

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
February 1, 2023 – 3:00 P.M.
Assembly Room, Government Plaza
205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Acting Chair, Mr. Craig Roberts, called the meeting to order at 3:00 pm. Christine Dawson, Historic Development staff, called the roll as follows.

Members Present: Bob Allen, Cart Blackwell (alternate), Abby Davis, Karrie Maurin, Andre Rathle, Craig Roberts, and Joseph Rodrigues

Members Absent: Janelle Adams (alternate), Catarina Echols, Kimberly Harden, Kathleen Huffman (alternate), Gypsie Van Antwerp, and Jim Wagoner

Staff Members Present: Annie Allen, Christine Dawson, John Sledge, and Kim Thomas

2. Mr. Blackwell moved to approve the minutes from January 18, 2023 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 Ms. Davis and approved unanimously.

B. MID-MONTH APPROVALS - APPROVED

1. Applicant: Integrity Maintenance LLC

- a. Property Address: 114 N. Julia Street
- b. Date of Approval: 1/10/2023
- c. Project: Replace front and rear entry door in-kind.

2. Applicant: Joshua Jernigan

- a. Property Address: 34 Lee Street
- b. Date of Approval: 1/12/2023
- c. Project: 1. Reroof in-kind with laminate shingles in charcoal color.
2. Replace some rotten wood siding boards then paint the siding & the remainder of the exterior to match.

3. Applicant: Mark Horn

- a. Property Address: 105 S. Georgia Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 1/13/2023
- c. Project: Reroof in-kind with Landmark asphalt shingles. Color: Gray/Charcoal

4. Applicant: Darrel J. Williams

- a. Property Address: 308 St. Louis Street, Unit 204
- b. Date of Approval: 1/17/2023
- c. Project: Replace two (2) sets of paired windows on the second floor of the Claiborne Street elevation and two (2) fixed windows on the second floor of the St. Anthony Street elevation with aluminum clad windows with similar light pattern to the existing and a bronze finish, per submitted plans and specifications.

5. Applicant: Darrel J. Williams

- a. Property Address: 308 St. Louis Street, Unit 203
- b. Date of Approval: 1/17/2023
- c. Project: Replace one (1) set of paired windows on the second floor of the Claiborne

Street side of the building with aluminum clad windows with similar light pattern and in bronze finish, per submitted plans and specifications.

6. Applicant: Global South Holdings

- a. Property Address: 1420 Government Street
- b. Date of Approval: 1/18/2023
- c. Project: Install four (4) signs, all reading "Reserved Parking: Unauthorized vehicles will be towed away at the vehicle owner's expense." All signs will be 24" high by 18" wide and composed of aluminum. The signs will be attached to 6' tall baked enamel steel U-channel posts.
 - 1. One (1) sign will be placed in the planter to the east of the building, facing south.
 - 2. One (1) sign will be placed in the planter on the west side of the building (facing Lafayette Street).
 - 3. Two (2) signs will be placed along the south property line facing inward.

7. Applicant: Gregory Parker

- a. Property Address: 851 Elmira Street
- b. Date of Approval: 1/18/2023
- c. Project: Secure structure. Repair exterior.
 - 1. Repair/replace wood siding in-kind (to match in reveal and dimensions). Repaint building white.
 - 2. Temporarily board windows to secure. In phase 2, replace windows with wood with historically appropriate light patterns.
 - 3. Reroof in-kind.
 - 4. Repair/replace foundation/crawl space wall in-kind.
 - 5. Replace wrought iron porch supports in-kind, as needed.
 - 6. Repair/replace soffits and eaves in-kind as needed.

8. Applicant: Mobile Bay Roofing LLC

- a. Property Address: 962 Augusta Street
- b. Date of Approval: 1/18/2023
- c. Project: Reroof in-kind with 30-year architectural shingles. Color: Cobblestone Grey.

9. Applicant: Denver Hawsey

- a. Property Address: 1553 Eslava Street
- b. Date of Approval: 1/19/2023
- c. Project: Reroof with 26ga Tuff-Rib Galvalume Metal Panels.

10. Applicant: HF Glaude Construction

- a. Property Address: 201 S. Warren Street
- b. Date of Approval: 1/20/2023
- c. Project: Repoint mortar in-kind on NE elevation

11. Applicant: Mobile Bay Roofing LLC

- a. Property Address: 1207 Selma Street
- b. Date of Approval: 1/23/2023
- c. Project: Reroof in-kind with a 30 yr. architectural shingles. Color: Colonial Slate.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2023-06-CA: 916 Church Street

- a. Applicant: Douglas Kearley on behalf of RGH Oakleigh LLC
- b. Project: New construction: 9 two-story single-family residences

APPROVED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

2. 2023-07-CA: 1353 Dauphin Street

- a. Applicant: Jerry Jackson/Professional Roofing & Construction LLC
- b. Project: Reroof mansard type roof with lap vinyl lap siding
DENIED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. The next ARB meeting is scheduled for February 15, 2023.

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, January 31, 2023. Please include your name, home address, and the item number about which you are writing.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

ADDRESS	916 Church	APPLICATION NO.	2023-06-CA
SUMMARY OF REQUEST	New construction: nine (9) two-story single family residences		
APPLICANT	Douglas B. Kearley	OWNER, IF OTHER	RGH Oakleigh, LLC
HISTORIC DISTRICT	Oakleigh Garden Historic District	MEETING DATE	2/01/2023
CLASSIFICATION	Vacant	REVIEWER	A. Allen

DISTRICT/PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

Oakleigh Garden Historic District was initially listed in the National Register in 1972 under Criteria A (historic significance) and C (architectural significance) for its local significance in the areas of architecture, landscape architecture, and planning and development. The district is significant for its high concentration of 19th- and 20th-century architectural types and styles and significant in the area of landscape architecture for its canopies of live oaks planted from 1850 to 1910. The district is significant in the area of planning and development as the location of Washington Square, one of only two antebellum public parks remaining in Mobile. The district was expanded in 1984, and an updated nomination was approved in 2016.

The lot at 916 Church Street is currently vacant. The large lot was created by the combination of four previously residential lots. The 1878 Hopkins map shows three structures on three lots, one being a large center lot, spread across the site. The large center lot belonged to “Dr. Carter.” The southwest corner lot was occupied by a large west-facing building with two rear wings. By the time of the 1891 Sanborn map, the southwest corner had been redeveloped with a frame house facing Church Street, and a smaller frame house had been constructed between the corner house and Dr. Carter’s property. The 1904 Sanborn shows the two houses on either side of Dr. Carter’s property had been expanded to the north; the footprints of the buildings on all four lots remained the same through the 1956 Sanborn map. However, two of the four houses had been demolished by the 1980 aerial photograph.

According to MHDC files, this property appeared twice before the Architectural Review Board (ARB). In August 1985, the ARB approved the creation of a parking lot on the site. In January 2021, approval in concept was granted for the first phase of a 14-unit, multi-family residential development.

SCOPE OF WORK (per submitted application)

- a. Construct nine two-story frame single family dwellings, ranging from 2055 to 2175 square feet.
- b. The proposed residences would be rectangular in shape. Each would measure 18’-0” wide by 52’-8” deep and stand approximately 29’- 5 ½” high at the apex of its hipped roof.
- c. Five (5) units would face south to Church Street. Two (2) units located on the northwest corner of the lot would face west to Marine Street, and two (2) units, located on the northeast corner of the lot would face west to the interior of the lot. The front yard setbacks will measure 11’-8” to the front wall plane of each building unit.

- d. Each proposed structure would be clad in cementitious wood siding. All trim would also be of cementitious wood. Each roof would be clad in dimensional shingles. All windows would be aluminum clad wood.
- e. Each foundation would be raised concrete slab measuring 2'-8" and would be faced in brick.
- f. All elevations will be the same, with the exception of the façade elevations. Three façade variations are proposed, which would be selected by the prospective purchasers.
- g. The proposed façade elevations would consist of three bays and appear as follows:

1) Scheme 2 (as submitted)

On the first floor, the first two bays (from left to right) would each consist of a six-over-six window measuring 2'-6" wide by 7'-0" high. The third bay would consist of a wood ¾ glass lite door measuring 3'-0" wide by 7'-0" high, with a single lite transom above measuring 18" high.

On the second floor, the first two bays (from left to right) would each consist of a six over-six window measuring 2'-6" wide by 6'-0" high. The third bay would consist of a wood ¾ glass lite door measuring 3'-0" wide by 7'-0" high.

A double porch would span the first and second stories of the façade. Each porch would measure 18'-0" wide by 6'-8" deep. The first and second story porch would measure approximately 11'-4" and 9'-0" high, respectively. The porches would be supported by four regularly spaced square columns. On the second floor, each column would be capped and decorative brackets placed along the cornice above each column. A v-pattern balustrade would run between the columns on both floors.

2) Scheme 3 (as submitted)

On the first floor, the first two bays (from left to right) would each consist of a six-over-six window measuring 2'-6" wide by 7'-0" high. The third bay would consist of a wood ¾ glass lite door measuring 3'-0" wide by 7'-0" high, with a single lite transom above measuring 18" high.

On the second floor, the first two bays (from left to right) would each consist of a six over-six window measuring 2'-6" wide by 6'-0" high. The third bay would consist of a wood ¾ glass lite door measuring 3'-0" wide by 7'-0" high.

A double porch would span the first and second stories of the façade. Each porch would measure 18'-0" wide by 6'-8" deep. The first and second story porch would measure approximately 11'-4" and 9'-0" high respectively. The porches would be supported by four regularly spaced full length square columns with recessed panels. A simple slim picket balustrade would run between the columns on the second floor porch. Four steps rising to the first-floor porch would be located in the third bay across from the entry door.

3) Scheme 4 (as submitted)

On the first floor, the first two bays (from left to right) would each consist of a six-over-six window measuring 2'-6" wide by 7'-0" high. The third bay would consist of a wood ¾ glass lite door measuring 3'-0" wide by 7'-0" high, with a single lite transom above measuring 18" high.

On the second floor, all three bays would consist of a six over-six window measuring 2'-6" wide by 4'-0" high.

A single story hipped roof porch would span the first floor of the façade. The porch would measure 18'-0" wide by 6'-8" deep. Measuring approximately 11'-4" high, the porch would be supported by four regularly spaced square posts. A simple slim picket balustrade would run between the posts. Four wood steps rising to the first floor porch, and flanked by concrete topped cheek walls, would be located in the third bay across

from the entry door. Decorative spindle work and brackets would run below the porch cornice between the posts.

h. Other elevations would appear as follows:

1) Right elevation (when facing the façade)

From front to rear of the structure

First floor: one (1) six-over-six window measuring 2'-10" wide by 6'-0" tall; one (1) wood ¾ glass lite door measuring 3'-0" wide by 7'-0" high, with a two-lite transom above measuring 18" high; two six-over-six windows measuring 2'-10" wide by 6'-0" tall equally spaced and located on the rear third of the elevation.

Second floor: three (3) six-over-six windows measuring 2'-10" wide by 5'-0" high regularly spaced across the elevation.

A hipped roof clad in dimensional shingles would cover the panel door on this elevation. The porch would be supported by two square posts and sit on a concrete stoop measuring 4'-1 ¾ " wide by 9'-9" deep.

2) Left elevation (when facing the façade)

From front to rear of the structure

First floor: one (1) six-over-six window measuring 2'-10" wide by 6'-0" tall; one (1) six-over-six window measuring 2'-0" wide by 2'-0" tall; one (1) six-over-six window measuring 2'-10" wide by 6'-0" high; one (1) diamond shape 4-lite window measuring 2'-0" by 2'-0", all regularly spaced across the elevation.

Second floor: one (1) six-over-six window measuring 2'-10" wide by 5'-0" high; one (1) diamond shape 4-lite window measuring 2'-0" by 2'-0"; one (1) six-over-six window measuring 2'-10" wide by 5'-0" high, all regularly spaced across the second half of the elevation.

3) Rear elevation

First floor: No fenestration is proposed for this elevation

Second floor: One (1) six-over-six window measuring 2'-10" wide by 5'-0" centered on the elevation.

i. Site Considerations:

- 1) Front yards would be sodded with flowerbeds in front of each house that would contain a row of boxwoods against the porch, lirioppe, and seasonal plantings. The beds will be pine straw. An island would break up the internal drive and would be landscaped with a crepe myrtle, lirioppe, and pine straw. The landscaping outside of the private courtyards would be maintained by the HOA to provide a cohesive aesthetic.
- 2) Courtyards would be located in between each unit enclosed by 6'-0" wooden privacy fences with gates. These fences would vary in length, running from unit to unit. Proposed ground cover for the courtyards would be sod. A paver or pea gravel walkway would connect the front of a unit to its courtyard gate.
- 3) The development would be accessed by a driveway on Marine street. The interior of the lot would be paved and consist of a driveway and parking spaces which would include: six pairs (12 spaces in total) located adjacent to the fenced courtyards, six (6) spaces facing the north side of the lot between units, and another pair facing the east side end of the lot, also between two units.

STAFF REPORT

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

1. **6.34** Maintain the visual line created by the fronts of buildings along a street.
 - Where front yard setbacks are uniform, place a new structure in general alignment with its neighbors.

- Where front yard setbacks vary, place a new structure within the established range of front yard setbacks on a block.
2. **6.35** Maintain the side yard spacing pattern on the block.
 - Locate a structure to preserve the side yard spacing pattern on the block as seen from the street.
 - Provide sufficient side setbacks for property maintenance.
 - Provide sufficient side setbacks to allow needed parking to occur behind the front wall of the house.
 3. **6.36** Design the massing of new construction to appear similar to that of historic buildings in the district.
 - Choose the massing and shape of the new structure to maintain a rhythm of massing along the street.
 - Match the proportions of the front elevations of a new structure with those in the surrounding district.
 4. **6.37** Design the scale of new construction to appear similar to that of historic buildings in the district.
 - Use a building height in front that is compatible with adjacent contributing properties.
 - Size foundation and floor heights to appear similar to those of nearby historic buildings
 - Match the scale of a porch to the main building and reflect the scale of porches of nearby historic buildings.
 5. **6.38** Design exterior building walls to reflect traditional development patterns of nearby historic buildings.
 - Use a ratio of solid to void that is similar in proportion to those of nearby historic buildings.
 - Reflect the rhythm of windows and doors in a similar fashion on all exterior building walls. The ARB will consider all building walls; however, building walls facing streets may face increased scrutiny.
 - Use steps and balustrades in a similar fashion as nearby historic structures.
 - Design building elements on exterior building walls to be compatible with those on nearby historic buildings. These elements include, but are not limited to: • Balconies • Chimneys • Dormers
 6. **6.39** Use exterior materials and finishes that complement the character of the surrounding district.
 - Use material, ornamentation or a color scheme that blends with the historic district rather than making the building stand out.
 - If an alternative material is used that represents an evolution of a traditional material, suggest the finish of the original historic material from which it evolved.
 - Use a material with proven durability in the Mobile climate and that is similar in scale, character and finish to those used on nearby historic buildings.

ACCEPTABLE MATERIALS

Materials that are compatible in character, scale and finish to those used on nearby historic buildings are acceptable. These often include:

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

UNACCEPTABLE MATERIALS

Materials that are incompatible in character, scale and finish to those used on nearby historic buildings are unacceptable. These often include:

- Metal siding
 - Vinyl siding
 - Unfinished concrete block
 - Plywood
 - Masonite
 - Vinyl coatings
 - Ceramic coatings
 - Exterior insulation and finishing system (EIFS) wall systems
7. **6.40** Design a roof on new construction to be compatible with those on adjacent historic buildings.
- Design the roof shape, height, pitch and overall complexity to be similar to those on nearby historic buildings.
 - Use materials that appear similar in character, scale, texture and color range to those on nearby historic buildings.
 - New materials that have proven durability may be used.

ACCEPTABLE ROOF MATERIALS

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

- Asphalt dimensional or multi-tab shingles
 - Wood shake or shingle
 - Standing seam metal
 - Metal shingles
 - 5-V crimp metal
 - Clay tile
 - Imitation clay tile or slate
8. **6.41** Design a new door and doorway on new construction to be compatible with the historic district.
- Place and size a door to establish a solid-to-void ratio similar to that of nearby historic buildings.
 - Place a door in a fashion that contributes to the traditional rhythm of the district as seen in nearby historic buildings.
 - Incorporate a door casement and trim similar to those seen on nearby historic buildings.
 - Place and size a special feature, including a transom, sidelight or decorative framing element, to complement those seen in nearby historic buildings.
 - Use a door material that blends well with surrounding historic buildings. Wood is preferred. Paneled doors with or without glass are generally appropriate.
9. **6.42** Design a porch to be compatible with the neighborhood.
- Include a front porch as part of new construction if it is contextual and feasible.
 - When designing a porch, consider porch location, proportion, rhythm, roof form, supports, steps, balustrades and ornamentation relative to the main building and porches in the district.
 - Design the elements of a porch to be at a scale proportional to the main building.
 - Where a rhythm of porches exists on a street or block, design a porch that continues this historic rhythm.
 - Design a rear or side porch that is visible from the public right-of-way to be subordinate in character to the front porch.

10. **6.43** Design piers, a foundation and foundation infill to be compatible with those of nearby historic properties.
- Use raised, pier foundations.
 - If raised foundations are not feasible, use a simulated raised foundation.
 - Do not use slab-on-grade construction. This is not appropriate for Mobile’s historic neighborhoods. If a raised slab is required, use water tables, exaggerated bases, faux piers or other methods to simulate a raised foundation.
 - Do not use raw concrete block or exposed slabs.
 - If foundation infill must be used, ensure that it is compatible with the neighborhood.
 - If solid infill is used, recess it and screen it with landscaping.
 - If lattice is used, hang it below the floor framing and between the piers. Finish it with trim.
 - Do not secure lattice to the face of the building or foundation.
 - Do not use landscaping to disguise inappropriate foundation design.

ACCEPTABLE FOUNDATION MATERIALS

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

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

UNACCEPTABLE FOUNDATION MATERIALS

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

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

11. **6.44** Use details and ornamentation that help new construction integrate with the historic buildings in the district.
- Use a decorative detail in a manner similar to those on nearby historic buildings. A modern interpretation of a historic detail or decoration is encouraged.
 - Do not use a decorative detail that overpowers or negatively impacts nearby historic buildings.
12. **6.45** Locate and design windows to be compatible with those in the district.
- Locate and size a window to create a solid-to-void ratio similar to the ratios seen on nearby historic buildings.
 - Locate a window to create a traditional rhythm and a proportion of openings similar to that seen in nearby historic buildings.
 - Use a traditional window casement and trim similar to those seen in nearby historic buildings.
 - Place a window to match the height of the front doorway.
 - Place a window so that there is proportionate space between the window and the floor level.
 - Do not place a window to directly abut the fascia of a building.
 - Use a window material that is compatible with other building materials.
 - Do not use a reflective or tinted glass window.

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

ACCEPTABLE WINDOW MATERIALS

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

- Wood
- Vinyl-clad wood
- Aluminum-clad customized wood
- Extruded Aluminum

UNACCEPTABLE WINDOW MATERIALS

Materials that are not similar in character, profile, finish and durability to those used on nearby historic buildings are unacceptable.

These often include:

- Mill finish metal windows
- Snap-in or artificial muntins
- Vinyl

13. **10.2** Design a fence to be compatible with the architectural style of the house and existing fences in the neighborhood.

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

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

- Design a fence located behind the front building plane to not exceed 72" in height. If the subject property abuts a multi-family residential or commercial property, a fence up to 96" will be considered.
- An alternative fence material with proven durability, matte finish and an accurate scale and proportion of components is acceptable. A simple wood-and-wire fence is acceptable provided it is appropriate to the style of the house.

14. **10.5** Visually connect the street and building.

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

15. **10.7** Minimize the visual impact of parking.

- Locate a parking area at the rear or to the side of a site whenever possible.

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

ACCEPTABLE WALK AND PAVING MATERIALS

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

These often include:

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

16. 10.10 Provide a landscaped front yard for a residential property in a historic district.

- Maintain a predominant appearance of a planted front yard/lawn.
- Minimize paved areas in a front yard.
- Consider using decorative modular pavers, grass and cellular paving systems in order to minimize the impact of hard surface paving where grass or other plant materials are not used.
- In commercial areas, consider using landscaping to screen and soften the appearance of surface parking areas. Use an internal and perimeter landscaping treatment to screen a fenced or walled parking area.
- Do not use landscaping to hide a design feature that is inconsistent with these Design Review Guidelines.

B. Staff Analysis

This application proposes the construction of a nine unit development at 916 Church Street. The *Design Review Guidelines* provide direction on new construction within Mobile's historic districts. Items taken into account for residential structures include placement, mass, scale and building components.

Placement guidelines consider setback from the street and distance between buildings. The *Guidelines* state that the placement of a new residential structure falls within the range of varied setbacks along a street. The property under review is a corner lot. Setbacks along both Church and Marine Street vary between approximately 3'-0" to 25'-0". The proposed 11'-8" front yard setbacks for the 916 Church Street units fit well within this range, respecting the historical character of the surrounding contributing buildings. The proposed side yard setbacks for the subject property, which fluctuate from unit to unit, are consistent with the varying distances between buildings in the immediate vicinity (A.1, 2).

The *Guidelines* state that the massing and scale of new construction relate to those of historic structures in the district. Nearby contributing structures range in size and form, from single story cottages to two-story structures with front porches spanning the façades. The narrow and deep rectangular massing of the proposed buildings is similar to those found in the surrounding neighborhood. Likewise, the height of their foundations and roofs maintain the traditional proportions of surrounding historic dwellings (A.3, 4).

The *Guidelines* call for new construction to mirror the traditional design patterns, materials, and character of adjacent structures and of the surrounding district. The detached residences on the subject street and

immediate cross streets are predominately populated with one or two-story gable or hipped roof cottages of two or three bays, sitting on raised foundations and comprising front porches and restrained architectural detailing. The majority of these residences possess long flat side elevations with varying fenestration patterns. The form of the proposed structures assimilates with this practice. The incorporation of building components such as the pane-and-panel doors, six-over-six sashes, and simple decorative details at 916 Church Street echo prevalent conventions within the district. Likewise, the proposed fenestration patterns are also observably consistent with those of nearby contributing structures. The proposed materials of fiber cement siding, wood, and brick are acceptable and suitable materials for new construction within Mobile's historic districts. (A.5-12).

The *Guidelines* provide direction for fence types and placement. First, the fence must suit the architectural style of the house and existing fences in the area. Also, fencing behind residences in historic districts should not exceed 72". At 6'0", the wood fence design intended to enclose each of the nine proposed courtyards falls within height restrictions imposed by the *Guidelines*. However, according to submitted renderings, the placement of the fences in-line with the front building plane on the outward facing units does not comply with the *Guidelines*' call to locate a fence of the proposed height behind the front plane (A. 13).

The proposed paved entrance driveway and interior paved area with parking adheres to the *Guidelines*' directive to minimize the visual impact of parking from the street. In the same way, the planned landscaping for the subject project observes the *Guidelines*' call to provide the appearance of a planted front yard and visually soften the appearance of paved or parking areas (A.14-16).

Of further note, the proposed site plan for the project under review places units 8 and 9 such that they are orientated towards the inside of the lot, facing the parking area. The *Guidelines* (Guideline 10.10, included above) state that a landscaped front yard should be provided for a residential property in a historic district. Although these two units do not face out towards a street, creating a true front yard, the plans do call for landscaping in front of the home as mentioned in the scope of work. In addition, it should be pointed out that the Board previously approved in concept (January 2021) a multi-family residential development on the subject property which included an inward facing unit in the northeast corner of the lot.

C. Summary of Analysis

- The application proposes the construction of nine (9) two-story single family residences at 916 Church Street.
- The proposed setbacks, massing scale and design comply with the *Design Review Guidelines*.
- Siding, foundation, and fenestration materials are in compliance with the *Guidelines*.
- The fencing proposed to enclose adjacent courtyards are in accordance with the *Guidelines* in regard to materials and height measurements. However, the placement at the front building plane is not in compliance.
- The proposed interior paved parking and driveway area complies with the *Guidelines* in regard to placement, materials and landscaping.

STAFF SUGGESTION

Staff suggests that all proposed 6'-0" fences be placed behind the front wall plane of their respective buildings.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on Section B above, Staff believes the proposed construction of nine (9) two-story single family residences at 916 Church Street, with the incorporation of the aforementioned suggestion, would not

impair the architectural and historic character of the surrounding district and recommends approval of the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Douglas Kearley was present to discuss the application. He stated that he was amenable to the Staff suggestion.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Maurin asked if the foundation heights proposed for the residences fall within the range found in the surrounding area.

Mr. Kearley replied that they do.

Mr. Rodrigues asked if there is a fence proposed for the east lot line and what the proposed plan is for trash.

Mr. Kearley stated that a fence will be installed along the east and north lot lines and that there will be a dumpster situated on the lot. He added that the location of the dumpster would be approved by Staff.

Ms. Maurin asked if a fence along the east and north lot lines is required as it may cause segregation of the proposed development.

Mr. Kearley stated that a fence is not required.

Mr. Roberts asked if there was a proposed landscape plan.

Mr. Kearley stated that the landscape would be coordinated with Staff as well.

FINDING FACTS

Mr. Blackwell moved that, based on the evidence presented in the application, the Board finds the facts in the Staff's report and noted that the applicant will incorporate Staff's suggestion to set 6'-0" fences behind front building planes and that a fence will be incorporated along the north and east lot lines, if applicant so chooses.

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Blackwell moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, with the inclusion of the aforementioned Staff suggestion, the construction of nine (9) two-story single family residences at 916 Church Street would not impair the architectural and historic character of the surrounding district, and 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	1353 Dauphin Street	APPLICATION NO.	2023-07-CA
SUMMARY OF REQUEST	Reroof mansard type roof with vinyl lap siding.		
APPLICANT	Jerry Jackson	OWNER, IF OTHER	various (condominiums)

HISTORIC DISTRICT	Old Dauphin Way	MEETING DATE	02/01/2023
CLASSIFICATION	Non-Contributing	REVIEWER	C. Dawson

DISTRICT/PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

Old Dauphin Way Historic District was initially listed in the National Register in 1984 under Criterion C for significant architecture and community planning. The district includes most nineteenth-century architectural styles and shows adaptations of middle-class domestic designs of the nineteenth century to the regional, Gulf Coast climate. It includes “fine examples of commercial, institutional, and religious structures as well as 20th-century apartments.”

The property at 1353 Dauphin Street consists of two non-contributing, two-story multi-family structures constructed c. 1980. The 1878 Hopkins ward map of Mobile shows the property occupied by a residence with an offset rear wing; the property was owned by J.T. Mayberry. Sanborn Fire Insurance maps and historic aerial photos show the house persisted on the site until some point between 1967 and 1980. A deed trace revealed that the property was sold to Alexander Foreman IV in 1973. Foreman leased an apartment complex on the property to Magnolia Inn Apartment Ventures in 1974. Therefore, it appears the extant buildings were constructed c. 1974.

This property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board.

SCOPE OF WORK (per submitted application and communication)

1. 1. Replace existing shingle roofing with lap vinyl siding in beige color.

STAFF REPORT

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

1. “Design exterior materials and finishes associated with additions and alterations to non-historic structures to be compatible with the historic district.
 - Use materials with a character compatible to those used historically and with proven durability.
 - Maintain original material whenever possible provided the material is durable and compatible with the surrounding historic district.” (6.28)
2. “Design replacement roofs and roofs of additions to be compatible with the district.
 - Use a roof material that is in keeping with the historic district.” (6.29)

B. STAFF ANALYSIS

The subject property, 1353 Dauphin Street, is considered non-contributing property within the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The application under review involves replacing the existing shingle roofing with vinyl lap siding in a beige color. The work was begun before a building permit was issued and before a COA application had been made. A Stop Work Order was placed on the property, but work continued and appears now to be complete.

The *Guidelines* instruct that “exterior materials and finishes associated with additions and alterations to non-historic structures to be compatible with the historic district. Use materials with a character compatible to those used historically and with proven durability.” (A.1) The replacement of a shingled roof with vinyl siding would seem to be inconsistent with this directive, as vinyl siding is neither compatible with historic materials, nor does it have proven durability.

In reference to roofs, the *Guidelines* further instruct, “Design replacement roofs and roofs of additions to be compatible with the district. Use a roof material that is in keeping with the historic district.” (A.2) Vinyl siding is not a roofing material, nor is it compatible with the Old Dauphin Way Historic District in which it has been installed.

C. Summary of Analysis

- The applicant was discovered to be reroofing the multi-family structures without the benefit of a building permit or a Certificate of Appropriateness, and a Stop Work Order was issued.
- The applicant applied for a Certificate of Appropriateness and continued work prior to the ARB meeting at which the application would be considered and without a building permit.
- The vinyl lap siding applied to the mansard roofs is not a material considered appropriate in Mobile’s historic districts.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on Section B above, Staff believes the completed reroofing of two multi-family structures with lap vinyl siding at 1353 Dauphin Street impairs the architectural or historic character of the surrounding district. Staff recommends denial of the application and removal of the vinyl siding, to be replaced with an appropriate roofing material.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Joseph Hathcock was present to discuss the application. He acknowledged the oversight regarding the permitting process and stated that the reason was a communication issue between departments.

He added that he believed a permit application had been submitted.

Ms. Dawson replied a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) was never issued.

Mr. Hathcock stated that the previous shingles on the roof were sliding out of place and falling off. Cement fiber siding was not an option as it was not flexible; therefore, vinyl siding was chosen as a replacement material for the roof.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Hathcock asked what other material could be used for the roof.

Mr. Roberts replied that fiberglass shingles are an option.

Mr. Roberts stated that the issue is the lack of a COA and a building permit; in the case of a COA, certain material requirements have to be met.

Mr. John Brooks stated that he submitted an application and thought the fee was paid.

Mr. John Stimpson commented that one complication lies in that the applicant is representing a condominium association who engaged the roofer, not an individual owner, which makes it difficult to determine who is at fault for the oversight.

Mr. Hathcock asked how this type of situation could be mitigated in the future.

Mr. Blackwell stated that there is a process in place to come to a workable solution in situations such as these, that the issue here seems to be that the procedure got lost in translation.

Mr. Roberts stated that siding is not an appropriate material for a mansard roof.

FINDING FACTS

Ms. Davis 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

Ms. Davis moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, the reroofing of the mansard type roof with vinyl lap siding at 1353 Dauphin Street would impair the architectural and historic character of the surrounding district, and a Certificate of Appropriateness should not be granted.

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

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:43 p.m.

