

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
October 5, 2022 – 3:00 P.M.
Multi-Purpose Room, Government Plaza
205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. Mr. Bob Allen, acting Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:00 pm. Christine Dawson, Historic Development staff, called the roll as follows.

Members Present: Bob Allen, Karrie Maurin, Andre Rathle, Joseph Rodrigues, and Gypsie Van Antwerp

Members Absent: Janelle Adams (alternate), Cart Blackwell (alternate), Abby Davis, Catarina Echols, Kimberly Harden, Kathleen Huffman (alternate) Craig Roberts, and Jim Wagoner

Staff Members Present: Annie Allen, Christine Dawson, Chris Kern, Marion McElroy, John Sledge, and Meredith Wilson

2. Ms. Van Antwerp moved to approve the minutes from September 21, 2022 meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Rodrigues and approved unanimously.
3. Mr. Rodrigues moved to approve the Mid-Month COAs granted by Staff. The motion was seconds by Ms. Van Antwerp and approved unanimously.

MID-MONTH APPROVALS - APPROVED

1. Applicant: Ethos General Contractors, LLC

- a. Property Address: 1321 Dauphin Street
- b. Date of Approval: 9/13/2022
- c. Project: Reroof in-kind with Timberline HDZ shingles in Shakewood color

2. Applicant: Wesley Van Camp

- a. Property Address: 1058 Old Shell Road
- b. Date of Approval: 9/13/2022
- c. Project: 1. Replace back door in-kind with a four (4) panel wood door. Paint in Palmetto Street Bronze; 2. Install white metal storm door to rear doorway.; 3. Install white roof gutter and downspouts to rear of house; 4. On east elevation: repair window and replace rotten window sill. Repaint to match existing window trim color.; 5. Strip and refinish front door and paint in Palmetto Street Bronze.

3. Applicant: David Hagan

- a. Property Address: 161 S. Dearborn Street
- b. Date of Approval: 9/13/2022
- c. Project: Paint the exterior. Siding: Benjamin Moore Putnam Ivory; Trim: Benjamin Moore White Dove; Porch: Sherwin Williams Gale Force; Porch Ceiling: Sherwin Williams Atmosphere

4. Applicant: Robert Burns

- a. Property Address: 1004 Charleston Street
- b. Date of Approval: 9/14/2022
- c. Project: 1. Repaint exterior. Benjamin Moore paint colors. Body: Province Blue; Trim:

Brilliant White; Porch: Platinum Grey; Porch Ceiling: Bashful Blue. 2. Install operable wood shutters on façade to fit window openings. Shutters will be painted Chrome Green.

5. Applicant: WRICO Signs

- a. Property Address: 352 State Street
- b. Date of Approval: 9/15/2022
- c. Project: Install a one-sided, 9'-6"x2'-0" aluminum pan sign painted silver with mounted 1/4" flat cut aluminum letters which read "Dunn Building Company. Since 1878". Sign will be mounted on the upper southeast corner of the east elevation.

6. Applicant: Signarama

- a. Property Address: 601 Government Street
- b. Date of Approval: 9/15/2022
- c. Project: Install a two-sided 5'x3' hanging wood sign which will be attached to an existing steel sign arm with metal brackets. "Maloney Frost".

7. Applicant: Richard Bradley

- a. Property Address: 7 Hannon Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 9/16/2022
- c. Project: Construct a 6' fence of pre-treated wood. The fence will extend eastward down the north and south property lines, ending at the east (rear) property line. The fence will begin behind the rear wall plan of the structure.

8. Applicant: Brandi Loewen

- a. Property Address: 59 Semmes Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 9/16/2022
- c. Project: Remove existing chain-link fence. Install a 4'0" pressure treated wood fence which will run from the northwest (rear) corner of dwelling northward to abut the neighbor's existing privacy fence on the north property line. Install a gate of the same material which will run from the southwest (rear) corner of the dwelling southward to abut the neighbor's existing privacy fence on the south property line.

9. Applicant: Mike McKeon

- a. Property Address: 1004 Old Shell Road
- b. Date of Approval: 9/16/2022
- c. Project: Place iron plumber pipe bar across deck between columns above plinths, flat black in color; erect three-foot picket fence across front of property.

10. Applicant: Cox Pools of the Southeast, Inc.

- a. Property Address: 50 N. Reed Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 9/16/2022
- c. Project: Construct a 25'x15' gunite pool. Install 407 sf of paver pool decking around the perimeter.

11. Applicant: Novare Restoration & Roofing Professionals

- a. Property Address: 257 State Street
- b. Date of Approval: 9/19/2022
- c. Project: Reroof in-kind with Atlas architectural shingles in Weathered Wood color

12. Applicant: Roof Doctor

- a. Property Address: 360 S. Ann Street
- b. Date of Approval: 9/20/2022
- c. Project: Reroof in-kind with shingles in Charcoal color

13. Applicant: Dianne K. Irby

- a. Property Address: 308 Chatham Street
- b. Date of Approval: 9/20/2022 (revision to COA originally issued 3/21/2022)

- c. Project: Repaint house in light gray-blue similar to Glidden Ariel or Magic Wand.
- 14. Applicant: The Construction Expert LLC d/b/a Mobile Roofing & Construction**
 - a. Property Address: 18 Semmes Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/22/2022
 - c. Project: Repair and replace damaged shingles to match existing
- 15. Applicant: All Weather Roofing & Construction LLC**
 - a. Property Address: 1601 West Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/22/2022
 - c. Project: Reroof in-kind with architectural shingles in Colonial Slate color
- 16. Applicant: The Construction Expert LLC d/b/a Mobile Roofing & Construction**
 - a. Property Address: 7 Hannon Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/22/2022
 - c. Project: Reroof garage only with architectural shingles in Pewter color
- 17. Applicant: James Martin**
 - a. Property Address: 262 Marine Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/22/2022
 - c. Project: Repaint in historic Benjamin Moore colors. Repair and replace lap siding in-kind. Reroof in-kind.
- 18. Applicant: Joseph Collins**
 - a. Property Address: 33 Blacklawn Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/23/2022
 - c. Project: 1. Construct minor one-story rear addition (closet and bathroom) at southwest corner of house.
 - a. Addition will measure 18' wide by 10' deep and be clad in wood lap siding. It will be stepped back from the plane of the south elevation by approximately 1'-4".
 - b. Addition will rest on brick piers to match existing.
 - c. Addition will have a hipped roof lower than the existing house roof and clad in shingles to match the existing.
 - d. Addition will have no fenestration.
 - 2. Construct new wood stairs with wood railing and concrete landing at existing rear door.
 - 3. Repaint house as follows (Benjamin Moore): Body - Classic Gray; Trim and accent areas - Simply White
- 19. Applicant: Franchise Management Services, Inc.**
 - a. Property Address: 1655 Lamar Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/23/2022
 - c. Project: Reroof in-kind with Certain Teed Landmark shingles in Heather Blend color.
- 20. Applicant: All Weather Roofing & Construction LLC**
 - a. Property Address: 953 Savannah Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 9/26/2022
 - c. Project: Reroof in-kind with Architectural Landmark shingles in Moire Black color

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2022-60-CA: 14 N. Lafayette Street

- a. Applicant: Benjamin Cummings on behalf of McGill-Toolen High School
- b. Project: Demolish non-contributing theater building

APPROVED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

2. 2022-61-CA: 110 N. Ann Street

- a. Applicant: Jennifer Johnson
 - b. Project: New construction: one-story single-family residence
- APPROVED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

3. 2022-62-CA: 1452 Government Street

- a. Applicant: Adams Stewart Architects/ Jason Shipp
 - b. Project: New construction: one-story office building
- TABLED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

4. 2022-63-CA: 106 S. Broad Street

- a. Applicant: 195, LLC/ Cory Bronenkamp
 - b. Project: Rehabilitate existing structure for apartment use; work to include new windows and doors, outdoor staircase, and courtyard; repave and stripe parking area
- APPROVED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

5. 2022-64-CA: 1703 Dauphin Street

- a. Applicant: Michael Brooks
 - b. Project: Install pre-fab shed in rear yard
- APPROVED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. The next ARB meeting is scheduled for October 19, 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, October 4, 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	14 N. Lafayette Street	APPLICATION NO.	2022-60-CA
SUMMARY OF REQUEST	Demolish non-contributing theater building		
APPLICANT	Benjamin Cummings	OWNER, IF OTHER	McGill-Toolen High School

HISTORIC DISTRICT	Old Dauphin Way	MEETING DATE	10/05/2022
CLASSIFICATION	Non-Contributing	REVIEWER	C. Dawson

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 lot at 14 N. Lafayette Street was empty at the time the 1956 Sanborn map was developed. The aerial photograph from 1967 shows the current structure extant. Therefore, the one-story, brick-veneered mid-century modern building was constructed between 1956 and 1967.

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. Demolish theater building.
2. Spread grass seed.

STAFF REPORT

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

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. (12.0)

B. Staff Analysis

The subject property, 14 N. Lafayette Street, is a non-contributing structure located within the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The application under review involves demolition of the c. 1960 theater building.

The *Guidelines* state that when demolition is contemplated, the current significance of the structure should be considered. (A.1) The subject theater building is considered a non-contributing property in the Old Dauphin Way district.

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.” (A.2) In the case of the subject building, the building is in fair condition. The roof has leaked for many years, causing extensive damage to the interior and ultimately leading to the abandonment of the property by the Mobile Theater Guild.

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. (A.3) The building has been altered over its history, primarily through changes to its fenestration. Fixed steel windows on the west (façade) elevation were replaced with glass block in 1999, and doors have periodically been replaced. However, these changes do not detract from the building’s unique character in the district; it would be considered the only example of its type. The long, low shape of the building, emphasized by its horizontal banding, grouped windows, and minimalist front porch with a flat roof mark this building as one of only a handful of Modern buildings in Old Dauphin Way; it is the only such theater building.

The *Guidelines* instruct that the impact of a structure’s demolition on surrounding structures, including neighboring properties, properties on the same block or across the street, or properties throughout the individual historic district should be taken into account. (A.4) The visual impact upon neighboring properties of the demolition of this building will not be significant. The property to the immediate north of this is a playing field related to McGill-Toolen, and the property to the immediate south is a c. 1890 two-story Queen Anne house. The theater building is not visually or temporally related to the house.

The theater building at 14 N. Lafayette Street is not “part of an ensemble of historic buildings that create a neighborhood.” While it is significant to and strongly associated with Mobile’s cultural history over the last approximately seventy (70) years, it does not closely visually relate to the properties in its nearby vicinity. (A.5)

Finally, the *Guidelines* instruct that the future use of a cleared site should be considered. (A.6) At some undetermined point in the future, the applicant plans to use the parcel for a new locker room for the existing playing field located on the parcel to the immediate north of the subject property. In the immediate future, the area where the theater building currently exists would be grassed.

C. Summary of Analysis

- The application requests a COA to demolish the existing c. 1960 theater building.
- The building is in fair condition and is a non-contributing element of the district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on Section B above, Staff believes the proposed demolition of the theater building would not impair the architectural and historic character of the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Ben Cummings was present to discuss the application. He stated he had nothing to add.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board had no questions or comments.

FINDING OF FACT

Ms. Van Antwerp 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. Rodrigues and approved unanimously.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Rodrigues moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, the proposed demolition of the structure at 14 N Lafayette Street would not impair the architectural or historic character of the surrounding district, and a Certificate of Appropriateness should be granted.

Ms. Van Antwerp seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

ADDRESS	110 N. Ann Street	APPLICATION NO.	2022-61-CA
SUMMARY OF REQUEST	New Construction of a single-family residence		
APPLICANT	Rodney Clements	OWNER, IF OTHER	Jennifer Johnson

HISTORIC DISTRICT	Old Dauphin Way	MEETING DATE	10/05/2022
CLASSIFICATION	Vacant	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 lot at 110 N Ann Street currently sits vacant. According the MHDC files, a c. 1915 frame two-story residence once sat on the lot. The 1925 Sanborn map shows a two-story frame dwelling with a partial-width front porch at this address. There also was a smaller frame, two-story residence behind the main dwelling, with a street address of 110 ½ N. Ann. The house burned in 2002 and was subsequently demolished in 2003. This property has never come before the Architectural Review Board.

SCOPE OF WORK (per submitted application and communication)

1. Construct a two-story wood frame residence.
 - a. The proposed residence would be rectangular in shape with an attached 2-car garage wing projecting from the east (rear) elevation. A gable front porch would be centered on the façade. The structure would be located on the lot such that the front porch would sit 30’-0” back from the street front. The north and south side yards would each measure 10-’6”.
 - b. A gable roof would top the structure with a cross gable topping the rear single-story garage wing. The roof would be clad in Sovereign Charcoal colored architectural shingles.
 - c. The proposed siding for the dwelling would be Hardieboard smooth cement lap siding.
 - d. The proposed foundation would be a 3’-0” concrete slab obscured by the same cement board siding.
 - e. All proposed windows would be two-over-two sash. The entry door and sidelights would be wood painted black, the rear entry door would be of steel panel construction, and the garage door would be three-layer steel construction.
 - f. Elevations would appear as follows:
 - 1) West elevation (façade)
 - The west façade would measure 64’-0” with a 33’-10” centered gabled porch. The porch would be 6’-0” deep and supported by four (4) equally spaced wood posts with simple caps. The porch would sit on four (4) 2’-0” concrete piers, be enclosed by a wood railing, and accessed by five (5) wood steps centered on the façade across from the entry door. The 3’-0” by 8’-0” twelve (12) lite and panel door would be flanked by sidelights each measuring 12” wide. The porch gable

would consist of a decorative wooden truss simulating a king post truss design. Four (4) two-over-two single hung windows would be equally spaced across the façade and would measure 3'-0" by 5'-0". Above, two equally spaced shed roof dormers would project from the second story, each with a two-over-two single hung window measuring 3'-0" by 5'-0" and topped with a standing-seam metal roof. A stone veneer chimney would be located approximately 1/4th in from the south gable end, and would sit slightly east of the roof ridge.

- 2) East elevation (rear)
 - A shed roof dormer would be centered on the second-story and consist of a pair of two-over-two single-hung windows measuring 3'-0" by 5'-0". This elevation would comprise three bays.
 - From south to north, the first bay would comprise the dwelling's rear wall measuring 22'-6" wide with one two-over-two single hung 3'-0" by 5'-0" window set approximately two-thirds in from the south end of the bay.
 - The central bay would be a recess measuring 18'-0" wide and set back approximately 8'-0". Five centered wooden steps would access the back porch created by the recess. This bay would comprise – from south to north- a grouping of three (3) two-over-two single-hung windows measuring 9'-0" by 6'-0"; and a French door measuring 3'-0" by 6'-8".
 - The third bay would be the gable end of the cross-wing (garage), which would project 29'-0" from the rear wall plane and measure 23'-6" wide. This bay would consist of a decorative wooden truss in the gable (simulating a king post truss design) and no fenestration.
 - 3) North elevation
 - From west to east, this elevation would consist of the cross-wing (garage) and the gable end of the main block of the dwelling.
 - The cross-wing bay would comprise a double garage door located slightly west of center. This door would measure 18'-0" by 8'-0" and consist of five (5) simulated panels, each topped by a four-light horizontal window.
 - The gable end bay of this elevation would consist of three (3) two-over-two windows measuring 3'-0" by 5'-0" and a smaller horizontal two-over-two window measuring 3'-0" by 2'-0". These windows would be regularly dispersed across the first two-thirds of the elevation. Above, the gable would consist of a decorative wooden truss (simulating a king post truss design).
 - 4) South elevation
 - From west to east, this elevation would consist of the gable end of the main block of the dwelling and the cross-wing (garage). The gable end bay would comprise one two-over-two single hung window measuring 3'-0" by 5'-0", one (1) horizontal two-over-two fixed window measuring 5'-0" by 4'-0", and a pair of single hung two-over-two windows measuring 3'-0" by 5'-0". These windows would be regularly dispersed across the bay. Above, the gable would consist of a decorative wooden truss (simulating a king post truss design). To the east, the rear cross-wing (garage) would project 29'-0" with no fenestration.
2. Proposed site improvements include a concrete driveway which would measure 8'0" wide. The driveway would run eastward from the street and be accessed on the northwest side of the property. A 5'0"-wide walkway would run eastward from the public sidewalk to the front porch steps centered on the west façade.

STAFF REPORT

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

1. **6.34** 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.
2. **6.35** Maintain the side yard spacing pattern on the block.
 - 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.
3. **6.36** Design the massing of new construction to appear similar to that of historic buildings in the district.
 - Choose the massing and shape of the new structure 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.
4. **6.37** 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
 - Match the scale of a porch to the main building and reflect the scale of porches of nearby historic buildings.
5. **6.38** Design exterior building walls to reflect traditional development patterns of nearby historic buildings.
 - 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. The ARB will consider all building walls; however, building walls facing streets may face increased scrutiny.
 - Use steps and balustrades in a similar fashion as nearby historic structures.
 - Design building elements on exterior building walls to be compatible with those on nearby historic buildings. These elements include, but are not limited to:
 - Balconies
 - Chimneys
 - Dormers
6. **6.39** Use exterior 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.
 - If an alternative material is used that represents an evolution of a traditional material, suggest the finish of the original historic material from which it evolved.
 - Use a material with proven durability in the Mobile climate and that is similar in scale, character and finish to those used on nearby historic buildings.

ACCEPTABLE MATERIALS

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 (lap siding, shingles, board and batten)
- Concrete siding
- Cement fiber board siding
- Skim stucco coat

UNACCEPTABLE MATERIALS

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

7. **6.40** 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.
 - New materials that have proven durability may be used.

ACCEPTABLE ROOF MATERIALS

Materials that are similar in character, scale, texture and color range to those used on nearby historic buildings are acceptable. These often include:

- Asphalt dimensional or multi-tab shingles
- Wood shake or shingle
- Standing seam metal
- Metal shingles
- 5-V crimp metal
- Clay tile
- Imitation clay tile or slate

8. **6.41** Design a new door and doorway on new construction to be compatible with the historic district.
 - Place and size a door to establish a solid-to-void ratio 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.
9. **6.42** 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.
 - Design the elements of a porch to be at a scale proportional to the main building.
 - Where a rhythm of porches exists on a street or block, design a porch that continues this historic rhythm.
 - Design a rear or side porch that is visible from the public right-of-way to be subordinate in character to the front porch.
10. **6.43** Design piers, a foundation and foundation infill to be compatible with those of nearby historic properties.
- Use raised, pier foundations.
 - If raised foundations are not feasible, use a simulated raised foundation.
 - Do not use slab-on-grade construction. This is not appropriate for Mobile’s historic neighborhoods. If a raised slab is required, use water tables, exaggerated bases, faux piers or other methods to simulate a raised foundation.
 - Do not use raw concrete block or exposed slabs.
 - If foundation infill must be used, ensure that it is compatible with the neighborhood.
 - If solid infill is used, recess it and screen it with landscaping.
 - If lattice is used, hang it below the floor framing and between the piers. Finish it with trim.
 - Do not secure lattice to the face of the building or foundation.
 - Do not use landscaping to disguise inappropriate foundation design.

ACCEPTABLE FOUNDATION MATERIALS

Materials that are similar in character, texture and durability to those used on nearby historic buildings are acceptable. These often include:

- Brick piers
- Brick infill
- Wood (vertical pickets)
- Framed lattice infill

UNACCEPTABLE FOUNDATION MATERIALS

Materials that are not similar in character, texture and durability to those used on nearby historic buildings are unacceptable. These often include:

- Mineral board panels
- Concrete block infill
- Metal infill
- Plywood panel infill
- Plastic sheeting infill
- Vinyl sheeting infill

11. **6.44** Use details and ornamentation that help new construction integrate with the historic buildings in the district.

- Use a 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.
12. **6.45** 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.
 - Do not use a reflective or tinted glass window.
 - Use a 1/1 window instead of window with false muntins. A double paned window may be acceptable if the interior dividers and dimensional muntins are used on multi-light windows. A double paned 1/1 window is acceptable.
 - Do not use false, interior muntins except as stated above.
 - Recess window openings on masonry buildings.
 - Use a window opening with a raised surround on a wood frame building.

ACCEPTABLE WINDOW 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

UNACCEPTABLE WINDOW MATERIALS

Materials that are not similar 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

13. **10.5** Visually connect the street and building.

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

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 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 subject property, 110 N. Ann Street, is a vacant lot located within the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The application under review involves construction of a single-family residence on an interior lot. The *Design Review Guidelines* call for certain items to be taken into account for new construction residences including placement, mass, scale and building components.

With regard to placement, two components are taken into account – setback from the street and distance between buildings. The *Guidelines* state that new buildings should respect and maintain the alignment of traditional façade lines, as well as the rhythm of side and rear setbacks. (A.1,2) The property under review is located adjacent to and in the vicinity of contributing buildings. In accord with the *Guidelines*, the 30’-0” setback reflects the architectural landscape of the district. The *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 residence adopts the traditional massing of the neighborhood, which includes one- and two-story single-family residences. The outward massing of the building, a rectangle, is similar to massing found in the neighborhood. (A.7) The 3’-0” height of the foundation is similar to the foundation heights of nearby historic structures (A.4). The massing of the structure, with a 10’ ceiling, is compatible with the architectural context of the contributing landscape in which it is situated. (A.4)

Scale refers to a building’s size in relationship to other buildings. The *Guidelines* state that new construction should be in scale with nearby historic buildings. (A.4) The adjacent residence to the north, and those across the street to the west are two-story in height. As mentioned in the preceding paragraph addressing massing, the height of the ceiling and pitch of the roof combine to form a whole that would be compatible with the surrounding architectural landscape.

With regard to building components, the *Guidelines* call for consideration of traditional design patterns. (A.8, A.11) A variety of door designs, including pane-and panel with sidelights, are extant on the street and in the nearby vicinity of the subject property. The use of sashes of varying lite configurations, including two-over-two, is a feature of the district. (A.8,12. The wall treatments are visually compatible with the surrounding architectural and historical context, and Hardieboard is an acceptable material for new construction in Mobile’s historic districts. (A.5, A.6) However, the use of the Hardieboard siding down to grade, covering the concrete foundation is in conflict with the *Guidelines*. Likewise, the use of raw concrete piers on the front porch is not appropriate. (A.10) The proposed window spacing mimics a traditional solid-to-void ratio along all elevations. (A.12)

The proposed site considerations incorporated into the submitted design such as the walkway from the public sidewalk to the main entry respect the *Guidelines’* mandate to provide a visual connection between the street and proposed building. (A13,14)

C. Summary of Analysis

- The application proposes the construction of a two-story frame residence.
- The proposed setbacks, side yard spacing, massing, scale, and design comply with the *Design Review Guidelines*.
- The proposed fenestration, sidewall and roofing materials are compliant.
- The site considerations are also in accord with the *Design Review Guidelines*.

- The stone veneer proposed for the chimney is not appropriate in Mobile’s historic districts.
- The proposed use of Hardieboard siding down to grade along with the use of raw concrete piers on the front porch are both in conflict with the *Guidelines*.

STAFF SUGGESTIONS

Staff suggests the applicant choose an alternative veneer for the chimney that is acceptable under the *Design Review Guidelines*, such as brick. Likewise, Staff suggests that an acceptable material be used as infill between concrete piers for the foundation, and that a parge coat of stucco or cement be applied to all exposed raw concrete foundation piers in order to distinguish the raised foundation and bring the design and materials into compliance with the *Guidelines*.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on Section B above, Staff believes the construction of a two-story frame residence at 110 N. Ann Street as currently proposed would impair the historic character of the surrounding district and suggests using a locally appropriate veneer material for the chimney, exposing an appropriately foundation, and applying either a parged or brick veneered treatment to the porch foundation. Pending the incorporation of these suggested modifications, Staff recommends approval of the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Ms. Jennifer Johnson (owner) and Mr. Rodney Clements (architect) were present to discuss the application. Ms. Johnson stated that she was willing to comply with any modifications to the application that Staff had suggested.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board had no questions or comments.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Rodrigues moved that, based on the evidence presented in the application as amended by the applicant, the Board finds the facts in the Staff’s report.

Ms. Van Antwerp seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Rodrigues moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, the proposed construction of a single-family residence at 110 N. Ann Street would not impair the historic character of the surrounding district, and a Certificate of Appropriateness should be granted.

Ms. Van Antwerp seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

ADDRESS	1452 Government Street	APPLICATION NO.	2022-62-CA
SUMMARY OF REQUEST	New commercial construction: one-story office building		
APPLICANT	Jason Shipp/Adams Stewart Architects, LLC	OWNER, IF OTHER	Cindy Haber Center, Inc.
HISTORIC DISTRICT	Old Dauphin Way	MEETING DATE	10/05/2022
CLASSIFICATION	Vacant	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 earliest Sanborn map for this area of Government Street (1904) shows a two-story frame house with full-width front porch located on the center of three lots existing on the subject parcel. By the time the 1922 Sanborn Map was prepared, that house had been joined on the east and west by two-story frame dwellings with substantive footprints and possessing front, rear and side porches, offset wings and various accessory structures. The properties were numbers 1450, 1452, and 1454 Government Street. 1454 Government was associated with Blacksher Gardens. Tree cover partially obscures the properties, aerial photography appears to reveal that the two outer houses (1450 and 1454) no longer extant c. 1967. The center, older house was extant in a 1974 aerial photograph but had disappeared by 1980.

According to the MHDC files, this property has once appeared before the Architectural Review Board with an application to construct a single tenant commercial building in 2011 , which was never constructed.

SCOPE OF WORK (per submitted application and communication)

1. Construct a one-story office building.
 - a. The proposed building would measure 112’-7” wide by 86’-4” deep on the west elevation and 61’-4” deep on the east elevation.
 - b. The building would be set back 40’-3” from the Government Street right-of-way (ROW). The west and east side yard setbacks would be 50’-6” and approximately 30’-0”, respectively.
 - c. The building would be clad in Old Chicago brick and include a header row water table and soldier course cornice.
 - d. The roof would be divided into three (3) hipped sections, all clad in architectural asphalt shingles of Georgetown Gray color. The ridge heights of each section from east to west would be as follows: 22’-0”, 30’-0”, and 27’-10”.
 - e. The ceiling height would be 10’-10”.
 - f. Fenestration material: All windows would be aluminum-clad, and doors would be pane-and-panel fiberglass.

- g. The building would rest on a slab-on-grade foundation, not visible above ground.
- h. Elevations
 - 1) South Façade

The southern façade would consist of three graduated projecting bays. From west to east, the first projection would measure 37'-6" wide and project 16'-0" forward of the central bay. The central bay would measure 44'-11" and project 9'-0" forward of the third bay. The fenestration on each section (from west to east) would appear as follows:

 - a) The first bay would comprise a pair of fixed two-lite and transom storefront windows centered on this bay and located under an unarticulated brick gabled portal connected to the façade by a roof projection. Equally spaced on either side of the portal would be a nine-over-nine single-hung window flanked by wood fixed, louvered shutters with decorative dogs and hinges. Regularly dispersed across this bay would be four (4) 8" wall-mounted vertical sconces.
 - b) The second bay would consist of the following, regularly spaced across the bay : One (1) nine-over-nine single-hung window flanked by wood fixed, louvered shutters with decorative dogs and hinges; one (1) pair of pane-and-panel doors with pane-and-panel sidelights and transom located under an unarticulated brick gabled portal connected to the façade by a roof projection; two (2) nine-over-nine single-hung windows, each flanked by wood fixed, louvered shutters with decorative dogs and hinges. One (1) 8" black wall mounted vertical sconce would be located between these two windows.
 - c) The third bay would comprise one (1) 3'-0" x 6'-8" pane-and-panel door topped with a metal Juliet awning supported by scrolled brackets, and flanked by a pair of evenly spaced 8" black wall mounted vertical sconces. One (1) nine-over-nine single-hung window flanked by wood fixed, louvered shutters with decorative dogs and hinges. The door and window would be evenly spaced across the bay.
 - 2) North Elevation

From east to west, the north elevation would comprise four (4) nine-over-nine single-hung windows, each flanked by wood fixed, louvered shutters with decorative dogs and hinges, evenly distributed across the eastern half of the elevation; one (1) pair of pane-and-panel doors with pane-and-panel sidelights and transom; three (3) nine-over-nine single-hung windows, each flanked by wood fixed, louvered shutters with decorative dogs and hinges and evenly distributed roughly across the western third of the elevation.
 - 3) East Elevation

From south to north, the east elevation would comprise the profile of the two (2) unarticulated brick gabled portals sitting at the southern fronts of the first two projecting bays; the brick sidewalls of each section; and the profile of the metal Juliet awning on the façade of the third section. The third bay sidewall would consist of three (3) nine-over-nine single-hung windows, dispersed across the sidewall, each flanked by wood fixed, louvered shutters with decorative dogs and hinges.
 - 4) West Elevation

From north to south, the west elevation would comprise four nine-over-nine single-hung windows, regularly dispersed across the sidewall, each flanked by wood fixed, louvered shutters with decorative dogs and hinges; the western sidewall; the sidewall of the westernmost projecting bay on the façade and the western profile of the westernmost unarticulated gabled portal.
- i. Site considerations would include landscaping comprising some existing trees, new trees, shrubs and ground covers installed predominantly around the periphery of the property and near the building.

STAFF REPORT

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

1. **7.30** Orient a new commercial building to be similar to that of nearby historic structures.
 - Place buildings in line with adjacent historic buildings in terms of relationship to the street. If a project is flanked by non-historic structures, refer to nearby historic structures.
 - Design side setbacks to be similar to those in adjacent historic buildings. If a project is flanked by non-historic structures refer to nearby historic structures.
 - Orient façades of new commercial buildings similarly to adjacent historic structures. In most cases, new commercial structures should be oriented to directly face the street.
 - Face primary building entries toward the public street.
2. **7.32** Place and orient new commercial construction on commercial corridors to be compatible with that of adjacent historic residential structures and the district.
 - Establish front setbacks similar to those in adjacent historic residential development or historic residential development on the same block.
 - Orient façades to be parallel with the street or in the orientation of historic residential structures that are adjacent or on the same block. In some cases, the orientation should be north-south depending on the historic context.
 - For corner lots, align a sidewall with historic residential structures located to the rear of project. Offset sidewalls built close to the street edge to be in line with historic residential structures at the rear of the project.
3. **7.34** Design a building to be compatible with massing and scale with historic structures in the district.
 - Design building massing to reflect massing of nearby historic structures.
 - Where the volume of new construction is larger than historic structures in the district, break down the massing into smaller components to increase compatibility.
 - Limit the height or the perceived height of buildings to be similar to heights of nearby historic structures.
 - Use vertical and horizontal articulation design techniques to reduce the apparent scale of a larger building mass.
 - Incorporate changes in color, texture and materials.
 - Use architectural details to create visual interest.
 - Use materials that help to convey scale in their proportion, detail and form.
4. **7.35** Design building massing and scale to maintain the visual continuity of the district.
 - Incorporate floor-to-floor heights that appear similar to those of traditional commercial buildings in Mobile.
 - Design a new structure to incorporate a traditional base, middle and cap.
5. **7.36** Maintain traditional spacing patterns created by the repetition of building widths along the street.
 - Proportion a new façade to reflect the established range of traditional building widths seen in Mobile.
 - Where a structure must exceed a traditional building width, use changes in building configuration, articulation or design features such as materials, window design, façade height or decorative details to break the façade into modules that suggest traditional building widths.
6. **7.38** Design the massing and scale of new commercial construction to be compatible with historic residential structures in the district.
 - Break down building massing to create separate volumes that are similar to the massing of adjacent and nearby historic residential structures.

- Limit the height of a building to be similar to those of adjacent and nearby historic residential structures.
 - Where the lot lines of a commercial structure and residential structure meet, step down the height of the commercial building to match that of the adjacent residential structure.
7. **7.47** Where new commercial construction is located adjacent to historic residential structures, use building materials that are compatible with those materials used in nearby historic buildings.
 - Use a material that is reflective of nearby historic residential structures, including wood siding.
 8. **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.
 9. **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.

B. Staff Analysis

The application proposes the construction of an 8,250 sf single-story professional office building. The *Design Review Guidelines* propose several items to be taken into account when reviewing new commercial construction within Mobile’s historic districts. These include placement, massing, scale and building elements, materials and site considerations.

The property under review is a corner lot within a commercial corridor context, and its immediate vicinity consists of new and non-contributing commercial construction set on the periphery of a residential historic district. The adjacent historic residences are located to the rear of the subject property. In regard to placement, the *Guidelines* state that new commercial buildings be oriented to directly face the street and should be compatible with adjacent historic residential structures and the district. (A.1,2) In this instance, the proposed structure is placed appropriately to face Government Street. To ensure placement compatibility, the transition between the subject commercial project and rear-adjacent properties must be considered. 1452 Government is adjacent to two rear residential properties to the north, one facing Etheridge Street (a vacant lot) and a second fronting South Lafayette Street. The vacant lot is owned by the Cindy Haber Center, Inc., and the lot to the immediate north of it is occupied by a historic residence. The proposed project does not provide an appropriate transition between the subject commercial property and the rear adjacent historic residences in the form of a fence or landscaped buffer.

The *Guidelines* state that the massing and scale (the relationship of the parts of the larger whole comprising a building, and the building’s size in relation to surrounding buildings) of new a commercial building – where new construction outnumbers historic structures – should be broken down into smaller segments; should be limited in height; should comprise a traditional base, middle, and cap in its design; and should use design features, materials, and details that suggest traditional building widths of historic structures within the district. (A.3-6) As stated in the scope of work, the proposed one-story design will incorporate three (3) roof sections and three (3) bays with varying front wall planes on the façade which serve to create separate components to better match the massing of surrounding historic structures. Architectural features such as a cornice, multi-lite sash windows, and a water table articulate areas such as the cap, middle and base of the sidewalls and reduce the visible scale of the large building footprint. With regard to materials, the *Guidelines* call for the use of building materials that are compatible with those used in the surrounding historic buildings (A.7). The proposed materials for the project at 1452 Government blend with those used on historic structures in its immediate vicinity and in the district.

The project includes the proposed installation of trees, shrubs and ground cover, which serves to visually soften the impact of paving, curbing and parking areas as the *Guidelines* suggest. (A.9) The *Guidelines* direct that the visual effect of parking be minimized by locating parking areas to the side or rear of a site, and that landscaping is to be used to provide a visual buffer between a parking area and a public sidewalk. (A.8) The subject design calls for seven (7) parking spaces (four disabled) to be installed at the front of the building, which is not in compliance with this guideline. In addition, the design does not provide sufficient landscaping to reduce the visibility of the proposed front parking area.

C. Summary of Analysis

- The application proposes the construction of an 8,250 sqft one-story commercial office building.
- The proposed setbacks, side yard spacing, massing, scale, materials, and design comply with the *Design Review Guidelines*.
- The proposed project does not provide an appropriate transition or buffer between the subject property and the rear adjacent properties.
- The parking design as proposed is not in compliance with the *Guidelines*.

STAFF SUGGESTION

In order to provide an appropriate buffer between the proposed commercial development at 1452 Government Street and the two rear adjacent residential properties to its north, Staff suggests installing a privacy fence across the north (rear) property line, beginning at the northeastern corner and ending at the northwestern corner of the lot.

Further, if the applicant wishes to maintain the front parking spaces proposed in the submitted design, Staff suggests installing a hedge between the paved/parking area along the southern façade and the adjacent public sidewalk to create a visual buffer as the *Guidelines* direct.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on Section B above, Staff believes the proposed construction of a one-story commercial office building as currently proposed, with no suitable transition provided for the rear-adjacent residential properties and the lack of substantial landscaping to visually minimize the front parking design, would impair the historic integrity of the surrounding district and suggests installing an appropriate fence along the northern property line and implementing a hedge buffer south of the front parking area. Pending the incorporation of these suggested modifications, Staff recommends approval of the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Jason Shipp was present to discuss the application. He stated that he agrees with the Staff suggestions in the Staff Report regarding a fence along the north property line and a hedge between the front parking area and the adjacent public sidewalk.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Van Antwerp asked if any additional landscaping was needed on the east side of the property.

Ms. Allen stated that under the *Guidelines*, no further landscaping was required.

Ms. Maurin stated that the proposed design, although a good design, was stylistically inappropriate for the area. She stated that Government Street as a whole is an area of high-profile historic architecture and that hipped roofs in particular designate a more suburban design. She suggested that further ornamentation, details, or other tweaks be considered to bring the current design more in line with the area. Mr. Shipp stated that features such as the parapeted gables, window light patterns, and Old Chicago bricks were reflections of the neighboring properties.

Ms. Van Antwerp asked what type of buildings/businesses are on either side of the subject property. Ms. Maurin noted that the property to the east across Lafayette Street appears to have been built as a house but is now used as offices. Mr. Allen stated that a red brick apartment building exists to the east of that office building, and a George B. Rogers designed residence is east of the apartments.

Mr. Shipp commented that a garden center is across the street; thus, there was not a lot to work with in regards to structures from which to pull design guidance. He also stated that the owner is sensitive to “maintenance-free” and does not want a two-story structure.

Mr. Shipp offered color renderings for the Board’s consideration.

Ms. Maurin commented that she thought the design should be more historically based.

Mr. Allen inquired about the proposed outdoor lighting for the property. Mr. Shipp stated that the lighting plan is in the documents provided.

Ms. Maurin stated that the problem is in the proportions, that if the design could not be changed to a two-story plan, then maybe some other ornamentation or modifications could be applied.

Mr. Allen stated that from the street view, the roof appears very imposing. Ms. Van Antwerp stated that the parapeted gables were off-putting and fortress-like.

Ms. Maurin suggested that perhaps the design could provide for an implied porch.

Mr. Allen asked if the client was willing to modify the current design. Mr. Shipp replied yes.

Mr. Allen suggested the Design Review Committee process to help guide changes to the design.

Ms. Maurin asked Mr. Shipp if he could provide the ARB with some sketches. Mr. Shipp replied that he could in a day or two.

Mr. Rodrigues moved that, based on the Board discussion with the applicant, the application be tabled until the next ARB meeting on October 19, 2022, when applicant is able to produce a modified design proposal.

Ms. Van Antwerp seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

ADDRESS	106 S. Broad Street	APPLICATION NO.	2022-63-CA
SUMMARY OF REQUEST	Rehabilitate existing structure for apartment use; work to include new windows and doors, outdoor staircase, and courtyard; repave and stripe parking area		
APPLICANT	195, LLC/ Cory Bronenkamp	OWNER, IF OTHER	Matchpoint Development LLC
HISTORIC DISTRICT	Oakleigh Garden (local district only)	MEETING DATE	10/5/2022
CLASSIFICATION	Non-Contributing	REVIEWER	A. Allen/ 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 property on which the subject building exists was vacant in 1876, per the Hopkins ward map of Mobile. The earliest Sanborn Fire Insurance map to include this area just west of Broad Street was published in 1891. A two-story frame dwelling with an offset rear service wing is shown in the approximate location of the subject property, just south of Government Street Methodist Church. The 1904 and 1926/1955 Sanborn maps depict the same building on the site, though by 1926, the dwelling was noted to be apartments. Upon review of available aerial photographs, the house appears to have remained on the site through 1967 but disappeared at some point before 1980 (the next available photo). By that date, the existing structure was extant. Therefore, the subject property was constructed between 1967 and 1980.

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. Rehabilitate building for use as apartments.
 - a. The exterior of the building would be cleaned and repainted. The cinder block exterior would be painted in an alabaster color and the brick façade, doors and masonry breeze block surrounding the rear terrace would be painted a dark grey.
 - b. All proposed windows would be aluminum. All exterior doors would be five panel pre-painted metal.
 - c. Elevations would be altered as follows:

East elevation (façade)

- The existing concrete entry steps would be demolished.
- The existing planter would be extended to the north to shield the parking on the north side of the building.
- All existing fenestration on the façade will be removed. The two second story window openings would be infilled with cinder block.
- The first-floor central entry and existing signage at the north end of the elevation would be replaced with three (3) equally spaced 5'-0" wide by 3'-0" tall double-paned fixed windows across the façade.

West elevation (rear)

Iron bars on the existing windows would be removed. Cinder block would be installed within the existing recess on the southern end of the elevation to create a flush end wall.

South elevation

- Two (2) existing windows on the southern elevation would be removed to include (from west to east) the third window on the second story (including window unit air conditioner) and the second window on the first story. The existing window unit air conditioner in the westernmost second story window would be removed.
- Two (2) new window openings would be created and on either side of the removed window on the second story, and new single-hung double-paned windows installed measuring 3'-4 1/2" wide by 3'-0" tall.
- One (1) single-hung double-paned window measuring 3'-4 1/2" wide by 3'-0" tall would be installed to the west of the remaining existing second and third windows on the first story.

North elevation

The existing porch roof, columns and footings on this elevation would be demolished. New openings would be created for the following fenestration changes on the single-story portion of the elevation (from east to west):

- A pair of entry doors measuring 3'-0" wide by 6'-8" tall would be installed in the first bay, topped by a 4'-0" by 12'-0" painted metal canopy.
- The second bay would comprise two (2) regularly spaced double-paned fixed windows measuring 5'-0" wide by 3'-0" tall.
- The third bay would comprise a pair of entry doors measuring 3'-0" wide by 6'-8" tall, topped by a 4'-0" by 12'-0" painted metal canopy.
- The fourth bay would comprise two (2) regularly spaced double-paned fixed windows measuring 5'-0" wide by 3'-0" tall.
- The fifth bay would comprise one (1) entry door measuring 3'-0" wide by 6'-8" tall, topped by a 4'-0" by 7'-0" painted metal canopy.

The following changes are proposed for the two-story portion of the elevation:

- Second Story: Existing burglar bars would be removed from the existing westernmost window and entry door. Existing window unit air conditioner in easternmost window would be removed. All existing windows would remain. The existing entry door would be replaced with a new entry door measuring 5'-0" wide by 3'-0" tall. First Story: The easternmost window would be replaced with a single hung double paned window measuring 3'-4 1/2" wide by 3'-0" tall. The existing small window in the center of the bay would be removed. A new door opening would be created, and an entry door measuring 3'-0" wide by 6'-8" tall with a single-pane sidelight on the east side would be installed.

The existing door on the west end would be removed and the opening enclosed with cinder block to match.

- The existing exterior steel staircase would be replaced with a treated wood staircase of matching width.
- The existing entry door located west of the two-story portion would be replaced with a new entry door measuring 5'-0" wide by 3'-0" tall.

2. Site Improvements

- a. A 4'-0" high iron fence would extend off the east façade and run northward to the driveway.
- b. The existing paved area to the north of the structure would be repaved in asphalt. Parking spaces would be created perpendicular to the north elevation.
- c. The existing concrete walk which runs westward along the north elevation would be extended to run the entire length of the structure.
- d. A 6'-0" high iron fence would run 110'-0" down the north property line.
- e. An additional parking area would be created adjacent to the west elevation, and would provide four (4) 10'-0" wide by 20'-0" deep parking spaces. A grass courtyard would be created south of this parking area and extend the southern and western (rear) property lines.
- f. A tall landscape hedge would be installed between the west (rear) parking area and the western property line.
- g. A gated dumpster enclosure would be erected at the far northwest corner of the property.

STAFF REPORT

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

1. **6.25** Design additions and alterations to non-historic structures to be compatible with the placement, massing and scale of surrounding historic structures.
 - Design an addition to respect the original orientation of the building and maintain the typical orientation of adjacent historic buildings.
 - Design an addition to a non-historic building to preserve setback distances and spacing between buildings to maintain setbacks and spacing typical of surrounding historic structures.
2. **6.27** Design exterior building walls associated with additions and alterations to non-historic structures to respect the character of the historic district.
 - Design a cornice line, foundation line, window and door height, and floor and ceiling height of an addition to a non-historic buildings to be similar to those of the original building provided these elements on the original building blend harmoniously with the historic district.
 - Use the alteration or addition to a non-historic building to improve the overall structure's appropriateness within the historic district.
3. **6.28** Design exterior materials and finishes associated with additions and alterations to non-historic structures to be compatible with the historic district.
 - Use materials with a character compatible to those used historically and with proven durability.
 - Maintain original material wherever possible provided the material is durable and compatible with the surrounding historic district.
4. **6.32** Design details and ornamentation to minimize impacts to the historic district.
 - Design details and ornamentation at a scale that is consistent with details and ornamentation on historic buildings in the district.
5. **6.33** Design window alterations and windows on new additions to non-historic structures to be

compatible with the neighborhood.

- Use a material and window type that is similar to those seen historically in the neighborhood. Tempered glass will be considered when required by the Mobile Code of Ordinances.
6. **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.

REAR AND NON-CORNER SIDE FENCES (LOCATED BEHIND THE FRONT BUILDING PLANE)

- Design a fence located behind the front building plane to not exceed 72" in height. If the subject property abuts a multi-family residential or commercial property, a fence up to 96" will be considered.
 - An alternative fence material with proven durability, matte finish and an accurate scale and proportion of components is acceptable. A simple wood-and-wire fence is acceptable provided it is appropriate to the style of the house.
7. **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 subject property, 106 S. Broad Street, is a non-contributing property within the locally-only designated Oakleigh Garden Historic District. The application under review involves the rehabilitation of the existing structure for apartment use. The work involved includes new fenestration and outdoor staircase; repaving and striping a new parking area; installation of a courtyard; and landscaping features.

When rehabilitating a non-contributing property within a locally designated historic district, the *Design Review Guidelines* require that compatibility with the character of the district be heavily considered. Within this context, the original orientation of the building is to be preserved, alterations to the structure should improve its overall suitability with the surrounding district, original materials should be maintained, details of the design should reflect those of the nearby historic structures, and windows should align with those seen historically in the vicinity. (A.1-5) The proposed project at 106 S. Broad would not alter the original orientation of the building. The brick façade, cinder block cladding, and other original materials would be retained. The removal of existing details and ornamentation from the structure such as signage, burglar bars, and window HVAC systems, would elevate its compatibility with the surrounding district. Further, the low profile and sleek design details serve to respect and minimize impact to the surrounding historic neighborhood. Pre-painted metal exterior doors are an acceptable material within Mobile's historic districts. Although the use of aluminum windows is not generally allowed within historic districts, this material is appropriate to a 1970s/80s-era cinderblock building such as the one under review. Finally, the *Guidelines* do not offer direction regarding metal canopies in relation to non-contributing residential structures. However, as with the aluminum windows, the proposed low-profile, minimalist canopies would complement the character of the existing c. 1970 building.

In regard to site considerations, the *Guidelines* provide direction concerning materials, location and height of fencing; along with requirements for parking area design. (A. 6-7) According to the color renderings of the subject property, the proposed 4'-0" iron fence running southward along the eastern end of the property is set back several inches behind the front wall plane. Therefore, its location, height and materials are all compliant with the *Guidelines*. Likewise, the 6'-0" high iron fence proposed to begin at the northwest corner of the property and run 110'-0" eastward along the 180'-0" property line, is also appropriate in placement, size and material. The proposed parking areas sit to the north side and rear of the property as mandated by the *Guidelines*, and landscape is provided in the form of low plantings at the front of the property and a tall landscape hedge at the rear to provide visual buffers.

C. Summary of Analysis

- The application proposes the rehabilitation of the non-contributing structure at 106 S. Broad Street, which is not part of the Oakleigh National Register District.
- The proposed alterations to the structure complement the character of the surrounding district in design, ornamentation, materials and orientation, as directed by the *Guidelines*.
- Although aluminum windows are not usually accepted in Mobile's historic districts, this material is appropriate to the subject building's style and era of construction.
- The site considerations of fencing, parking area design and landscaping are all in keeping with the *Guidelines*.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on Section B above, Staff believes the proposed rehabilitation of the existing structure at 106 S Broad Street 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 he had nothing to add.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Maurin commented that the proposed design was a handsome improvement to this “Frankenstein” building. She asked what the proposed rent may be for the units. Mr. Bronenkamp stated that these units would be short-term rentals (Airbnb) of 3-4-night minimums, or furnished units for people temporarily in town to work on location downtown who would prefer an apartment to a hotel. The pricing would be similar to hotel pricing which would help to maintain a certain professional clientele.

Mr. Allen asked if there had been any discussions regarding this project with the church to the north of the property. Mr. Bronenkamp stated that they have been in discussions with the church and will provide more information to them as the process of approvals moves forward.

Ms. Maurin inquired about the extent of the proposed landscaping in the front of the property. Mr. Bronenkamp replied that what is on the design is essentially what will be implemented; there is not much space between the building and the sidewalk. He further stated that he is working with the City regarding proper buffering and the proposed iron fence may become more of a screening fence on the north and west sides of the property.

FINDING OF FACT

Ms. Van Antwerp 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 on a 4-1 basis, with Mr. Rodrigues opposed.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Ms. Maurin moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, the proposed rehabilitation of the existing structure at 106 S. Broad Street for apartment use would not impair the architectural or historic character of the surrounding district, and a Certificate of Appropriateness should be granted.

Ms. Van Antwerp seconded the motion, and it was approved on a 4-0-1 basis, with Mr. Rodrigues abstaining.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

ADDRESS	1703 Dauphin	APPLICATION NO.	2022-64-CA
SUMMARY OF REQUEST	Install pre-fab shed in rear yard		
APPLICANT	Michael Brooks	OWNER, IF OTHER	
HISTORIC DISTRICT	Old Dauphin Way	MEETING DATE	10/5/2022
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 two-story Queen Anne house at 1703 Dauphin was constructed 1890. The 1925 Sanborn map of the area shows the house with a footprint much as it appears today, rectangular with the short sides to the north and south. However, a porch wrapped the northeast corner of the house, whereas today the porch is only present on the north elevation. When Old Dauphin Way became a historic district in 1984, this house exhibited a brick veneer first-story façade and infilled inset porch alongside. On September 12, 1989 the owners received a midmonth approval to remove this unsympathetic work and restore original bay window and inset porch. A decade later, the MHDC Marketing Committee deferred a decision on a plaque because it considered the restored façade “crudely detailed.” This issue does not appear to have been addressed, as the file only indicates midmonth approvals to repair rotten wood and repaint over the years.

This property has appeared before the Architectural Review Board (ARB) twice before. In October 2007, the ARB approved an application to extend existing fences; and in August 2022, an application was approved to reroof with a 26-gauge tuff-rib metal roof.

SCOPE OF WORK (per submitted application and communication)

STAFF REPORT

1. Construct a utility shed southeast of the historic dwelling, near the southern (rear) property line.
 - a. The shed would measure 10’-0” wide by 16’-0” long. The wall height would measure 6’-8 ¼” tall.
 - b. The shed would be topped by a gambrel roof which would measure 3’-2” in height and clad in Dimensional Premium Shingles (color: Charcoal).
 - c. The proposed structure would be clad in smart siding (engineered wood) and painted in *Tundra Frost*. The trim would be painted in *Black Magic*.

- d. The fenestration would consist of a 3'-0" by 6'-2" double door (6'-0" width in total), each with a 3'-0" wide horizontal transom. Four horizontal sliding vinyl windows (two on the north elevation and one each on the east and west elevations) would measure 3'-0" x 2'-0".
- e. The foundation would be of raw concrete block.

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

1.9.1 Design an accessory structure to be subordinate in scale to that of the primary structure.

- If a proposed accessory structure is larger than the size of typical historic accessory structures in the district, break up the mass of the larger structure into smaller modules that reflect traditional accessory structures.

2.9.2 Locate a new accessory structure in line with other visible accessory structures in the district.

- These are traditionally located at the rear of a lot.

ACCEPTABLE ACCESSORY STRUCTURE MATERIALS

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

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

UNACCEPTABLE ACCESSORY STRUCTURE MATERIALS

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

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

B. Staff Analysis

The application under review proposes the installation of a pre-fabricated shed in the rear yard at 1703 Dauphin St. The *Design Review Guidelines* direct that certain items be taken into account with the installation of accessory structures within Mobile's historic districts. These include scale, location, and materials.

In regard to scale, the *Guidelines* state that accessory structures be subordinate in size to the main structure (A.1). The proposed shed measures 10'-0" wide by 16'-0" long, with a wall height 6'-8 1/4", making it considerably smaller in scale in comparison to the two-story historic dwelling on the subject lot. The proposed location for the structure at the rear of the property also complies with the *Guidelines'* directives (A.2).

In addition to these *Guidelines* specific to accessory structures, accessory structures are meant to adhere to guidelines set up for new residential construction in historic districts. Within this context, the proposed shed comes into conflict with the *Guidelines* in two areas. Vinyl windows are not an accepted material for use within historic districts. Likewise, the use of raw concrete blocks for the foundation is not appropriate according to the *Guidelines*.

C. Summary of Analysis

- The application proposes the installation of a pre-fabricated accessory structure at 1703 Dauphin Street.

- The proposed design falls within the *Guidelines*' directives in regard to scale, location, design, siding and roof materials.
- The proposed use of vinyl windows and raw concrete foundation do not comply with the *Guidelines*.

STAFF SUGGESTION

The applicant proposes to install vinyl windows and raw concrete block foundation, each of which is prohibited in Mobile's historic districts per the *Design Review Guidelines*. Due to the proposed structure's façade being visible from the street, Staff suggests the two vinyl windows on the façade be replaced with an acceptable metal material. Staff also suggests that the raw concrete blocks proposed for the foundation be clad in a parging material (stucco or cement) to produce a more finished appearance.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on Section B above, Staff believes the installation of a 10'-0" wide by 16'-0" long shed at 1703 Dauphin Street as currently proposed with vinyl windows and raw concrete block foundation would impair the architectural and historic character of the existing historic structure and the surrounding district. Pending the incorporation of the suggested modifications, Staff recommends approval of the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Michael Brooks was present to discuss the application. He stated that he was not in agreement with installing custom windows as the structure was not visible from the street. He stated that he was amenable to applying stucco to visible raw concrete.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Maurin stated her opinion that the proposed shed was considered a temporary structure.

Ms. Allen stated that according to the *Guidelines*, accessory structures are meant to adhere to guidelines set up for new residential construction in historic districts.

Ms. Dawson mentioned the fence and vegetation intervening between Dauphin Street and the proposed shed location, adding that they provide somewhat of a visual buffer but are temporary elements.

Mr. Allen stated that the problem lies in that the *Guidelines* do not allow for vinyl windows.

Ms. Maurin asked the applicant if he would consider removing the two windows on the façade and only having windows on the east and west elevations.

Mr. Brooks replied 'no' due to insufficient light. He added that to have windows on the façade would mean custom windows, which does not make financial sense for a shed.

Mr. Allen clarified which elevation "faces" Dauphin Street and revisited removing the windows on the north elevation.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Rodrigues moved that, based on the evidence presented in the application, the Board finds the facts in the Staff's report, as amended to include the option to remove the two windows on the north elevation (façade).

Ms. Van Antwerp seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mrs. Maurin moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, the proposed installation of a pre-fabricated shed in the rear yard at 1703 Dauphin Street would not impair the architectural or historic character of the subject property or the surrounding district, and a Certificate of Appropriateness should be granted.

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

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:12 pm.