

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
August 3, 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 3:00 p.m. Christine Dawson, Historic Development staff, called the roll as follows.

Members Present: Bob Allen, Cart Blackwell (alternate) (*departed 3:51pm*), Catarina Echols, Karrie Maurin, Andre Rathle, Craig Roberts, Joseph Rodrigues, Gypsie Van Antwerp, and Jim Wagoner

Members Absent: Abby Davis, Janelle Adams (alternate), Kimberly Harden, and Kathleen Huffman (alternate)

Staff Members Present: Annie Allen, Bridget Daniel, Christine Dawson, Marion McElroy, and Meredith Wilson

2. Mr. Roberts moved to approve the minutes from the July 20, 2022 meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Blackwell and approved unanimously.
3. Mr. Blackwell moved to approve the Mid-Month COAs Granted by Staff. The motion was seconded by Ms. Van Antwerp and approved unanimously.

MID-MONTH APPROVALS - APPROVED

1. **Applicant: All Weather Roofing & Construction LLC**
 - a. Property Address: 120 Macy Place
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/12/2022
 - c. Project: Reroof (replacing asbestos shingles) with composite shingles in Pewter color.
2. **Applicant: Mobile Medical Museum**
 - a. Property Address: 1664 Spring Hill Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/12/2022
 - c. Project:
 1. Remove old concrete walkway from edge of patio and around front steps to the tree standing in the center of the front lawn of the house (approx. 560 linear feet).
 2. Install new concrete with fiber sidewalk of same length and approximately 4 feet wide.
 3. Install wheelchair-accessible threshold ramp at entrance of French doors on the southern side of the west façade in patio area.
 4. Install AARP-branded signage in vicinity of garden bordering the house, to recognize grant maker.
3. **Applicant: Ethos General Contractors LLC**
 - a. Property Address: 1322 Azalea Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/12/2022
 - c. Project: Reroof (replacing asbestos shingles) with F-Wave Slate Synthetic Roofing shingles. Color: Hampton Estate.

- 4. Applicant: K & J ENTERPRISES LLC**
 - a. Property Address: 410 Wisconsin Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/12/2022
 - c. Project: Reroof with standard 5V crimp metal roofing. New metal roof to cover existing roof.
- 5. Applicant: QPI Services Inc. (PLM)**
 - a. Property Address: 962 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/14/2022 (renewal of COA originally issued on 7/8/2021)
 - c. Project: 1. Demolish non-historic additions to north, east, west, and south elevations.
2. Secure and enclose resulting openings in building while plans are developed for rehabilitation.
- 6. Applicant: Stewart Hanley**
 - a. Property Address: 158 Congress Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/14/2022
 - c. Project: Repaint entire house in-kind.
- 7. Applicant: Teague Construction Systems Inc.**
 - a. Property Address: 57 South Lafayette Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/14/2022
 - c. Project: 1. Replace existing shingles with new GAF "Weathered Wood" high definition asphalt shingles.
2. Replace existing copper flashings with new 24-gauge Kynar-coated steel flashings.
- 8. Applicant: DBK Incorporated**
 - a. Property Address: 961 Texas Street to 950 Texas Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/15/2022 (Reissue of COA originally issued on 6/19/2020)
 - c. Project: 1. Relocate shotgun house at 961 1/2 Texas Street to 950 Texas Street, leaving the two additions.
2. Paint as follows: Body - Fort Morgan Sand; Shutters - Government Street Olive; Porch Decking & Foundation Infill - Spring Hill Brown; Front & Side Doors - Monterey Dark Blue
- 9. Applicant: David Hagan**
 - a. Property Address: 161 South Dearborn Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/15/2022
 - c. Project: Remove front shutters and move them to south elevation to replace rotten shutters. Repaint shutters in-kind. Color: Sherwin Williams Naval SW 6244.
- 10. Applicant: Blackwell Decor Services**
 - a. Property Address: 255 West Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/18/2022
 - c. Project: Repaint trim and front steps; stain front door to match existing. (Trim: SW 7757 High Reflective White; Front Steps: SW 6200 Link Gray; Stain Front Door SW 3505 Yankee Barn).
- 11. Applicant: Chris Doubrava**
 - a. Property Address: 503 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/18/2022
 - c. Project: Replace carriage house roof with roll roofing in-kind.
- 12. Applicant: Chris Doubrava**
 - a. Property Address: 751 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 7/18/2022
 - c. Project: Patch holes where vines have intruded through mortar. Paint exterior to match existing.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2022-40-CA: 1206 Palmetto Street

- a. Applicant: Douglas Kearley on behalf of Robert Burns
- b. Project: Construct two-story addition to rear of house; add balustrade atop front porch

APPROVED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

2. 2022-42-CA: 350 Church Street

- a. Applicant: Benjamin Cummings
- b. Project: Installation of masonry walls and fencing

APPROVED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

3. 2022-43-CA: 926 Conti Street

- a. Applicant: Taylor Atchison
- b. Project: After-the-Fact Approval: Construct 6-8' wood privacy fence parallel to Conti Street

DEFERRED - APPLICANT NOT PRESENT

4. 2022-44-CA: 1703 Dauphin Street

- a. Applicant: Michael Brooks
- b. Project: Reroof with 26-gauge tuff-rib metal

APPROVED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. The next ARB meeting is scheduled for August 17, 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, August 2, 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	1206 Palmetto Street	APPLICATION NO.	2022-40-CA
SUMMARY OF REQUEST	Construct full-width, 2-story addition at rear of house; install porch roof balustrade		
APPLICANT	Douglas Kearley	OWNER, IF OTHER	Robert Burns

HISTORIC DISTRICT	Oakleigh Garden	MEETING DATE	7/20/2022
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.

Per the National Register nomination, the one-story frame house at 1206 Palmetto Street was constructed c. 1905. The property appears on the 1925 Sanborn map (the earliest to capture this portion of the district) as a two-story, square, frame dwelling with a full-width front porch and integral rear stoop. Aerial photographs from 1952 through 1980 show a similar footprint, though small rear additions may have been constructed between 1967 and 1980. The footprint does not appear to have changed since that time.

The property at 1206 Palmetto Street has not appeared previously before the Architectural Review Board (ARB).

SCOPE OF WORK (per submitted application and plans)

1. Construct a full-width, 36'-8" deep, two-story addition to the rear of the house. The four (4) existing additions, including three enclosed porched, and deck would be removed.
 - a. The footprint of the addition would measure approximately 1,161.1 square feet, or approximately 2,322.2 square feet of living area (over two floors).
 - b. The walls would be clad in smooth Hardieplank lap siding to match the existing in size and reveal.
 - c. The cornice and other trim would match the existing.
 - d. The hipped roof, which would encompass the existing roof, would be covered in dimensional fiberglass asphalt shingles to match the existing roofing. The overhangs would match the existing.
 - e. The addition would rest upon a brick pier foundation of the same height as the existing.
 - f. The windows mostly would be the same size as the existing and composed of aluminum-clad wood.
 - g. The east elevation of the addition would appear as follows.
 - 1) Second floor: existing corner board; four (4) evenly spaced one-over-one

- windows
- 2) First floor: one-over-one window at the south end of the addition; aluminum-clad wood French door and transom above, sheltered by hip-roofed canopy at center; one-over-one window towards north end of elevation; inset rear porch
 - a) The east side stoop would be accessed by a set of five (5) wood steps with unelaborated wood handrail and pickets. The landing would rest upon brick piers. The wood canopy would be supported by plain knee brackets.
 - b) The east side of the approximately 5'-deep inset porch would be enclosed by unelaborated wood handrail and pickets. The northeast corner of the porch would be punctuated by an 8"x8" chamfered wood post.
- h. The north elevation would appear as follows.
- 1) Second floor: three (3) evenly spaced one-over-one windows
 - 2) First floor: inset porch occupying the eastern two-thirds of the elevation; paired one-over-one windows at the west end
 - a) The eastern half of the porch would be enclosed by unelaborated wood handrail and pickets with 8" chamfered wood posts at each end.
 - b) A pair of aluminum-clad wood doors with single-light transom would be located at the east and west ends of the porch.
 - c) The porch would be accessed by a set of four wood steps occupying slightly less than half the porch width. The steps would be flanked by handrails to match the east side stoop.
 - 3) Corner boards would adorn the east and west corners.
- i. The west elevation would appear as follows.
- 1) Second floor, from north to south: one-over-one window; fixed, single-light, horizontally oriented, rectangular window towards the south end; 2'-10" high one-over-one window at south end of addition
 - 2) First floor, from north to south: one-over-one window directly below northernmost window on second floor; one-over-one window at center-north; 2'-10" high one-over-one window at center-south; one-over-one window at south end of addition
2. Install new wood handrail on porch roof.
- a. The porch roof would be enclosed by unelaborated wood pickets between four (4) paneled wood newels, placed directly above the existing porch columns.
 - b. The newels would be approximately 3 feet tall and 8" square.

STAFF REPORT

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

1. "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." (6.9)
2. "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.” (6.10)
3. “Design the exterior walls of an addition to be compatible in scale and rhythm with the original historic structure.
 - Design the height of an addition to be proportionate with the historic building, paying particular attention to the foundation and other horizontal elements.
 - Design the addition to express floor heights on the exterior of the addition in a fashion that reflects floor heights of the original historic building.” (6.11)
 4. “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.” (6.12)
 5. “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.
 - 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.” (6.13)
 6. “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.” (6.14)
 7. “Design roofs such that the addition remains subordinate to the existing historic buildings in the district.” (6.15)
 8. “Design doors and doorways to an addition to be compatible with the existing historic building.
 - 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.” (6.16)
 9. “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.” (6.19)
10. “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 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.” (6.20)
11. “Design a window on an addition to be compatible with the original historic building.
- Size, place and space a window for an addition to be in character with the original historic building.
 - ...an aluminum clad wood window may be used, provided it has a profile, dimension, and durability similar to a window in the historic building.” (6.21)
12. “Do not apply architectural details that were not part of the original structure. For example, decorative millwork should not be added to a building if it was not an original feature. Doing so would convey a false history.” (5.19)

B. Staff Analysis

The subject property, 1206 Palmetto Street, was constructed c. 1905 as a foursquare type house; at least four additions were made to the rear of the house, apparently prior to 1980, and at least two porches were infilled as living space. The house is a Contributing property within the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. The application under review involves the construction of a 2-story rear addition and the installation of a railing atop the front porch.

The *Guidelines* offer instruction on designing compatible additions to existing historic structures, stating that additions should be subordinate to and of compatible massing and scale to the original structure. (A.1, 2) The proposed addition would be to the rear of the house, in accordance with the *Guidelines*. The addition would have a footprint of approximately 1,161 square feet, and the existing structure comprises an approximate 1,434-square foot footprint, per the City’s GIS, for a total resulting footprint of 2,595 square feet. Therefore, the addition would almost double the footprint of the existing structure. Regarding scale, the *Guidelines* state, “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.” (A.2) The proposed addition would not be subordinate to the existing structure in massing, as it would essentially double the size of the house, but the house’s footprint would negotiate the footprints of nearby houses, to which additions have been made over the years. Examples include 1208 Palmetto Street (3,071 square feet footprint), 210 Rapier Street (2,308 square feet footprint), and 208 Rapier (2,104 square feet footprint).

The scale would be compatible with the original structure, as required by the *Guidelines*. The scale, defined as the proportions of the elements of a building to one another and the whole (Ward Bucher, ed. *Dictionary of Building Preservation*, 1996), of the proposed addition’s foundation, floor heights, fenestration, and other architectural features would match those of the existing structure, in accordance with the *Guidelines*.

The exterior walls of additions should be compatible in rhythm and materials with the existing structure,

but they also should be clearly distinguishable. (A.4, 5) The exterior walls of the addition would have a similar rhythm of solids to voids (wall to windows/doors) as the existing structure and would be clad in smooth Hardiplank lap siding, an alternative material acceptable for additions in Mobile's historic districts. The point at which the proposed addition meets the existing 1905 structure would be apparent on the west elevation through the retention of the existing corner board, and on the east elevation through retention of the existing corner board on the second floor.

The proposed addition would have a hipped roof created by expanding and raising the roof of the existing house by approximately 2'. The *Guidelines* encourage the use of roofs on additions that are compatible with existing roofs in shape, pitch, level of complexity, covering, and details. (A.6) Appearing as a larger version of the existing roof, the roof of the addition would match the existing in all of these elements. The *Guidelines* further instruct that the roofs of additions should remain subordinate to the existing historic buildings in the district. (A.7) The proposed higher roof would be similar in height to the houses adjacent to the west and east, and the additional height would not be especially perceptible from the ground.

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

The proposed pairs of aluminum-clad French doors that would access the new rear porch would comply with the *Guidelines*, which state, "Design doors and doorways to an addition to be compatible with the existing historic building... Use a door material that is compatible with those of the historic building and the district." (A.10) Aluminum-clad wood doors are an acceptable material in Mobile's historic districts, and though the doors do not resemble the existing doors on the historic house, they would not be visible when viewing any of the historic elevations of the house.

The *Guidelines* state that the windows of additions should be in character with the original historic building in regard to size and spacing. (A.11) The proposed one-over-one aluminum-clad windows on the addition would be regularly spaced, as are those of the existing building, and would match the existing in size, light pattern, and height in the wall. Aluminum-clad wood is an acceptable material for windows in Mobile's historic districts.

No physical or documentary evidence of a previously existing balustrade atop the front porch roof could be located; therefore, the proposed feature would be speculative. The *Guidelines* instruct, "Do not apply architectural details that were not part of the original structure." (A.12) However, such an element has been added to nearby structures without apparent evidence of its previous presence and, therefore, would not constitute an aberration. In 1994, the ARB approved installation of a remarkably similar balustrade on the porch roof across the street from the subject property at 1209 Palmetto Street; this property is also a foursquare type house constructed c. 1905. The c. 1910 house at 252 Rapier Street is almost identical in design to 1206 Palmetto Street, and a balustrade was installed on its front porch roof between 1994 and 2007.

C. Summary of Analysis

- The proposed rear addition to the existing house would not be subordinate to the existing historic building in massing, but it would be compatible in scale. Further, the resulting footprint would be approximately average among nearby houses.
- The rhythm of solids to voids, use of differentiating corner boards, proposed wall cladding material, proposed window and door materials, matching foundation, and compatible roof are in compliance with the *Guidelines*.
- The proposed porch roof balustrade would not be out of character with the existing building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on Section B above, Staff believes the proposed construction of a full-width, 2-story addition at the rear of the house and installation of a porch roof balustrade would not impair the architectural or historic character of the subject building or the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

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

No written comments regarding the application were received from the public; no one was physically present to comment on the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board had no questions or comments.

FINDING OF FACT

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

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Roberts moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, the proposed construction of a full-width, 2-story addition at rear of house and installation of a porch roof balustrade would not impair the architectural or historic character of the subject property or the surrounding district, and a Certificate of Appropriateness should be granted.

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

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

ADDRESS	350 Church Street	APPLICATION NO.	2022-42-CA
SUMMARY OF REQUEST	Construct a masonry wall with iron gate		
APPLICANT	Ben Cummings	OWNER, IF OTHER	Cooper Restaurants, Inc.
HISTORIC DISTRICT	Church Street East	MEETING DATE	08-03-2022
CLASSIFICATION	Contributing	REVIEWER	A. Allen

DISTRICT/PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

Church Street East Historic District was initially listed in the National Register in 1971 under Criteria A (historic significance) and C (architectural significance) for its local significance in the areas of architecture, education, and urban planning. The district is significant for its concentration of multiple 19th century architectural styles and because it encompasses the site of Mobile in the early 1700s. The district boundaries were expanded in 1984 and 2005.

The property at 350 Church street, known as the Chandler House, is a two-and-a-half-story brick stuccoed townhouse structure. Federal in massing with Greek Revival detailing and a two-story cast iron gallery, it was built in 1854-1855 by William P. Carter. The building is a basic rectangular block with a rear offset wing to the east. The 1868 Pillans Ward Map depicts an empty lot at 350 Church Street, owned by W.P. Carter. By 1878, a brick structure of similar form to the existing building had been constructed with the full width front porch and also a rear two-story gallery spanning the rear north and west elevations. The 1891 Sanborn map details the same dwelling on the property with a series of three (3) adjacent accessory structures running along the north western corner of the property. By the 1904 Sanborn map, the smallest and most northern accessory structure no longer appears on the property. By the time of the 1924 Sanborn map, the property was owned by the Chandler family. This map reveals a larger third accessory structure replacing the smaller, extending further east down the north (rear) property line. All accessory structures are nonextant, though it is difficult to determine exactly when they became so. A 1990 alteration enclosed the rear gallery and extended the north (rear) wing.

This property has appeared before the Architectural Review Board (ARB) three (3) times. In 1983, an application was approved to repaint the cast iron. In 1989, a proposed extension of the rear wing was approved. In 1990, a request to install a sign was approved.

SCOPE OF WORK (per submitted application and plans)

1. Construct a masonry wall at the southern (front) property line along Church Street and the eastern property line along Claiborne Street, with a gate positioned on the southern façade which accesses the front entryway of the dwelling.
 - a. Materials: The wall would be constructed of “Old Mobile” brick laid in a running bond pattern with a rowlock course at the top. The proposed portion of the brick wall along the southern (front) property line would be topped with a salvaged iron fence on top. The gate would be of salvaged iron, modified with a square metal frame around a solid sheet metal plate added to its base.

b. Measurements:

The masonry wall proposed for the southern (front) property line along Church Street would extend 118' in length to include the front width of the property directly to the west of 350 Church Street, which is a parking lot owned by the proprietor of 350 Church Street. This length, from west to east, would comprise the following: an existing gate for vehicles (located approximately 14' in from the west end of the wall) with an opening which measures 16'6" and an opening for a gate to access the front entry of the building at 350 Church, which would measure approximately 3'0". This portion of the wall would also extend around the southeast corner of the property and run northward along the east side of the property for 16' where it would abut the solid masonry wall just behind the front plane of the building. The proposed brick portion would be 3'0" high. The salvaged iron fence would add approximately 3'0" to the height, bringing the total height to 6'0".

The masonry wall proposed for the eastern property line along Claiborne Street would begin 16' north of the southeast corner of the property and extend approximately 34'0" northward from the southeast corner of the property to abut the existing structure at its eastern off-set wing and would measure 6'0" high.

STAFF REPORT

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

1. **10.1** Maintain a historically significant fence or masonry site wall.
 - Maintain a historically significant wooden picket or cast-iron fence.
 - Maintain a historically significant stuccoed brick or concrete masonry site wall.
2. **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.
 - 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.

3. **10.3** Design a wall to be compatible with the architectural style of the house and existing walls in the district.
 - When building a solid wall, use a finish and material that is similar in texture, mass and durability to historic walls in the neighborhood.

ACCEPTABLE WALL MATERIALS

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

- Brick
- Stone
- Stucco over masonry

UNACCEPTABLE WALL MATERIALS

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

- Unstuccoed concrete block

B. Staff Analysis

This project proposes the construction of a masonry wall along the south and east sides of the contributing property at 350 Church Street. The materials proposed for the wall – salvaged "Old Mobile" brick and salvaged iron fencing – are congruent with the *Design Guidelines* as they are historically used materials and appropriate to the historic district. (A.1) The design of the proposed wall is consistent with the architectural style of the house and other existing walls in the district, also mandated by the *Guidelines*. (A.3)

Further, the *Guidelines* offer direction regarding heights of fences and walls within historic districts. They state that fences ordinarily should not surpass 36" and "*if combined with a wall, the total vertical dimension of the wall and fence collectively should not exceed 36", or in some cases 48"*." They also direct that a fence located behind the front building plane is not to exceed a height of 72". (A.2)

The proposed design of the wall portion which would run northward from the southeast corner of the property to abut the existing structure at its eastern off-set wing would measure 72" high. Although within the height parameters of the *Guidelines*, the proposed design of this wall would project forward of the building's front plane, which violates the *Guidelines*' directive concerning height and placement. This placement is also a safety concern as the high masonry wall could create a blind corner at the intersection of Church and Claiborne Streets. The wall and fence structure which would run along the front or southern side of the property would have a combined height of approximately 72". This surpasses the height limits imposed by the *Guidelines* for a wall located on a front property line. Given the above-mentioned variances from the *Guidelines*, adjustments to the proposed design could produce a fence more in keeping with the *Guidelines* and the district. With the implementation of these adjustments, a case can be made that a variance concerning the height of the front portion of the wall is appropriate in this instance.

Several examples of walls or wall/fence combinations spanning the street side or front of properties in varying capacities can be found within Mobile's local historic districts. For one, the property across the street from the subject property at 359 Church Street, or the Malaga Inn, which is also a contributing property within the Church Street East Historic District, boasts a stucco wall and iron fence combination, very similar in design to the subject proposal, which spans part of its street front façade and is observably higher than 48". In this case, the wall spans the street front property line of the lot directly to the east of the building lot. Although the wall at 359 Church does not extend in front of the building, it does enclose

an adjacent parking area, as would a portion of the proposed wall at 350 Church Street. A second contributing property within this district at 201 South Warren Street comprises a uniform 72” brick wall along both its front yard west side and its northern side along Monroe Street, where it abuts a projecting wing, in a similar arrangement as the proposed application. In this case, the solid brick wall is more visually restrictive of the historic structure than would be the brick and iron combination proposed for 350 Church Street. Another example exists at 255 State Street in DeTonti Square Historic District, where a solid brick wall runs across the northern front of a one-story façade, then down the western side of the property. It must be noted that the construction of these examples predates the current *Design Guidelines*. They indicate, however, that front yard wall and wall/fence combinations which exceed the 48” height restriction laid out in the present *Guidelines* do exist at contributing properties within Mobile’s historic districts. Further, it can be reasoned that in specific examples such as these, the walls are familiar and established features which do not disrupt the character of the historic properties or the districts.

The ARB recently approved the construction of an 8’ fence with a gate across the front property line at 9 N. Royal Street (September 15, 2021). This property is located in the Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District and is a vacant lot used for parking. Likewise, the western half of the lot at 350 Church Street is used for parking. Furthermore, because the subject structure and surrounding property is used commercially and sits within a section of the district which is commercial and civic in nature, the 36” and 48” height limits listed in the *Guidelines* regarding residential properties within the historic districts are not necessarily strictly applicable in this instance.

C. Summary of Analysis

- The proposed construction of a masonry wall with iron fence falls within the *Guidelines* in regards to materials.
- The southern or front portion of the wall would extend beyond the height restrictions laid out in the *Guidelines*. The eastern portion of the wall projects beyond the building’s front plane, which is not in compliance with the *Guidelines*.
- Within the Church Street East Historic District and other local historic districts, there are several examples of existing front yard walls which exceed the height restrictions laid out in the *Guidelines*. Although most of these examples were constructed prior to the adoption of the present *Design Guidelines*, their existence within Mobile’s historic districts is relevant.
- The commercial and civic nature of the subject property’s immediate surroundings argues for consideration of a variance in regards to the 36” and 48” height limits listed in the *Guidelines*.

STAFF SUGGESTIONS

Staff suggests the following modifications be made to the proposed project:

- Lower the height of the masonry portion of the masonry/iron wall by one-third, not to exceed 60” in total combined height.
- Extend the masonry/iron portion of the wall around the southeastern corner of the property, then northward along the eastern property line to just behind the building’s front wall plane (approximately 16’0”).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on Section B above, Staff believes the proposed construction, as presented, of a masonry and iron wall with a gate at 350 Church Street would impair the architectural or historic character of the existing historic structure and the surrounding district and suggests the aforementioned modifications be applied to

the proposed project. Pending the incorporation of the suggested modifications, Staff recommends approval of the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Cummings was present to discuss the application. He stated that he liked the Staff report in regards to the account of the materials, potential height variances, the commercial nature of the surrounding area, etc. However, he did not agree with the staff suggestion to lower the height of the wall or to bring the front wall design around the southeast corner. He maintained that the proposed design is necessary for privacy and security. He explained the significance of the proposed materials, stating that the brick, which came from Cotton Hall when it was damaged, is already on-site, and the iron was previously part of the property. He added that there are many examples of tall walls in the districts right at the sidewalk, and provided photos of examples.

Mr. Fred Renfrey came forward to submit a letter of support for the project written by Ms. Elizabeth Stevens.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Blackwell cited three (3) examples of pre-1860 houses with these walls. He added that the oldest part of the city of Mobile historically contained tall walls.

Mr. Roberts noted that walls were constructed prior to the creation of historic districts.

Mr. Cummings stated that a 3'0" wall and 3'0" fence on Church street will not hide the façade of the building and that the 6'0" wall on the Claiborne Street side of the property is desired for security.

Mr. Roberts stated his opinion that a 6'0" wall at the corner of Church and Claiborne Streets will not be approved by the City.

Mr. Cummings maintained that the Architectural Review Board approval is the first step in the process and that he would go through all the processes to get approval of the project. However, he doesn't think the wall at the corner creates a safety issue due to the fact that Claiborne Street is one-way and there is a traffic light at the intersection with Church Street.

Mr. Blackwell mentioned the example of old Constantine's site with a similar wall and stated that the ARB has previously approved these types of walls on a site-specific basis.

Mr. Allen stated that, per the ordinance creating the ARB, decisions of the ARB are not to be used as precedent for future decisions. He added that examples presented as 'precedent' aren't actually so. He specified that reason for the decision for the taller wall on Royal Street was the multi-story buildings on either side of the wall. He noted that the Guidelines provide guidance on side fences and those in front of the front plane of the house.

Mr. Blackwell stated that there are surviving examples of walls higher walls than permitted under the *Guidelines* that date from the era of this property.

Mr. Allen stated that those examples were there before the Guidelines and for whatever reason weren't deemed appropriate.

Mr. Blackwell stated that the Guidelines cover a huge area and don't consider the unique design of this specific historic downtown area and these unique cases. Ms. Echols agreed with Mr. Blackwell's statement.

Ms. Maurin stated that the *Guidelines* are just that – guidelines - a set of values of the community. She stated that she does not like the placement of the Claiborne Street portion of the wall.

Mr. Cummings stated that the owners desire privacy from cars stopped waiting for the light while they are sitting on their front porch. He maintained that the house remains open and visible on Church Street, just blocked from view on Claiborne Street for security reasons.

Mr. Roberts asked if the bricks would be painted. Mr. Cummings stated that the bricks would be left natural.

Ms. Maurin suggested vegetative screening instead of the 6'0" wall running all the way to the southeast corner.

Mr. David Cooper (owner) stated that he is anxious for security. He noted that there is an 8'0" fence at the Carnival Museum. He stated that there were plans to plant some trees at 350 Church Street. He added that after hearing the discussion, the staff suggestions make sense.

Mr. Roberts observed that Staff were offering a compromise.

Mr. Cooper stated that turning the corner with the brick/iron portion of the fence yet maintaining its proposed height makes sense. He added that his desire was also to protect the original windows from the Mardi Gras throws during the parade season.

Mr. Cummings stated his agreement to revise the application as Staff suggested in regards to extending the brick/iron portion of the wall around the southeast corner and northward behind the front wall plane of the building.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Blackwell moved to accept the revised application, noting historic examples in the area and the unique situation of this property – meaning the *Guidelines* cover a broad area with three (3) districts that comprise an urban location which has historically included wall designs which would not be appropriate to other historic districts and are not specifically addressed in the current *Guidelines*.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Wagoner seconded and passed on an 8-1 basis .with Mr. Allen opposed)

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Blackwell moved that, based on the revised application to include the change of design suggested in the Staff report, the existence of historic examples in the Church Street East and other downtown Mobile districts, and the unique nature of the property, the proposed construction of a masonry and iron fence and a fully masonry wall would not impair the historic or architectural character of the subject property or the surrounding district and a Certificate of Appropriateness should be granted.

Mr. Wagoner seconded the motion, and it was passed on a 7-2 basis, with Mr. Allen and Ms. Maurin opposed.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

ADDRESS	1703 Dauphin	APPLICATION NO.	2022-44-CA
SUMMARY OF REQUEST	Reroof with 26-gauge tuff-rib metal.		
APPLICANT	Michael Brooks	OWNER, IF OTHER	
HISTORIC DISTRICT	Old Dauphin Way	MEETING DATE	8/3/2022
CLASSIFICATION	Contributing	REVIEWER	J. Sledge

DISTRICT/PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

Old Dauphin Way Historic District was initially listed in the National Register in 1984 under Criteria A and 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 and an implementation of less locally-driven housing in the interwar period. It includes “fine examples of commercial, institutional, and religious structures as well as 20th century apartments” and picturesque neighborhoods that interrupt the city’s various grids.

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 ODW became a historic district in 1984, this house exhibited a brick veneer first-story façade and infilled inset porch alongside. On September 12, 1989 owners received a Midmonth approval to remove this unsympathetic work and restore original bay window and inset porch. A decade later, the MHDC Marking 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. The existing roofing appears to date to the 1940s.

This property appeared before the Architectural Review Board (ARB) once before. In October 2007 the ARB approved an application to extend existing fences.

SCOPE OF WORK (per submitted application and communications)

1. Reroof with 26-gauge tuff-rib metal.

STAFF REPORT

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

1. “Repair and maintain original roof materials rather than replace them, whenever possible.
 - Patch and replace damaged areas of an existing roof.
 - Retain and repair roof detailing, including gutters and downspouts.” (5.12)
2. “Use new roof materials that convey a scale and texture similar to those used traditionally.

- Use materials that are consistent with the architectural style of the structure.
- Use materials with a similar texture, pattern, and finish to the original.

Metal Roofs

If installing a new metal roof, apply and detail it in a manner that is compatible with the historic character of the roof, period, and style.

- Use standing-seam metal, metal shingles, or five v-crimp.
- Use metal with a matte, non-reflective finish.
- Install the roof to have low-profile seams.
- Finish roof edges in a similar fashion to those seen traditionally.
- Materials that are the same as the original, or that appear similar in texture, pattern, finish, and color range to the original are acceptable. These often include slate, tile, metal when consistent with the period and style of the building, dimensional shingles (asphalt, fiberglass, cement fiber, wood), built-up or membrane roof on gently sloping roofs (less than 3:12) where hidden from view, lead, copper, and other materials original to the building.” (5.13)

B. Staff Analysis

The subject property, 1703 Dauphin Street, is a Contributing property within the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The application under review involves replacing the existing asbestos shingle roofing with 26-gauge tuff-rib metal roofing.

The *Guidelines* instruct that replacement roofing should “convey a scale and texture similar to those used traditionally.” New materials should be consistent with the architectural style of the structure and have a similar texture, pattern, and finish to the original. (A.2) The proposed replacement of an asbestos shingled roof with metal roofing would seem to be inconsistent with this directive. While that is true of modern ribbed roofing with boxy joints, it does not obtain with standing seam or 5-V crimp styles of galvalume panels. The history of metal roofing material should be considered with those latter styles in mind.

5-V crimp galvanized metal is of longstanding popularity for residential usage in the United States. It appears to have first been manufactured in Britain in 1850, and by the 1890s American roofing companies were referring to it as “old style.” It may have been inspired as an imitation of the more expensive and difficult to install standing-seam metal (which Thomas Jefferson had on Monticello), but in any case it rapidly achieved success for its light weight, ease of application (Montgomery Ward’s catalog claimed that it could be installed “by anybody who can drive a nail”), and low cost. In its January 24, 1895 issue, for example, *The Iron Age* (published in New York) noted the expansion of the Jeffersonville (Ind.) Corrugating and Roofing Co. and emphasized that it would pay “most attention to corrugated and V-crimped roofing.” The material was widely advertised in late the 19th and early 20th century and was readily deliverable via the nation’s expanding railroads. In 1910 the Sears Roebuck Co. declared that the sales of V-crimp metal roofing exceeded those of all other styles combined, and Sweet’s Catalog of Building Construction (1913 edition) stated that V-crimp tin roofs were easy to repair, not affected by heat or cold, and lost “nothing in appearance with age.” This 1890-1920 period of popularity also coincided with the heyday of the Queen Anne style. Cheap metal roofing was seen as preferable to wood shingles for houses, especially in urban settings like Mobile, where devastating fires periodically swept downtown during the early 19th century and even as late as 1919. As the twentieth century approached, local builder/architects increasingly resorted to metal roofs, including standing-seam, tin plate (shingles), and 5-V crimp.

Given the historical appropriateness of metal roofs to various architectural styles (standing seam on Italianate, Greek Revival, and Victorian; metal shingles on Victorian; and 5-V crimp on Victorian, Four Square, and Vernacular styles) the ARB has long approved their use (usually on a mid-month basis) and numerous examples are dotted throughout the historic districts. 1703 Dauphin is a perfectly acceptable candidate for a metal roof, provided it is used in 5-V crimp or standing seam panels, as opposed to the ribbed panels. This style looks significantly different curb-side than the older styles and is not appropriate because of the boxy joints.

C. Summary of Analysis

- Standing seam or 5V-crimp metal roofs are appropriate on houses of this period.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on Section B above, Staff believes the proposed application of 26-gauge tuff-rib metal roofing would not impair the architectural or historic character of the subject property or the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Michael Brooks was present to discuss the application. He stated that 24” o.c. trusses are required for fortified roofing; however, the trusses at 1703 Dauphin are of varying measurements. He continued that the roofing is hardly visible from the street and submitted photos of examples of other houses in the historic district with the same roofing as proposed in the application. He also stated that he is open to either a black or galvanized (silver) finish.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Blackwell departed prior to consideration of this application.

The Board had no questions or comments.

FINDING OF FACT

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

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Wagoner moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, the proposed reroofing with 26-gauge tuff-rib metal 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

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Ms. Dawson stated that the appeal to the Board's decision on a COA application for 518 Dauphin Street would be heard at the August 23rd City Council meeting and asked that a Board member be present at this appeal.

2. Ms. Dawson reminded the Board of a poll which was sent out to determine dates for sessions to examine the use of alternative materials and to evaluate the relevant *Guidelines*.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:10pm.