

**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
MINUTES
December 7, 2022 – 3:00 P.M.
Assembly Room, Government Plaza
205 Government Street**

A. CALL TO ORDER

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

Members Present: Cart Blackwell (alternate), Abby Davis, Catarina Echols, Craig Roberts, Joseph Rodrigues, and Andre Rathle

Members Absent: Janelle Adams (alternate), Bob Allen, Kimberly Harden, Kathleen Huffman (alternate), Karrie Maurin, Jim Wagoner, and Gypsie Van Antwerp

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

2. Mr. Blackwell moved to approve the minutes from November 16, 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 seconded by Mr. Blackwell and approved unanimously.

MID-MONTH APPROVALS - APPROVED

1. Applicant: Tuff Shed, Inc.

- a. Property Address: 18 Semmes Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 11/8/2022
- c. Project: Place a 12'x20' portable prefabricated shed clad in smart siding, topped with a gable roof clad in dimensional shingles, and placed on a concrete slab. Fenestration will consist of an 8' high by 7' wide aluminum roll-up canister Door, a six-panel steel entry door, and a 3'x3' aluminum insulated slide window. Paint colors: body: Sheffield Gray, trim: Delicate White

2. Applicant: Christopher Construction Group LLC

- a. Property Address: 1500 Brown Street
- b. Date of Approval: 11/8/2022
- c. Project: Reroof in-kind with architectural shingles. Color: Black

3. Applicant: Robert Dueitt Construction LLC

- a. Property Address: 1056 Palmetto Street
- b. Date of Approval: 11/9/2022
- c. Project: Repair rotten wood around windows and repaint house in-kind (color: Sherwin Williams White)

4. Applicant: M&T Construction & Painting LLC

- a. Property Address: 207 Michigan Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 11/14/2022
- c. Project: Replace damaged siding in-kind on north elevation. Repaint using Monterey Dark Blue and Church Street Gray (trim).

5. Applicant: Lucy Barr Designs

- a. Property Address: 254 N Jackson Street
- b. Date of Approval: 11/14/2022
- c. Project: Construct a carport/garage structure at rear of property, topped by a gabled roof clad in shingles to match the existing dwelling. The structure will be clad in Hardie board vertical siding with Hardie board lap siding within the end gables. Paint colors: body: white; columns: Old Mobile Dark Green.

6. Applicant: James Rodriguez

- a. Property Address: 259 McDonald Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 11/14/2022
- c. Project: Reroof in-kind with architectural shingles (GAF Timberline). Color: Shakeswood

7. Applicant: All Weather Roofing & Construction LLC

- a. Property Address: 1410 Eslava Street
- b. Date of Approval: 11/14/2022
- c. Project: Reroof in-kind using architectural Landmark shingles; color: charcoal

8. Applicant: Heyer Enterprises

- a. Property Address: 1101 Montauk Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 11/15/2022
- c. Project: Construct a 16'x9' screened porch on the rear (south) elevation. Structure will be topped with a galvalume shed roof. The foundation will be clad in wood skirting.

9. Applicant: E.C. Latham & Co. - Designers

- a. Property Address: 13 S. Monterey Street
- b. Date of Approval: 11/16/2022
- c. Project: Construct a 13'-0"x9'-10" addition to east/rear elevation of the dwelling. Addition will be clad in Hardie board siding and topped with a standing-seam metal shed roof. Windows will be wood or aluminum-clad. Paint colors to match the existing structure.

10. Applicant: Tuff Shed, Inc

- a. Property Address: 457 Chatham Street
- b. Date of Approval: 11/17/2022
- c. Project: Place a 10'x20' prefabricated accessory structure to the rear of the primary dwelling on a concrete slab foundation. The structure will be clad in horizontal cement lap siding and topped by a gable roof clad in dimensional shingles (color: charcoal). Fenestration will consist of one 6'-8"x3' steel entry door and aluminum windows. Paint colors: body: Dover Gray; trim: Delicate White

11. Applicant: Franchise Management Services, Inc.

- a. Property Address: 264 Park Terrace
- b. Date of Approval: 11/17/2022
- c. Project: Reroof in-kind with Certified Landmark shingles. Color: Charcoal

12. Applicant: All Weather Roofing & Construction LLC

- a. Property Address: 356 Charles Street
- b. Date of Approval: 11/17/2022
- c. Project: Reroof in-kind using Architectural Landmark shingles. Color: pewter

13. Applicant: Victoria Mauldin

- a. Property Address: 1155 Caroline Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 11/18/2022
- c. Project:
 1. Replace roof in-kind with architectural shingles. Color: charcoal.
 2. Repaint frame exterior. Color: White
 3. Repaint deck on porch. Color: Grey
 4. Repair in-kind any existing rotten wood siding, decking, etc.
 5. Remove non-historic screen and framing on front (north façade) elevation

14. Applicant: John Cocke, IV

- a. Property Address: 6 S. Pine Street
- b. Date of Approval: 11/22/2022
- c. Project: Install board-and-batten Hardie siding over existing Masonite siding.

15. Applicant: Pigeons on the Roof, LLC

- a. Property Address: 54 Houston Street
- b. Date of Approval: 11/28/2022
- c. Project: Reroof with 26-gauge galvalume tough rib metal

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2022-73-CA: 28 Lee Street

- a. Applicant: Ben Cummings on behalf of First Light Community
- b. Project: Construct rear addition; site improvements

APPROVED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

2. 2022-62-CA: 1452 Government Street

- a. Applicant: Adams Stewart Architects/ Jason Shipp
- b. Project: New construction: one-story office building

APPROVED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

3. 2022-74-CA: 1155 Caroline Street

- a. Applicant: D&V Homes, LLC/Victoria Mauldin
- b. Project: Demolish rear screened porch

APPROVED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

D. OTHER BUSINESS

- 1. The next ARB meeting is scheduled for December 21, 2022.

Public comment regarding items on this agenda will be accepted via e-mail (mhdc@cityofmobile.org) or USPS (Mobile Historic Development Commission, P.O. Box 1827, Mobile, AL 36633) until 5PM on Tuesday, December 6, 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	28 Lee Street	APPLICATION NO.	2022-73-CA
SUMMARY OF REQUEST	Addition to west (rear) elevation; site improvements		
APPLICANT	Ben Cummings/Cummings Architecture	OWNER, IF OTHER	Marty O'Malley/First Light Community
HISTORIC DISTRICT	Old Dauphin Way	MEETING DATE	12/07/2022
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 dwelling at 28 Lee Street is a Craftsman bungalow with Tudor Revival detailing. The structure does not appear on the 1904 Sanborn Map. The 1925 Sanborn Map depicts the structure’s form as it appears today. This property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board.

SCOPE OF WORK (per submitted application and communication)

1. Remove existing non-historic deck on west (rear) elevation of structure.
2. Construct an addition on west (rear) elevation.
 - a. The proposed addition would measure 28’-7” wide by 18’-4” deep with a 5’ wide inset at the eastern end of the north and south elevations. The addition would be topped with a gable roof which would extend from the original roof and match the existing pitch, slope and eaves.
 - b. The structure would be clad in Hardie plank horizontal siding, with board and batten Hardie board placed above the cornice in the west gable, to match the existing trim in the east (front) gable. Both the horizontal siding and board and batten will be painted to match the existing color scheme.
 - c. Fenestration would consist of five (5) aluminum clad insulated one-over-one windows measuring 5’-6” by 3’-0” and one (1) wood pane-and-panel door measuring 7’-0” by 3’-6”, which would be painted to match the existing doors.
 - d. The foundation would be of cinder blocks clad in a stucco finish, to match existing.
 - e. Elevations of the addition would appear as follows:
 - West elevation (from north to south)
Four (4) windows regularly spaced across the elevation
 - North Elevation (from east to west)
One (1) door centered in the 5’-0” recessed bay; no fenestration is proposed for the remaining bay.
 - South Elevation (from west to east)

- No fenestration is proposed for the far western bay; one (1) window centered in the 5'-0" recessed bay.
3. Construct a new wood framed ramp and steps on the northern end of the west elevation.
 - a. A proposed landing measuring approximately 5'-5" wide and projecting approximately 3' off the northern wall would be constructed off the entry door located in the northern recessed portion of the addition. Two sets of stairs with three (3) steps measuring 3'-0" wide would descend from the east and west sides of the landing. A ramp 5'-0" long by 3'-0" wide would descend from the north side of the landing to a second landing, which would measure 5'-0" by 5'-0". A second ramp measuring 8'-9" long and 3'-0" wide would descend eastward from this landing to ground level.
 - b. The balustrade proposed for the steps and ramp would consist of evenly spaced newel posts topped by a handrail, with pickets spaced evenly between them. The railing height would be 3'-0" on the landing, steps, and ramps.
 4. Pour a concrete parking pad to the north of the existing dwelling. The parking pad would extend and infill the existing two-track driveway to the west and provide parking for two vehicles at the north side of the property.

STAFF REPORT

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

1. **6.9** Place an addition so that it is subordinate to the historic residential structure.
 - Place and design an addition to the rear or side of the historic building wherever possible.
 - Place a vertical addition in the rear so it is not visible from the street.
2. **6.10** Design an addition to be compatible in massing and scale with the original historic structure.
 - Design the massing of an addition to appear subordinate to the historic building.
 - Where feasible, use a lower-scale connecting element to join an addition to a historic structure.
 - Where possible, match the foundation and floor heights of an addition to those of the historic building.
3. **6.11** Design the exterior walls of an addition to be compatible in scale and rhythm with the original historic structure.
 - Design the height of an addition to be proportionate with the historic building, paying particular attention to the foundation and other horizontal elements.
 - Design the addition to express floor heights on the exterior of the addition in a fashion that reflects floor heights of the original historic building.
4. **6.12** Clearly differentiate the exterior walls of an addition from the original historic structure.
 - Use a physical break or setback from the original exterior wall to visually separate the old from new.
 - Use an alteration in the roofline to create a visual break between the original and new, but ensure that the pitches generally match.
5. **6.13** Use exterior materials and finishes that are comparable to those of the original historic residential structure in profile, dimension and composition. Modern building materials will be evaluated for appropriateness or compatibility with the original historic structure on an individual basis, with the objective of ensuring the materials are similar in their profile, dimension, and composition to those of the original historic structure.
 - Utilize an alternative material for siding as necessary, such as cement-based fiber board, provided that it matches the siding of the historic building in profile, character and finish.
 - Use a material with proven durability.
 - Use a material with a similar appearance in profile, texture and composition to those on the

- original building.
- Choose a color and finish that matches or blends with those of the historic building.
 - Do not use a material with a composition that will impair the structural integrity and visual character of the building.
 - Do not use a faux stucco application.
6. **6.14** Design a roof of an addition to be compatible with the existing historic building.
 - Design a roof shape, pitch, material and level of complexity to be similar to those of the existing historic building.
 - Incorporate overhanging exposed rafters, soffits, cornices, fascias, frieze boards, moldings or other elements into an addition that are generally similar to those of the historic building.
 - Use a roofing material for an addition that matches or is compatible with the original historic building and the district.
 7. **6.15** Design roofs such that the addition remains subordinate to the existing historic buildings in the district.
 - Where possible, locate a dormer or skylight on a new addition in an inconspicuous location.
 - In most cases, match a roof and window on a dormer to those of the original building.
 8. **6.16** Design doors and doorways to an addition to be compatible with the existing historic building.
 - If a historic door is removed to accommodate the addition, consider reusing it on the addition.
 - Design a door and doorway to be compatible with the historic building.
 - Use a door material that is compatible with those of the historic building and the district.
 - Use a material with a dimensionality (thickness) and appearance similar to doors on the original historic building.
 - Design the scale of a doorway on an addition to be in keeping with the overall mass, scale and design of the addition as a whole.
 9. **6.19** Design piers, foundations and foundation infill on a new addition to be compatible with those on the historic building.
 - Match the foundation of an addition to that of the original.
 - Use a material that is similar to that of the historic foundation.
 - Match foundation height to that of the original historic building.
 - Use pier foundations if feasible and if consistent with the original building.
 - Do not use raw concrete block or wood posts on a foundation.
 10. **6.20** Use details that are similar in character to those on the historic structure.
 - Match a detail on an addition to match the original historic structure in profile, dimension and material.
 - Use ornamentation on an addition that is less elaborate than that on the original structure.
 - Use a material for details on an addition that match those of the original in quality and feel.
 - Match the proportions of details on an addition to match the proportions used on the original historic structure.
 11. **6.21** Design a window on an addition to be compatible with the original historic building.
 - Size, place and space a window for an addition to be in character with the original historic building.
 12. **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.

B. Staff Analysis

The application under review proposes the construction of a one-story addition to the west (rear) elevation of the historic structure at 28 Lee Street.

The *Guidelines* call for an addition to an existing historic structure to be subordinate to the main structure in both placement and size. The proposed plans comply with this guideline in that the addition is located off the rear elevation and measures approximately 525 square feet, which is less than a third of that of the original structure. (A.1) As mandated by the *Guidelines*, the massing, scale, rhythm and roof design are all compatible with the original structure. The proposed addition is not only smaller in footprint, but also is visibly subordinate to the main structure with the implementation of the recessed, creating a break from the original north and south elevations. Along with the recess, the use of a different cladding fabric for the addition differentiates it from the historic structure as directed by the *Guidelines* (A.4).

In accordance with the *Guidelines*, the fenestration and foundation of the proposed addition are all comparable to those of the original structure and complement its character and style. The proposed one-over-one windows, pane-and-panel door, horizontal and board and batten siding are all elements which are compatible with the original house and complement its character and style. Likewise, the proposed fenestration patterns of placement are in keeping with the character of the structure (A. 5, 8-11). Further, matching the ceiling, floor heights, and roof slope to those of the existing serves to maintain the scale and provide compatibility with the original structure, also mandated by the *Guidelines* (A.2, 3,6,7).

C. Summary of Analysis

- The application proposes an addition to the west (rear) elevation with the construction of new frame wood steps and ramp on the northern end of the addition.
- The proposed addition is in compliance with the *Guidelines* in regards to placement, scale, and rhythm.
- The proposed addition is appropriately differentiated from the original structure with the use of a hyphen and alternate cladding materials.
- The materials, design elements, and fenestration patterns proposed for the addition are also in compliance with the *Guidelines*.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on Section B above, Staff believes the proposed construction of a one-story addition to the west (rear) elevation, addition of wooden exterior steps and ramps, and expansion of the driveway and parking area of 28 Lee Street would not impair the architectural or historic character of the existing historic structure or the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Ms. Sydney Boteler was present to discuss the application. She stated she had nothing to add.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Roberts asked why lap siding was used in the proposed design as opposed to stucco, as understandably brick would have been difficult to match to the original.

Ms. Boteler responded that stucco was not considered but lap siding was chosen due to its affordability and appropriateness.

Mr. Blackwell stated that there are other bungalows in the neighborhood with lap-sided additions to the rear.

Ms. Echols stated that board and batten would be a more congruent choice but is not required.

Mr. Rodrigues noted that the proposed new windows do not completely match the existing. Ms. Echols stated that the two windows being removed could be reused on the addition.

FINDING FACT

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

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Blackwell moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, the construction of an addition at 28 Lee Street would not impair the architectural or historic character of the subject properties or surrounding district, and a Certificate of Appropriateness should be granted with the specification that the use of stucco or board and batten is acceptable to be considered, along with the reuse of original windows, all to be overseen by Staff.

Mr. Rodrigues 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	12/07/2022
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 appeared twice before the Architectural Review Board. In 2011, an application to construct a single tenant commercial building was approved but was never constructed. In October 2022, this application was put before the Architectural Review Board. The Board requested that the applicant meet with a Design Review Committee to discuss making some adjustments to the proposed design. The Design Review Committee met with the applicant on November 4, 2022.

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’-10” from the Government Street right-of-way (ROW). The west and east side yard setbacks would be 51’-7” and approximately 25’-11 ¼”, 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) sections, all clad in architectural asphalt shingles of Georgetown Gray color. From east to west, the first two sections would be hipped, with the

third section comprised of an east facing gable sitting on a hipped roof. The ridge heights of each section from east to west would be as follows: 22'-0", 32'-1", and 29'-10".

- e. The eave height would be 12'-8".
- f. Fenestration material: All windows would be aluminum-clad and measure 3'-7" wide by 7'-4" high. Doors would be impact rated 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 cascading 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 third bay would measure 30'-2" wide.

Fenestration on each section (from west to east) would appear as follows:

- a) The first bay would comprise a 12'-0" wide projecting pedimented gable supported by a pair of brick pilasters measuring 1'-8 1/2" each, and connected to the façade by a roof projection. The gable would be clad in 6" Hardie siding and articulated with wood trim. One (1) six-over-six single-hung window flanked by wood fixed, louvered shutters with decorative dogs and hinges would be centered within the recess created by the projecting gable. Equally spaced on either side of the gable would be a six-over-six single-hung window flanked by wood fixed, louvered shutters with decorative dogs and hinges.
- b) The second bay would consist of the following, regularly spaced across the bay : One (1) six-over-six single-hung window flanked by wood fixed, louvered shutters with decorative dogs and hinges; one (1) paneled entry door (measuring 7'-0" high by 3'-8" wide) with multi-pane sidelights and transom located under a pedimented portico supported by 24" square columns with Tuscan base and capitals, and connected to the façade by a roof projection; two (2) six-over-six single-hung windows, each flanked by wood fixed, louvered shutters with decorative dogs and hinges.
- c) The third bay would comprise one (1) 3'-0" x 7'-0" paneled door topped with a two-light transom and sheltered by a metal Juliet awning supported by scrolled brackets. One (1) six-over-six single-hung window flanked by wood fixed, louvered shutters with decorative dogs and hinges. The door and window would be located toward the east and west ends of the bay.

2) North Elevation

From east to west, the north elevation would comprise four (4) six-over-six 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 paneled doors with four-light transom; three (3) six-over-six 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 projecting pedimented gable and the pedimented portico 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) six-over-six single-hung windows, dispersed across the sidewall, each flanked by wood fixed, louvered shutters with decorative dogs and hinges. The upper gable portion of the roof would be clad in Hardie siding and articulated with wood bed mold trim, to match the two pedimented gables on the southern façade.

- 4) West Elevation
From north to south, the west elevation would comprise four six-over-six single-hung windows, regularly dispersed across the sidewall, each flanked by wood fixed, louvered shutters with decorative dogs and hinges; the sidewall of the westernmost projecting bay on the façade and the western profile of the projecting pedimented gable and pilasters on the southern façade.
- i. Site considerations would include:
 - 1) Landscaping comprising some existing trees, new trees, shrubs and ground covers installed predominantly around the periphery of the property and near the building. A hedgerow would be installed between the paved/parking area along the southern façade and the adjacent public sidewalk.
 - 2) An 8'-0" shadow box style wood fence would be installed across the north (rear) property line.
 - 3) Paved parking areas would be provided to the north and south of the building. Drive lanes would be provided on all four sides of the building. Vehicular entry to and egress from the property would be permitted via a curb cut on the Lafayette Street (east) side of the property, and egress only would be provided on the Etheridge (west) side of the property.

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 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. To provide an appropriate transition between the subject commercial property and the rear adjacent historic residences, the applicant is proposing to install an 8'-0" fence across the north (rear) property line.

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 handicapped) to be installed at the front of the building, which is not in compliance with this guideline. However, this front parking is required in order to provide adequate parking spaces under the zoning code and allow for appropriate traffic flow. The design provides sufficient landscaping in the form of trees and hedgerows 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 applicant has altered the previously proposed plan to incorporate Staff suggestions providing a buffer between the proposed commercial development at 1452 Government Street and the two rear adjacent residential properties in the form of a proposed 8'-0" shadow box style wood fence, which would run across the north (rear) property line.
- After meeting with the Design Review Committee on November 4, 2022, the applicant further incorporated design changes to the building to comply with the Board's suggestion to create a more stylistically appropriate building design for this area of Government Street by incorporating more historically derived elements and features which reflect the many examples of high-profile architecture in the surrounding neighborhood. The stylistic changes to the proposed design include projecting pedimented gables with pilasters and columns, door designs, window pane configuration, reconfiguration of roof line on the east end, lintel and sill ornamentation, etc.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on Section B above, Staff believes the proposed construction of a one-story commercial office building at 1452 Government Street would not impair the architectural or historic character of surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Jason Shipp and Mr. Todd Stewart were present to discuss the application. They stated that they had nothing to add.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Roberts asked if the proposed privacy fence was 6'-0" or 8'-0".

Mr. Shipp responded that the fence would be 8'-0".

Mr. Blackwell verified with Staff that the revised design is agreeable to what was discussed in the Design Review Committee.

Ms. Dawson replied that it is.

Mr. Roberts stated that the 8'-0" fence cannot run up to the street front beyond the front plane of neighboring houses. That the fence must step down to 4'-0" from just behind the front plane to the street.

Ms. Echols verified that the windows would be aluminum clad.

Mr. Shipp responded that they would.

FINDING 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 one-story commercial building at 1452 Government Street would not impair the architectural or historic character of the surrounding district, and a Certificate of Appropriateness should be granted with the stipulation that the rear 8'-0" fence include a step-down to 4'-0" at the front plane of the neighboring house.

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

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

ADDRESS	1155 Caroline Avenue	APPLICATION NO.	2022-74-CA
SUMMARY OF REQUEST	Demolish screened porch addition on south (rear) elevation.		
APPLICANT	Victoria Mauldin/D&V Homes, LLC	OWNER, IF OTHER	
HISTORIC DISTRICT	Old Dauphin Way	MEETING DATE	12/07/2022
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 property at 1155 Caroline Avenue is a frame one-story Craftsman Bungalow with a gable roof and a porch spanning the northern façade with brick knee wall and end columns. Craftsman style elements include twelve-over-one and sixteen-over-one windows, exposed rafters and decorative brick work. Although an exact construction date is unknown, the dwelling does not appear on the 1904 Sanborn Map but is present on the 1925 map. Considering this evidence and the style of the building, it can be reasonably deduced to have been built c.1925. The form of the building on the 1925 Sanborn Map shows a rear projecting wing which no longer exists. In addition, at some point, a screened porch with a shed roof was added across the south (rear) elevation. According to aerial photographs, the projecting rear wing is present in 1952 but appears is no longer extant in the subsequent 1967 photograph. Therefore, the screened porch was likely added between 1952 and 1967.

This property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board.

SCOPE OF WORK (per submitted application and communication)

1. Demolish the shed-roof porch addition located on the south elevation of the dwelling.
2. Enclose and secure all resulting exposed portions of the structure with plywood sheathing in preparation for further rehabilitation of the property.
3. Remove debris from site.

STAFF REPORT

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

Demolition Guidelines 12.0

1. Consider the current significance of a structure previously determined to be historic
2. Consider the condition of the structure in question. Demolition may be more appropriate when a building is deteriorated or in poor condition

Impact on the street

3. Consider whether the building is one of the last remaining positive examples of its kind in the neighborhood, county, or region.
4. Consider the impact that demolition will have on surrounding structures, including neighboring properties, properties on the same block or across the street or properties throughout the individual historic district.
5. Consider whether the building is part of an ensemble of historic buildings that create a neighborhood.

Nature of Proposed Development

6. Consider the future utilization of the site.

B. Staff Analysis

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

The addition proposed for demolition at 1155 Caroline Avenue is a shed roof screened porch which spans the south (rear) elevation of the dwelling. Although the porch is historic, in that it has been extant for over fifty years, it is not original to the property, nor does it contribute to the historic or architectural integrity of the dwelling or of the surrounding district. Also, the addition is in a state disrepair and rot. Located on the rear elevation, the addition is subordinate in size to the rest of the structure. The building is an inner block dwelling, so the addition is not visible from the street. Therefore, its demolition will not impair the surrounding district. (A.1-5)

After demolition of the porch, the site would continue to be used as a residential property. The applicant is in the beginning stages of rehabilitating the building and plans to move forward with other projects to improve and preserve the property. (A.6)

C. Summary of Analysis

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on Section B above, Staff believes the demolition of the rear addition at 1155 Caroline Avenue would not impair the architectural or historic character of the property or the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board had no questions or comments.

FINDING 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 demolition of a rear screened porch addition at 1155 Caroline Avenue would not impair the architectural or historic character of the subject property or surrounding district, and a Certificate of Appropriateness should be granted.

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

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Mr. Chris Hines was present to provide an update to the Board on 203 Marine Street window replacement project. He stated that no filler was used around the windows and that the custom muntins made a significant difference in the appearance of the window. He suggested that no filler be used around the windows and that a thicker sash may be needed. He added that in his opinion, the option to use argon gas is an up-sale tactic by the vendor that gives the glass a greenish tint and does not make a significant difference in insulation.
2. Mr. Roberts brought to the Board's attention two properties which do not appear to be carrying out projects in compliance with their COA's approved scopes of work and asked that Staff take a look at them. These include 336 S. Monterey Street and 280 Chatham Street.

Ms. Dawson stated that she has a planned site visit for 280 Chatham Street.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:34pm.

