

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
February 15, 2023 – 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 3:12 pm. Christine Dawson, Historic Development staff, called the roll as follows.

Members Present: Bob Allen, Catarina Echols, Craig Roberts, Joseph Rodrigues, and Gypsie Van Antwerp

Members Absent: Janelle Adams (alternate), Cart Blackwell (alternate), Abby Davis, Karrie Maurin, Andre Rathle, Kimberly Harden, Kathleen Huffman (alternate), and Jim Wagoner

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

2. Mr. Rodrigues moved to approve the minutes from February 1, 2023 meeting. The motion was seconded by Ms. Van Antwerp and approved unanimously.
3. Mr. Rodrigues moved to approve the Mid-Month COAs granted by Staff. The motion was seconded by Ms. Van Antwerp and approved unanimously.

B. MID-MONTH APPROVALS - APPROVED

1. Applicant: Branch Communications

- a. Property Address: 853 Dauphin Street
- b. Date of Approval: 1/25/2023
- c. Project: Install temporary (30 days, renewable) ballast-mount cellular antenna on rooftop for additional capacity during Mardi Gras.

2. Applicant: Downtown Mobile District Management Corporation

- a. Property Address: 226 Dauphin Street
- b. Date of Approval: 1/25/2023
- c. Project: 1. Repair in-kind damaged stucco and rotten wood along storefront.
2. Replace in-kind the canvas awning.
3. Repaint in the following colors. Body: SW6804/Dignity Blue; Pilasters: SW6225/Sleepy Blue; Cornice and Door Trim: SW6385/Dover White.
Storefront, Window Sashes, and Canopy: SW9142/Moscow Midnight

3. Applicant: ShaMyra Sylvester

- a. Property Address: 209 Dauphin Street, Unit A
- b. Date of Approval: 1/26/2023
- c. Project: After-the-fact approval for repainting of façade. Color: Black

4. Applicant: Donna Flowers

- a. Property Address: 308 Michigan Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 1/26/2023
- c. Project: Remove and replace existing non-original back door to enclosed porch area with a coated metal door of similar design; reinstall pet door. Door to be painted Sherwin Williams Spanish Toile Red. Sash/trim to be painted white.

5. Applicant: Ronel Swanepoel

- a. Property Address: 1117 Montauk Avenue

- b. Date of Approval: 1/27/2023
- c. Project: Repaint exterior. Body: SW Agreeable Gray; Shutters: Connected Gray; Trim: white

6. Applicant: M & T Construction

- a. Property Address: 754 Government Street
- b. Date of Approval: 1/31/2023
- c. Project: Replace existing fence with wood shadow box fencing, similar to existing fencing on neighboring property

7. Applicant: Doug Ray

- a. Property Address: 308 St Louis Street, Unit 202
- b. Date of Approval: 2/01/2023
- c. Project: Replace two (2) sets 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.

8. Applicant: Demouy General Contracting Inc.

- a. Property Address: 157 Roberts Street
- b. Date of Approval: 02/02/2023
- c. Project: Construct a 28'-0" by 24'-0" garage with covered porch.
 - 1. The gable-roofed garage will have an open shed-roofed porch area on the south side measuring 12'-0" wide.
 - 2. The structure will sit to the rear of the lot (east end), behind the main dwelling.
 - 3. The structure will be clad in fiber cement horizontal siding painted to match the main dwelling. The roofs will be clad in fiberglass shingles.
 - 4. The foundation will be slab-on-grade.
 - 5. Fenestration: The west façade will consist of a set of wood carriage doors measuring 9'-0" wide by 8'-0" high and a one-over-one clad sash window measuring 2'-0" wide by 3'-0". The south wall of the enclosed portion will consist of a set of painted metal (white) double leaf doors, each measuring 3'-0" wide by 8'-0" high.

9. Applicant: Robert Dueitt Construction LLC

- a. Property Address: 3 Blacklawn
- b. Date of Approval: 2/2/2023
- c. Project: Remove screen from front porch and replace in-kind to match original design and materials.

11. Applicant: Mobile Bay Roofing LLC

- a. Property Address: 1202 New St Francis Street
- b. Date of Approval: 02/03/2023
- c. Project: Reroof in-kind with architectural shingles in Moire Black color.

12. Applicant: Mobile Bay Roofing LLC

- a. Property Address: 313 George Street
- b. Date of Approval: 02/06/2023
- c. Project: Reroof in-kind with architectural shingles in Moire Black color.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2023-08-CA: 205 Marine Street

- a. Applicant: Roger Franklin
- b. Project: Replace windows in a non-historic residence

DENIED

-

CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

2. 2023-09-CA: 307 Charles Street

- a. Applicant: Douglas Kearley on behalf of Kim & Susan Richardson
 - b. Project: New construction: One-story single-family residence and carport
- APPROVED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

D. OTHER BUSINESS

- 1. The next ARB meeting is scheduled for March 1, 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, February 14, 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	205 Marine Street	APPLICATION NO.	2023-08-CA
SUMMARY OF REQUEST	Replace nine (9) wood windows with vinyl windows on north, south, and east elevations.		
APPLICANT	Roger Franklin	OWNER, IF OTHER	
HISTORIC DISTRICT	Oakleigh Garden	MEETING DATE	02/15/2023
CLASSIFICATION	Non-Contributing	REVIEWER	A. Allen

DISTRICT/PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

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

The 1878 Hopkins ward map of Mobile shows the subject property as a vacant lot. By the time of the 1904 Sanborn map's preparation, the current property was numbered 105 Marine Street and was occupied by a wood frame one-story dwelling with a projecting side wing to the north. A porch spans both the west façade and projecting wing's Marine Street elevation. A third porch spans the L-shape created by the projecting wing at the rear. A small outbuilding sits to the rear of the dwelling on the south lot line. The same structure is represented on the 1925 Sanborn Map, which was republished in 1956. Aerial photos show this dwelling extant in 1967. The subsequent photo from 1980 shows the lot vacant. An MHDC file photo reveals a vacant lot as well; therefore, at some point between 1967 and 1979, the subject property was cleared. The one and one-half story Greek Revival Cottage type house at 205 Marine Street was constructed in 2005.

This property appeared before the ARB in May 2005, when an application was approved for the construction of the existing dwelling.

SCOPE OF WORK (per submitted application)

1. Remove nine (9) existing wood windows located on the north, south and east elevations.
2. Replace with simulated divided-light vinyl six-over-six windows, to match existing window openings.

STAFF REPORT

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

1. **6.33** Design window alterations and windows on new additions to non-historic structures to be compatible with the neighborhood.

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

B. Staff Analysis

This application involves the replacement of six-over-six wood windows with vinyl six-over-six windows. The subject house was constructed in 2005 after approval by the Architectural Review Board of a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) specifying wood six-over-six windows would be used. According to photos provided by the applicant and the submitted window survey, the windows on the north and south elevations are in a deteriorated state. Although the four (4) windows on the east (rear) elevation are not yet exhibiting signs of deterioration, the applicant wishes to proactively replace these window to provide consistency of appearance. The applicant does not intend to replace the windows on the west façade at this time.

The *Guidelines* advise, “Design window alterations...to non-historic structures to be compatible with the neighborhood.” (A.1) The proposed vinyl six-over-six windows would not be compatible with the district in material. The original wood six-over-six windows approved by the ARB in 2005 are an appropriate design for the building type and style, and vinyl windows are not “similar to those seen historically in the neighborhood.” The proposed windows would not be in conformance with the *Guidelines*.

It should be noted that in May 2022, the ARB approved the same window product proposed in this application for replacement of 11 windows (all but those on the west façade) at 203 Marine Street, which is also a non-contributing structure built in the same year as the subject structure. The relevant COA included replacing windows on all elevations with the exception of those on the façade, just as proposed in the subject application.

C. Summary of Analysis

- The house at 205 Marine Street is non-historic and non-contributing to the Oakleigh Garden historic district.
- The house was constructed with wood six-over-six windows, as approved by the ARB in 2005.
- The windows on the north and south elevation are in a deteriorated state.
- The proposed replacement of the existing wood six-over-six windows with vinyl six-over-six windows is not in conformance with the *Guidelines*.
- The ARB approved the same product for replacement windows at 203 Marine Street in 2022.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on Section B above, Staff believes the proposed removal and replacement of the existing six-over-six wood windows with vinyl six-over-six windows would impair the architectural or historic character the surrounding district. Staff recommends denial of the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Roger Franklin was present to discuss the application. He stated that he questions why Staff would recommend denial of the subject application when the neighboring property’s application was approved to install vinyl windows, and there are other properties within Oakleigh Garden Historic District with vinyl windows.

No written comments regarding this application were received from the public.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Echols stated that, based on the Staff report for 205 Marine Street, the neighboring property at 203 Marine Street was approved for vinyl windows on a trial basis to determine the durability of a certain vinyl window product. She added that research is suggesting that vinyl windows will deteriorate as rapidly as poor quality wood, which is the currently installed window material at 205 Marine Street. In addition, vinyl windows cannot be repaired, but have to be replaced, which is not sustainable.

Mr. Wagoner stated that this situation was foreseeable when 203 Marine Street was approved for vinyl windows. Once the Board made its decision, it created a difficulty in arguing for denial of the subject application, which presents almost identical conditions to those of 203 Marine Street. He stated that there was a lot of discussion around the application for 203 Marine Street but questioned whether there was an end date for the trial period.

Mr. Rodrigues stated a committee of Board members is in the process of researching alternative window materials and possible amendment of the current *Design Guidelines*.

Ms. Echols added that in the meantime, we do have guidelines which state that vinyl windows are not an approvable material within historic districts. She added that the issue is about quality and durability, that the vinyl window will not last. She stated that she would not suggest vinyl windows for any homeowner regardless of whether the residence is contributing or non-contributing because of the unsustainability of the product and because they are not suitable to the surrounding district. She continued that the Board is in the process of reviewing the *Guidelines*, but that the new *Guidelines* will not accept vinyl windows.

Mr. Allen commented that 203 Marine Street was a one-off trial; it does not set a precedent.

Ms. Van Antwerp asked Staff if their recommendation was based on the acknowledgement that 203 Marine Street was approved. Ms. Allen replied that Staff must and does strictly adhere to the *Guidelines* when making a recommendation.

Mr. Wagoner asked Mr. Franklin if he would be willing to withdraw his application and wait until the Board has finished their research and reconsideration of the *Guidelines*. Mr. Franklin stated that two or three of the windows on the house need immediate attention, and it sounded like vinyl would never be approved. He also stated he is sure the Board is aware of the cost difference between using vinyl and wood.

Ms. Echols reiterated that the Board is considering the sustainability of alternative materials such as vinyl clad and that these seemingly more affordable products are ending up in landfills. She added that the issue is not just the historic background.

Mr. Franklin stated that the wood windows at 205 Marine did not last, either. Ms. Echols agreed with Mr. Franklin, that many new growth wood products provide a sustainability challenge as well. She added that the Board is still looking for solutions.

Mr. Franklin stated that there are many new construction properties within Oakleigh Garden Historic District with vinyl windows.

Ms. Echols responded that these windows are predominantly vinyl clad wood windows, a different product.

Mr. Franklin commented that he recommended that the Board not approve pine windows.

Ms. Echols agreed, commenting that the quality of wood and the need to specify certain types of wood are other issues that the Board is discussing.

Ms. Van Antwerp stated that the Board wishes to be able to give property owners options and suggested that Mr. Franklin use the option to withdraw his application and return when the Board has revised the *Guidelines*.

FINDING FACTS

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

The motion was seconded by Ms. Van Antwerp and approved unanimously.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Wagoner moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, with the consideration of the exception made and approval granted for neighboring property 203 Marine Street, that the replacement of nine (9) wood windows with vinyl windows on north, south, and east elevations would not impair the architectural and historic character of the surrounding district, and Certificate of Appropriateness should be granted.

Mr. Rodrigues second the motion. The motion failed on a 2 to 3 basis, with Mr. Wagoner and Mr. Rodrigues voting in favor and Ms. Van Antwerp, Mr. Allen, and Ms. Echols voting against.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

ADDRESS	307 Charles Street	APPLICATION NO.	2023-09-CA
SUMMARY OF REQUEST	New construction: one-story brick veneer residence.		
APPLICANT	Douglas B. Kearley	OWNER, IF OTHER	Kim & Susan Richardson
HISTORIC DISTRICT	Oakleigh Garden	MEETING DATE	02/15/2023
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 307 Charles Street is currently vacant. The 1904 Sanborn Map labels the subject lot as 207 Charles, and depicts a one-and-a-half story frame residence with a front porch and a narrow rear projecting wing. A small accessory structure sits to the east behind the house on the north property line. On the 1925 Sanborn Map the street number had been changed to 307. The same main structure is portrayed, yet with a smaller garage building sitting on the southern property line behind the house. Aerial photography between 1952 and 1980 show a structure sitting on the lot. The following aerial photo taken in 1997 shows the lot vacant. MHDC file photos of the adjacent lot at 963 Augusta Street, taken in 1979, show a frame structure with a front porch in the background at 307 Charles Street. Therefore, it appears the house was no longer extant between 1980 and 1997.

According to the MHDC files, this property received approval from the ARB in September 2022 for the construction of single-story wood frame residence.

SCOPE OF WORK (per submitted application)

1. Construct a single-story residence.
 - a. The proposed residence would be a bungalow in form with Craftsman detailing. A porch would span the width of the west façade. The structure would be located on the lot such that the front wall plane would sit 32'-6" back from the street front. The north and south side yards will measure 10'8" and 10'0" wide, respectively.
 - b. A hipped roof would top the structure; a screened porch which would project 4'-0" from the rear of the north elevation. A covered walkway would extend eastward from the rear elevation and connect to a carport/storage structure. All roofs would be clad in dimensional asphalt/fiberglass shingles.

- c. The proposed structure would be clad in brick veneer, painted in an off-white color (or another to be determined and approved by Staff) with a cementitious wood cornice. The rear screened porch would be enclosed vinyl screen in pre-finished black metal frame set between two (2) 10" square wood posts.
- d. The proposed residence would measure 28'4" wide by 85'8" deep, and 13'-4" high to the top of the plate.
- e. The structure would sit on 3'-0" masonry piers with a continuous brick crawlspace enclosure, which would be topped with a projecting soldier course brick water table.
- f. Fenestration material: All doors, sidelights and transoms would be wood. All windows would be aluminum clad wood.
- g. Elevations would appear as follows:

1) West façade

The west façade would consist of a 10'-0" deep porch spanning the elevation, supported by four (4) equally spaced 2'-0" by 2'-0" square painted brick columns. Each column would be topped with a pair of fypon corbels mounted to a cementitious wood trim cornice. A 30" high brick half wall would enclose the porch on all sides, except for an opening on the northern end of the façade accommodating cement parged brick steps which would descend to a sidewalk connecting the dwelling to the ROW. The steps would measure 6'-9" wide and would be flanked by 2'-0" high brick cheek walls with 3" concrete caps.

The front wall plane of the three-bay façade would consist of a 3'-0" wide by 6'-3" tall wood t-panel wood door set in the northernmost bay, with sidelights measuring 1' x 4' and topped by a transom measuring 6'x1'. The third and southernmost bay would contain two double casement windows, each measuring 3'-4" wide by 5'-8" tall.

A copper eyebrow dormer measuring 6'-6" wide would be centered on the roof.

2) East elevation

The east (rear) elevation, from south to north, would consist of a brick end wall bay and a screened porch bay, which would be recessed westward by approximately 20". The brick end wall would contain fixed wood clad paired windows measuring 5'-6" wide by 2'6" tall, centered on the bay. The screened porch bay, from south to north, would consist of a wood single screened panel door measuring 3'-0" wide by 6'-3" tall, which would abut the northern wall of the brick bay; a 10" square post; three (3) screen panels in metal frames; one (1) 10" square post.

A landing measuring approximately 4'-6" wide would project eastward from the rear entry door. Two (2) brick steps of the same width would descend to a second landing. Two steps would then descend to ground level. An iron balustrade on the north side of the steps would consist of 5/8" iron bars set at 4" intervals and a 3' high handrail.

3) North elevation

The north elevation, from east to west, would consist of the blank north wall of the main block of the house, a projecting screened porch bay, the side wall of the proposed dwelling, and the southern end of the front porch. The projected screened porch portion would consist of the following: a 10" square column; two (2) screen panels in metal frames; 10" square column; two screen panels in metal frames; 10" square column. The side wall would consist of the following fenestration regularly spaced across the elevation: paired double casement windows, each measuring 3'-4" wide by 5'-8" tall; three (3) double casement windows each measuring 3'-4" wide by 5'-8" tall.

The southern end of the front porch would consist of the following: brick knee wall; column.

4) South elevation

The south elevation, from west to east, would consist of the northern end of the front porch and the side wall of the proposed dwelling.

The front porch portion would consist of the following: column; brick knee wall

The sidewall portion would consist of the following fenestration regularly spaced across the elevation: Two (2) double casement windows each measuring 3'-4" wide by 5'-8" tall; one (1) casement window, measuring 2'-0" wide by 3'-0" tall; three (3) double casement windows each measuring 3'-4" wide by 5'-8" tall.

2. Construct a garage/storage structure.

a. The proposed structure would be located 10'-0" to the east or rear of the proposed dwelling and be connected by a covered breezeway extending from the dwelling's rear entry door and supported by 8" square wood columns. The distance from the east lot line to the structure would measure 14'-0", and the distance from the north lot line would measure 5'-8".

b. The proposed structure would measure 22'-0" wide by 30'-0" deep and approximately 9'-0" high to the top of the side wall. The 30'0" deep measurement would include, from west to east, an open carport area measuring 22'-0" deep and an enclosed storage area measuring 8'-0" deep.

c. A hipped roof would top the structure.

d. The proposed structure would be clad in smooth finish cementitious wood siding, painted to match proposed dwelling.

e. The foundation would be slab on grade.

f. Elevations would appear as follows:

1) West Elevation

The west elevation from north to south would consist of the following: Three (3) 8" square wood columns equally spaced across the elevation.

2) East Elevation

No fenestration is proposed for this elevation.

3) North Elevation

The north elevation from east to west would consist of the following: corner board; corner board; 8" square wood column; 8" square wood column.

4) South Elevation

The south elevation from west to east would consist of the following: 8" square wood column; corner board; pair of galvanized metal doors and frame, each measuring 2'-6" wide by 6'-8" tall; corner board.

3. Proposed site improvements include a concrete driveway, which would be accessed on the southwest side of the property and would run eastward from the street, continuing to the south entrance of the carport. A concrete terrace is proposed for the enclosed area created by the projecting rear bay and the screen porch and the west elevation of the carport. The concrete will possibly be stained (still to be determined by owner and approved by Staff).

STAFF REPORT

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

1. **6.34** Maintain the visual line created by the fronts of buildings along a street.

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

ACCEPTABLE MATERIALS

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

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

- Skim stucco coat

UNACCEPTABLE MATERIALS

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

- Metal siding
- Vinyl siding
- Unfinished concrete block
- Plywood
- Masonite
- Vinyl coatings
- Ceramic coatings
- Exterior insulation and finishing system (EIFS) wall systems

7. **6.40** Design a roof on new construction to be compatible with those on adjacent historic buildings.

- Design the roof shape, height, pitch and overall complexity to be similar to those on nearby historic buildings.
- Use materials that appear similar in character, scale, texture and color range to those on nearby historic buildings.
- New materials that have proven durability may be used.

ACCEPTABLE ROOF MATERIALS

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

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

8. **6.41** Design a new door and doorway on new construction to be compatible with the historic district.

- Place and size a door to establish a solid-to-void ratio similar to that of nearby historic buildings.
- Place a door in a fashion that contributes to the traditional rhythm of the district as seen in nearby historic buildings.
- Incorporate a door casement and trim similar to those seen on nearby historic buildings.
- Place and size a special feature, including a transom, sidelight or decorative framing element, to complement those seen in nearby historic buildings.
- Use a door material that blends well with surrounding historic buildings. Wood is preferred. Paneled doors with or without glass are generally appropriate.

9. **6.42** Design a porch to be compatible with the neighborhood.

- Include a front porch as part of new construction if it is contextual and feasible.
- When designing a porch, consider porch location, proportion, rhythm, roof form, supports, steps, balustrades and ornamentation relative to the main building and porches in the district.
- Design the elements of a porch to be at a scale proportional to the main building.
- Where a rhythm of porches exists on a street or block, design a porch that continues this historic rhythm.

- Design a rear or side porch that is visible from the public right-of-way to be subordinate in character to the front porch.

10. **6.43** Design piers, a foundation and foundation infill to be compatible with those of nearby historic properties.

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

ACCEPTABLE FOUNDATION MATERIALS

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

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

UNACCEPTABLE FOUNDATION MATERIALS

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

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

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

- Use a decorative detail in a manner similar to those on nearby historic buildings. A modern interpretation of a historic detail or decoration is encouraged.
- Do not use a decorative detail that overpowers or negatively impacts nearby historic buildings.

12. **6.45** Locate and design windows to be compatible with those in the district.

- Locate and size a window to create a solid-to-void ratio similar to the ratios seen on nearby historic buildings.
- Locate a window to create a traditional rhythm and a proportion of openings similar to that seen in nearby historic buildings.
- Use a traditional window casement and trim similar to those seen in nearby historic buildings.
- Place a window to match the height of the front doorway.
- Place a window so that there is proportionate space between the window and the floor level.
- Do not place a window to directly abut the fascia of a building.
- Use a window material that is compatible with other building materials.

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

ACCEPTABLE WINDOW MATERIALS

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

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

UNACCEPTABLE WINDOW MATERIALS

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

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

13. 10.5 Visually connect the street and building.

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

14. 10.7 Minimize the visual impact of parking.

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

15. 9.1 Design an accessory structure to be subordinate in scale to that of the primary structure.

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

16. 9.2 Locate a new accessory structure in line with other visible accessory structures in the district.

- These are traditionally located at the rear of a lot.
- Materials that are compatible with the historic district in scale and character are acceptable. These often include: wood frame, masonry, and cement-based fiber siding.
- Materials that are not compatible with the historic district in scale and character are unacceptable. These often include metal, plastic, and fiberglass.

B. Staff Analysis

This application proposes the construction of a one-story brick veneer residence and a carport/storage structure. The *Design Review Guidelines* provide direction on new construction within Mobile's historic districts. In regard to setbacks, orientation, massing, and scale, the proposed new structure complies with

the *Guidelines* call for new construction to respect the building patterns of the surrounding district. The suggested front yard setback of 32-6', along with the side yard spacings of 10'8" and 10'0" on the north and south respectively, are well within the range of setbacks which occur on the surrounding lots (A.1,2). The historic structures in the immediate vicinity of the subject property range in size and form, from single story and one-and-a-half story cottages of varying depths, to stately two-story structures with projecting side wings. The proposed one-story craftsman bungalow design for 307 Charles Street is consistent in massing, proportions, and heights with surrounding historic structures. (A.3,4)

As stated above, a high occurrence of 19th and early 20th century stylistic influences can be observed in the Oakleigh Garden Historic District through varying degrees of ornamentation on porches, cornices, fenestration surrounds, etc. The decorative elements and design details proposed for the subject structure, such as knee and cheek walls, eyebrow dormer, t-panel door, and casement windows lend respect to the early twentieth century Craftsman style and to the stylistic character of the district. The proposed materials of brick, wood, and smooth cement fiber siding are acceptable for new construction and are sympathetic to the character of the surrounding historic district. Further, many of the lots on Charles Street and nearby cross streets such as Savannah and Augusta Streets are narrow and deep with single-story homes which boast hipped roofs, front porches, and long flat side elevations with varying fenestration patterns. The design of the subject property would uphold these traditions, as the *Guidelines* advise. Further, the proposed raised foundation with brick skirting is in keeping with those of the surrounding houses which are almost entirely raised on either concrete or brick piers with varying infill materials. Likewise, the ceiling height of 13'4" at 307 Charles would be observably similar to those of nearby structures (A.5-12).

The walkway from the sidewalk to the steps of the front porch provides a visual connection between the street and the proposed residence as mandated in the *Guidelines*. (A.13).

The proposed placement of the carport/storage building at the rear of the lot complies with the directive in the *Guidelines* to minimize the visual impact of parking and to place accessory buildings at the rear of the lot. (A.14, 15) The lower stature of the carport (9' at the plate) versus the primary structure (13'-4" at the plate) and its smaller footprint (660 square feet versus approximately 2400 square feet) make the accessory structure clearly subordinate to the proposed house, and the proposed materials are compliant with the *Guidelines*. (A.15, 16)

C. Summary of Analysis

- The application proposes the construction of a single-story brick veneer residence and carport structure to the rear.
- The proposed setbacks, side yard spacing, massing, scale, and design comply with the *Design Review Guidelines*, maintaining the rhythm and historic character of the surrounding district.
- Siding, foundation and fenestration materials fall within the *Guidelines*.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on Section B above, Staff believes the proposed construction of a single-story brick veneer residence and carport at 307 Charles Street 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 had nothing further to add.

No written comments regarding this application were received from the public.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Rodrigues asked for verification that the application included a house and a carport. Mr. Kearley responded that it did.

Ms. Van Antwerp asked if the paint color would be approved today. Ms. Echols responded that the paint color would be chosen by the applicant with approval by Staff.

FINDING FACTS

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

The motion was seconded by Ms. Van Antwerp and approved unanimously.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Wagoner moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, the construction of a single-family residence and carport/storage structure at 307 Charles Street would not impair the architectural and historic character of the surrounding district, and a Certificate of Appropriateness should be granted.

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

D. OTHER BUSINESS

Ms. Dawson reminded the Board that the next meeting, on March 1st, and all meeting going forward will be held in the auditorium.

Ms. Van Antwerp asked that the minutes recording the details surrounding the approval at 203 Marine be made accessible to the Board for their reference.

Ms. Echols stated that the NAPC (National Alliance of Preservation Commissions) makes allowances for exceptions and trial approvals.

Mr. Wagoner commented that exceptions seem too open-ended.

Ms. Echols added that the issue is not just how a window material looks that makes it historic; it is also about its performance and durability.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:57 pm.