a historic district, as detailed in the *Guidelines*. (A.1-3)

B. Summary of Analysis

- The application proposes the construction of a rear addition to the historic structure at 254 Roper Street, along with various repair and replacement work.
- The addition is compliant with the *Guidelines* in size, placement and materials.
- The addition is distinguishable on the north and south elevations, but not from the proposed continuous integrated roof.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on Section B above, Staff believes the proposed construction, as presented, of a rear addition at 254 Roper Street would not impair the architectural or historic character of the existing historic structure or the surrounding historic district and recommends approval of the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board had no questions or comments.

FINDING FACTS

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

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Blackwell moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, the proposed construction of a rear addition and repairs would not impair the architectural or historic character of the structure of the surrounding district, and a Certificate of Appropriateness should be granted.

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

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

ADDRESS	1157 Spring Hill Avenue	APPLICATION NO.	2022-59-CA
SUMMARY OF REQUEST	Demolish non-historic addition on rear elevation. Secure building.		
APPLICANT	David Miller	OWNER, IF OTHER	
HISTORIC DISTRICT	Old Dauphin Way	MEETING DATE	09/21/2022
CLASSIFICATION	Contributing	REVIEWER	A. 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 20th-century apartments.”

The Victorian cottage at 1157 Spring Hill Avenue was constructed c.1904 by contractor brothers Daniel and James Jett. The structure appears on both the 1904 and 1925 Sanborn maps. On both map publications, the dwelling is depicted as a one-story frame structure with front porch and projecting octagonal bay window. In the 1925 depiction, the porch extending across the rear elevation in 1904 has been truncated to make room for a small hipped roof addition (c. 1915) on the southeast portion of the house. Between 1955 and 1980, this porch was closed in to create a flat-roofed addition.

According to MHDC vertical files, this property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board (ARB). In 2019, an application to demolish the historic structure at 1157 Spring Hill Avenue was withdrawn before appearing before the ARB.

SCOPE OF WORK (per submitted application and communication)

1. Demolish flat-roof addition located on the southwest portion of the structure.
2. Enclose and secure all resulting exposed portions of the structure with plywood sheathing and paint to match existing exterior.
3. Remove debris from site.

STAFF REPORT

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

Demolition Guidelines 12.0

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

Impact on the street

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.

Nature of Proposed Development

6. Consider the future utilization of the site.

B. Staff Analysis

The *Guidelines* require that the following be considered when a demolition is proposed: the architectural significance of the building, the impact the demolition will have on the streetscape, and the nature of future utilization of the site.

The addition proposed for demolition at 1157 Spring Hill Avenue measures 16' wide by 17' deep. The form (flat roof) and materials (aluminum siding) are visibly non-historic and do not contribute to the historic or architectural integrity of the dwelling or of the surrounding district. Also, the addition is in disrepair with a collapsing roof which has left the structure exposed to the elements. Located on the western half of the rear elevation, the addition is subordinate in size to the rest of the structure. The building is an inner block dwelling, so the addition is not visible from the street. Therefore, its demolition will not impair the surrounding district. (A.1-5)

Subsequent utilization of the site includes the removal of debris and securing the historic structure for future preservation. The applicant is in negotiations to donate the structure to a local non-profit organization that can carry out extensive rehabilitation work; the applicant wishes to transfer the property in a more stabilized state to facilitate this objective. Further, in July 2022, a Notice of Violation and Corrective Order was issued for the subject property by the City of Mobile's Municipal Enforcement department. In demolishing this derelict addition and securing the building, the applicant is making a forthright effort to comply with the conditions of the order. (A.6)

C. Summary of Analysis

- The addition proposed for demolition does not contribute to the historic integrity of this property or that of the surrounding district.
- The demolition of the addition would not impair the surrounding historic district.
- The proposed demolition will enable the historic building to be better secured and stabilized for future rehabilitation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on Section B above, Staff believes the demolition of the non-historic rear addition at 1157 Spring Hill Avenue would not impair the architectural or historic character of the property or the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. David Miller was present to discuss the application. He stated that he had nothing to add.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board had no questions or comments.

FINDING FACTS

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

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Blackwell moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, the proposed demolition of a non-historic addition would not impair the architectural or historic character of the structure or the surrounding district, and a Certificate of Appropriateness should be granted.

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

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:26 pm.