

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
January 18, 2023 – 3:00 P.M.
Assembly Room, Government Plaza
205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Vice-Chair, Mr. Jim Wagoner, called the meeting to order at 3:00 pm. Christine Dawson, Historic Development staff, called the roll as follows.

Members Present: Bob Allen, Karrie Maurin, Craig Roberts, Joseph Rodrigues (*arrived 3:06*), Gyspie Van Antwerp, and Jim Wagoner

Members Absent: Janelle Adams (alternate), Cart Blackwell (alternate), Abby Davis, Catarina Echols, Kimberly Harden, Kathleen Huffman (alternate), and Andre Rathle

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

2. Mr. Roberts moved to approve the minutes from January 4, 2023 meeting. The motion was seconded by Ms. Van Antwerp and approved unanimously.
3. Ms. Van Antwerp moved to approve the Mid-Month COAs granted by Staff. The motion was seconded by Mr. Roberts and approved unanimously.

B. MID-MONTH APPROVALS - APPROVED

1. Applicant: Restoration Roofing

- a. Property Address: 1110 Savannah Street
- b. Date of Approval: 12/29/2022
- c. Project: Reroof in-kind with architectural shingles. color: Weatherwood

2. Applicant: Artious Walker

- a. Property Address: 267 Dauphin Street
- b. Date of Approval: 1/04/2023
- c. Project: Repair/ revitalize front of building.
 1. Remove old signage components.
 2. Repair exterior stucco.
 3. Replace damaged window framing in kind.
 4. Replace broken glass windows.
 5. Repaint front to best match approved (previously submitted) rendering.
Stuccoed body of storefront: SW6383 "Golden Rule"; Trim: SW2704 "Merlot"
 6. Clean / Refurbish 2nd story brick work.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2023-01-CA: 157 Dauphin Street

- a. Applicant: Carlos Gant on behalf of Tracy Roberts
- b. Project: Changes to façade

TABLED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

2. 2023-02-CA: 506 Aurelia Street

- a. Applicant: E&J Concrete LLC on behalf of Masjid Baitul Haqq Community
 - b. Project: Demolish one-story dwelling
- TABLED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

3. 2023-03-CA: 36 McPhillips Avenue

- a. Applicant: Windows USA
 - b. Project: Replace 20 windows with vinyl windows
- DENIED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

4. 2023-05-CA: 406 Marine Street

- a. Applicant: Douglas Kearley on behalf of Porchlight LLC
 - b. Project: New construction: single-family residence
- APPROVED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

D. OTHER BUSINESS

- 1. The next ARB meeting is scheduled for February 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, January 17, 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	157 Dauphin Street	APPLICATION NO.	2023-01-CA
SUMMARY OF REQUEST	Changes to north façade		
APPLICANT	Carlos Gant	OWNER, IF OTHER	Tracy Roberts

HISTORIC DISTRICT	Lower Dauphin Street Commercial	MEETING DATE	1/18/2023
CLASSIFICATION	Contributing	REVIEWER	A. Allen

DISTRICT/PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District was initially listed in the National Register in 1979 under Criteria A (historic significance) and C (architectural significance) for its local significance in the areas of commerce and architecture. The district is significant for its unique character stemming from the high concentration of closely spaced two- and three-story brick buildings and as Mobile’s nineteenth century commercial thoroughfare. The district boundaries were expanded in 1982, 1995, 1998, and 2019.

157 Dauphin Street is a two-story contributing commercial building located in the Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District. It is a brick building with a masonry façade. Currently the storefront entry is boarded up. According the MHDC vertical files, this building was constructed c. 1860 and was associated with a Thomas Byrnes. Historic photographs show that the building’s original façade was brick and consisted of four large second story windows set above a suspended metal awning over the storefront. A heavy ornamented cornice was accentuated with a centered arched molding which echoed the shape of decorative hoods over the four windows. The property’s façade underwent an art deco remodel by J.N Stafford around 1937. At this time, the four windows were covered on the second story by a masonry veneer which included a large recessed stucco panel centered on the second story. On the ground floor, a glass storefront was installed with deep recesses leading to an entry door. Although this historic storefront is no longer extant, the rest of this façade remains intact.

This property has not appeared previously before the Architectural Review Board (ARB).

SCOPE OF WORK (per submitted application and plans and correspondence)

1. Install new storefront and signage on first story of façade.
 - a. The proposed new storefront would measure 21’-7” wide by 10’-7” high.
 - b. The storefront would include a centered opening measuring 8’-0” wide by 7’-10” high. The opening would be topped with a 1’-9” double-paned transom.
 - c. The centered opening would be flanked by two 1’-0” wide pilasters which would extend the full 10’-7” height of the storefront. Two metal framed openings would sit on the outside of the columns on either side of the opening. These openings would appear to be double paned fixed windows, each topped by a double-paned transom; however, there would be no glazing. These openings would measure 5’-5 ½” wide by 8’-11 ½” high, with the transoms spanning the width of the openings and measuring 1’-9” high. Both openings would sit above a proposed new cementitious trim and knee wall which would span the width of the openings and measure 1’-8” high.

2. Install a fixed glazed window on second story of façade.
 - a. The proposed window would be centered on the façade and set within a 1” recess which would measure 5’-2” wide by 10’-9” high.
 - b. The proposed window would measure 4’-2” wide by 6’-2” high, and be topped by a stucco panel measuring 4’2” wide by 2’-5” high.
3. Repairs and repainting to existing façade.
 - a. The existing masonry façade, including the recessed stucco panel, would be re-skimmed and painted in Copper Red.

STAFF REPORT

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

- 1) **7.1** Preserve the key character-defining features of a historic commercial façade.
- 2) **7.2** Repair an altered storefront to its original design.
 - Use historic photographs when determining the original character of a storefront design.
 - Where evidence does not exist, use a contemporary interpretation of a traditional storefront. Consider retaining a non-original storefront where it has achieved historic importance as an option.
 - Do not remove a façade veneer if it may cause serious damage to the original historic materials underneath (i.e. historic brick).
 - In the Dauphin Street area of Downtown, a corner building may not require a water table on side walls.
- 3) **7.3** Retain an original bulkhead as a decorative panel.
 - Retain the bulkhead below the display window.
 - If the original bulkhead is covered with another material, consider exposing the original design.
 - If the original bulkhead is missing, develop a sympathetic replacement design that is similar in profile, texture and durability to the original.
- 4) **7.5** Retain the original shape of the transom in a historic storefront.
 - Preserve the historic transom shape and configuration.
 - Add new glass if the original glass is missing.
 - Do not remove or enclose a transom.
 - If a transom must be blocked out, retain the original proportions.
- 5) **7.6** Replace a historic storefront to be consistent with the historic location.
 - Locate a new storefront in the same plane as it was historically.
 - Do not recess or project a replacement storefront from the front façade.
 - Screen service panels and trash containers that must be attached to an exterior building wall.
- 6) **7.7** Preserve and repair original materials on a historic commercial building whenever possible.
 - Do not paint over exposed brick.
 - Strive to preserve materials on the sides and rear of a historic commercial building where possible.
 - Brick is the most common façade material, but in some cases stucco has been applied to an original brick façade.
 - If brick repair is required, match the mortar color, consistency and strike to the original as closely as possible.
- 7) **7.11** If necessary, replace a door in a fashion that is sensitive to the historic commercial character of the building.
 - Use doors with high proportions of transparent glass.

- Do not use a residential door for a commercial building.
- 8) **7.16** Preserve and repair an original detail or ornamentation on a historic commercial building.
 - Maintain an original detail and ornamentation on a historic façade. Prioritize the front façade.
 - Maintain the established spatial relationships and scale of existing details.
 - Preserve and maintain a significant original detail or ornamentation element, including a pilaster, window frame, or molded wood, terra cotta or brick.
 - Do not remove later historic fabric to recreate missing elements without proof of the original.
 - 9) **7.18** Preserve and repair an original detail or ornamentation on a historic commercial building. »
 - Maintain the original space patterns and location of windows. Most display windows have a bulkhead below and a transom above.
 - Preserve the size and shape of an upper story window.
 - Consider maintaining a Carrara glass or glass block storefront if it has attained historic significance as an alteration.
 - 10) **7.19** If required, replace original historic windows to be compatible with the windows on the original historic building.
 - Use large panes of glass that fit the original opening for a display window. Where a display window is no longer required, the ARB will consider an alternative design.
 - Do not use opaque treatments for a window, including black plexiglass. Do not paint a window.
 - Do not use reflective mirror glass for a window.
 - Unless evidence exists from existing buildings or historic photographs, do not use a multi-pane design that divides the storefront window into smaller components.
 - Use a tempered glass window if required by the building code.
 - Reopen an upper story window if it is blocked.
 - If reopening an upper story window is not feasible, use a fixed shutter to define the original proportion of the window opening.
 - 11) **7.23** Minimize the visual impact of metal bars or grills on a historic building.
 - Use security features that are sized properly to fit the opening.
 - Use security features that are simple and do not include decorative detailing.
 - If roll-down security grills are used on storefronts, use an open weave pattern that permits visibility to display items.
 - Use a roll-down security grill that is located on the interior of a window or doorway.
 - If halo lighting is used to accentuate a sign or building, locate the light source so that it is not visible.
 - If a back-lit sign is used, illuminate each individual letter or element separately.

B. Staff Analysis

The *Design Review Guidelines* call for original and key character defining features of a historic commercial façade to be preserved, that original materials be repaired, and an altered storefront be repaired to its original design. The current façade at 157 Dauphin is not original to the building. However, it is a historic one as it has been extant for over ninety years and has attained historic significance as an alteration. The proposed repairs to the historic masonry and stucco and the plan to repaint the façade respect these aforementioned *Guidelines* (A.1, 2, 6, 9). The proposed new storefront design reflects the character of the c. 1937 storefront in its placement, in the muntin pattern of the windows and transoms, and in the retention of the original bulkhead (A.3-5). However, the proposed lack of glass in the storefront departs from the *Guidelines*' directive to repair a historic storefront to reflect its original design. There is no ARB-approved precedent in the Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District for muntins with no glass. As such, this proposed design element is not in keeping with the historic character of the building or the district.

The installation of a new window on the second story of the historic façade is not specifically addressed in the *Guidelines*. The *Guidelines* do state, however, that if a window must be replaced, the replacement be compatible with the windows on the original historic building (A.10). A few arguments come into play here which support the proposed installation of a new window. First, MHDC records show that there were originally four windows across the second story façade, creating a precedent for windows on the second story of the façade. Second, the proposed design and repurposing of this building has a demonstrated need for a better light source to the interior. A window at this location is required to bring in the additional light. Further, the proposed style, profile and positioning of this new window complements the character of the historic façade. Therefore, an argument can be made that this proposed new window does not impair the character of the historic façade.

The proposed perforated roll-down security door follows the *Guidelines* call for minimal visual impact to the façade (A. 11).

It should be noted that the proposed signage for the north façade shown on the submitted drawings is not being considered in this application, as the design has not yet been confirmed. The applicant plans to submit a separate signage COA application when said design is finalized.

C. Summary of Analysis

- The proposed repairs to the existing façade are in compliance with the *Guidelines*.
- The proposed alterations to the existing façade comply with the *Guidelines* in all areas except the proposed lack of glass in the storefront.
- The proposed installation of a window on the second story of the façade is an alteration which can be supported due to a precedent for windows in this location, the need for a better light source, and the compatibility of the proposed window's design.
- The proposed roll-down security door is also compliant with the *Guidelines*.

STAFF SUGGESTIONS

Staff suggests that glass or plexiglass be installed in the proposed storefront to bring the proposal into compliance with the *Guidelines* and to create a design that is complementary to the contributing building and the surrounding district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on Section B above, Staff believes that the proposed changes to the north façade at 157 Dauphin Street would not impair the architectural or historic character of the existing historic structure or the surrounding district with the inclusion of the aforementioned modification applied to the proposed project. Pending the incorporation of the suggested modification, Staff recommends approval of the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Rodrigues recused himself from consideration of this application.

Mr. Carlos Gant was present to discuss the application. He stated that the intention of the open storefront is to allow more light into the deep recessed area forward of the building's entry door. He added that since submitting the application, he has found a fold-away window product that, when open would present no mullions; but when closed would present a center mullion.

Mr. Gant produced a rendering of the product which was shown to the Board.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Wagoner asked Mr. Gant if he was amenable to amending the application. Mr. Gant replied that he was.

Mr. Roberts asked Ms. Allen if Staff's recommendation was to put glass in the muntins on the storefront and if Staff is okay with the window proposed for the second floor. Ms. Allen replied yes to both queries.

Mr. Roberts stated that the submitted renderings do not match the proposed plans exactly, that the muntins shown on the rendering are not present on the drawings.

Ms. Maurin asked how the building would be secured. Mr. Gant replied that the building would be secured with sliding windows. He stated that the entry door to the restaurant is set way back off of the sidewalk due to the deep recess.

Mr. Allen stated that the c.1930s façade redesign is now the historic precedent and verified that the existing bulkhead would remain. Mr. Gant replied that the bulkhead would remain and be compatible to those of the neighboring buildings.

Mr. Allen asked if the foldaway window would be installed above the bulkhead. Mr. Gant replied that it would.

Mr. Allen asked for verification for what would exist beyond the bulkhead with foldaway window and the recess to the entry of the restaurant. Mr. Gant replied that there would be a typical glass entry door.

Mr. Allen asked why the drawings proposed one window on the second story; why not four? Mr. Gant replied that the design is attempting to maintain as much of the existing c.1930s fabric as possible.

Mr. Wagoner asked if Staff has seen the foldaway doors. Ms. Allen replied that Staff has not seen them.

Ms. Maurin commented that the renderings show cove lighting and asked if that is part of the proposal. Mr. Gant replied that cove lighting is desired for the project but is not part of the current application. Ms. Maurin recommended that the cove lighting design maintain invisible lines.

Mr. Wagoner asked for a timeline concerning submittal of an application for lighting and signage. Mr. Gant replied that a submittal should be fairly soon.

Mr. Wagoner proposed that the application be tabled until the application and drawings include the proposed foldaway windows, lighting, and signage.

Ms. Maurin stated that she would prefer to see a wood storefront instead of an aluminum one.

Mr. Wagoner stated that the Board would like to see more detailed drawings with material information for foldaway windows, signage, and lighting.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Ms. Van Antwerp moved that the application be tabled until such time that a revised application be submitted to include the newly proposed foldaway windows and more detailed drawings which include material information, lighting, and signage.

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

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

ADDRESS	506 Aurelia St.	APPLICATION NO.	2023-02-CA
SUMMARY OF REQUEST	Demolish house.		
APPLICANT	E&J Concrete LLC	OWNER, IF OTHER	Masjid Baitul Haqq Community
HISTORIC DISTRICT	Oakleigh Garden (local only)	MEETING DATE	1/18/2023
CLASSIFICATION	Contributing	REVIEWER	C. Dawson

DISTRICT/PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

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

The one-story hall-parlor type house at 506 Aurelia Street appears on the 1925 Sanborn fire insurance map of the area, the earliest available. While its precise construction date is unclear, this early house form is known to have persisted into the 1930s in the south. Over the house’s history, a rear ell and mud room have been added to the rear, a side porch has been enclosed, and the windows and siding have been replaced.

This property has not previously appeared before the Architectural Review Board (ARB).

SCOPE OF WORK (per submitted application and communications)

1. Demolish house.

STAFF REPORT

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

1. “Consider the current significance of a structure previously determined to be historic.
2. Consider the condition of the structure in question. Demolition may be more appropriate when a building is deteriorated or in poor condition.
3. Consider whether the building is one of the last remaining positive examples of its kind in the neighborhood, county, or region.
4. Consider the impact that demolition will have on surrounding structures, including neighboring properties, properties on the same block or across the street, or properties throughout the individual historic district.

5. Consider whether the building is part of an ensemble of historic buildings that create a neighborhood.
6. Consider the future utilization of the site.” (12)

B. Staff Analysis

This application involves the demolition of a Contributing structure within the locally designated portion of Oakleigh Garden Historic District. The frame one-story dwelling was constructed c. 1925.

The *Guidelines* state that when demolition is contemplated, the current significance of the structure should be considered. (A.1) The subject house is considered a contributing property in the locally designated portion of the Oakleigh Garden district.

Per the *Guidelines*, “the condition of the structure in question” should be considered. “Demolition may be more appropriate when a building is deteriorated or in poor condition.” (A.2) In the case of the subject house, the building is in fair to poor condition. The metal roof has partially peeled back, allowing water to infiltrate the interior, and the replacement siding on the south elevation is failing. One roof support on the non-historic front porch is missing. This property has not been cited by Municipal Enforcement for any deficiencies or violations of the property maintenance code.

Whether the building in question is “one of the last remaining positive examples of its kind in the neighborhood, county, or region” should be factored into any decision to allow or disallow demolition in a historic district. (A.3) The house is almost identical in design to the property adjacent to its south, 508 Aurelia Street and the property to its southeast, 509 Aurelia Street. However, the hall-parlor building type is not common in the nearby vicinity or in the larger Oakleigh Garden district. While the house has been altered through replacement siding, windows, and rear additions, its essential original building form is clear.

The *Guidelines* instruct that the impact of a structure’s demolition on surrounding structures, including neighboring properties, properties on the same block or across the street, or properties throughout the individual historic district should be taken into account. (A.4) The visual impact upon neighboring properties of the demolition of this building will be significant, as it will leave a gap-toothed appearance on the block and remove a structure that is contemporary to its immediate neighbors. The visual setting of the neighboring resources (defined by the National Park Service in *National Register Bulletin 15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria of Evaluation* as “the physical environment of a historic resource”, including “relationships between buildings and other features such as open spaces”) will be permanently altered.

The house at 506 Aurelia Street, as suggested above, is “part of an ensemble of historic buildings that create a neighborhood.” Removal of such an element should be carefully considered. (A.5)

Finally, the *Guidelines* instruct that the future use of a cleared site should be considered. (A.6) The applicant has not provided plans or any description of potential construction on the site.

C. Summary of Analysis

- The house at 506 Aurelia Street is a well-established element of the streetscape and neighborhood and is a contributing property within the locally designated Oakleigh Garden historic district.
- The house has been altered through two rear additions, the enclosure of a side porch as living area, replacement siding, and replacement windows.
- The applicant has not provided an indication of possible future use of the property.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on Section B above, Staff believes the proposed demolition of the house at 506 Aurelia Street would impair the architectural or historic character of the subject property and the surrounding district. Staff recommends denial of the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Eric Jones was present to discuss the application. He stated that the structure has extensive wood damaged by rot and termites. He continued that the residence sits on blocks, and the foundation has shifted, that to rehabilitate it would mean moving the house to rebuild the foundation. He added that, although no plans have been submitted, the future plan is to use the lot for parking and a garden.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Maurin asked if parking is allowed under the current code. Mr. Jones replied that it is, stating that a Permitting staff person had given him that information.

Mr. Wagoner stated that the Staff report points to the integrity of the neighborhood and the structure.

Ms. Van Antwerp asked if the parking plan would have to come back the Architectural Review Board. Ms. Dawson replied that it would.

Mr. Allen stated that the applicants don't have a proposal for lighting, signage, paving, etc.

Ms. Van Antwerp asked how many cars are expected to fit on the lot. Mr. Jones replied that 4 or 5 are expected to fit on the lot. He stated that he would submit drawings for the parking lot to Staff.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Rodrigues moved that the application be tabled until such time that a plan for parking be submitted to Staff by the applicant.

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

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

ADDRESS	36 McPhillips Avenue	APPLICATION NO.	2023-03-CA
SUMMARY OF REQUEST	Replace 20 windows with vinyl windows to match existing window openings		
APPLICANT	Chrystal Baugher/Windows USA	OWNER, IF OTHER	Betty Shinn

HISTORIC DISTRICT	Old Dauphin Way	MEETING DATE	01/18/2023
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 36 McPhillips Avenue is a frame one-story gable roof Craftsman style bungalow with a front porch supported by four square columns resting on brick pedestals spanning the façade. Decorative knee brackets and three-over-one sash windows further express the Craftsman style. The dwelling appears on the 1925 Sanborn Map, and its form and stylistic elements suggest a construction date c.1920s. The form depicted on the 1925 map is similar to the existing, yet there appears to have originally been an appended element extending southward from the front porch, which was replaced at an early date with the extant carport addition.

This property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board.

SCOPE OF WORK (per submitted application and communication)

1. Replace all windows, twenty (20) in total, with new windows to match existing window openings.
 - a. The proposed new windows are double hung vinyl windows by Alaskan Window Systems.
 - b. All proposed new windows will be white.
 - c. The proposed new windows will match the existing windows’ three-over-one configuration.

STAFF REPORT

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

1. **5.20** Preserve the functional historic and decorative features of a historic window.
 - Where historic (wooden or metal) windows are intact and in repairable condition, retain and repair them to match the existing as per location, light configuration, detail and material.
 - Preserve historic window features, including the frame, sash, muntins, mullions, glazing, sills, heads, jambs, moldings, operation, and groupings of windows.
 - Repair, rather than replace, frames and sashes, wherever possible.
 - For repair of window components, epoxies and related products may serve as effective solutions

to material deterioration and operational malfunction.

ACCEPTABLE WINDOW MATERIALS

Materials that are the same as the original, or that appear similar in texture, profile and finish to the original are acceptable. These often include:

- Wood sash
- Steel, if original to structure
- Custom extruded aluminum
- Aluminum clad wood
- Windows approved by the National Park Service

UNACCEPTABLE WINDOW MATERIALS

Materials that do not appear similar to the original in texture, profile and finish are unacceptable. These often include:

- Vinyl
- Mill-finished aluminum
- Interior snap-in muntins (except when used in concert with exterior muntins and intervening dividers)

B. Staff Analysis

The application under review calls for the replacement of twenty (20) windows at 36 McPhillips Avenue which would fit the existing window openings and match the existing historic windows in pane and muntin configuration.

On the subject of historic windows within Mobile’s historic districts, the *Design Review Guidelines* state. *“The type, size, framing, and dividing lights of windows, as well as their location and configuration (rhythm), help establish the historic character of a building. Original window components should be retained to the extent possible. The character-defining features of a window should be preserved. Historic windows can be repaired through re-glazing and patching and splicing wood elements such as muntins, frame sill and casing. Repair and weatherization is generally more energy efficient and less expensive than replacement. Windows should be in character with the historic building.”*

The *Guidelines* call for the preservation of the functional historic and decorative features of a historic window and specify that historic windows and their components be retained and repaired. The current state of the existing windows at the subject property appears to be an acceptable workable and/or repairable condition. Therefore, complete replacement is not in compliance with this guideline (A.1).

Further, the application proposes the use of vinyl replacement windows. According to the *Guidelines*, vinyl is not an accepted window material for contributing buildings within Mobile’s historic districts as it does not have a comparable appearance to wood in texture, profile, and finish.

C. Summary of Analysis

- The application proposes the replacement of all twenty (20) historic windows at 36 McPhillips Avenue.
- The existing windows do not appear to be in a state that is beyond repair, displaying evidence of usual wear.
- The proposed vinyl windows are not an accepted material for Mobile’s historic districts.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on Section B above, Staff believes the proposed replacement of twenty (20) historic windows with new vinyl windows at 36 McPhillips Avenue would impair the architectural or historic character of the existing historic structure and the surrounding district. Staff recommends denial of the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Rob Wilbanks was present to discuss the application. He stated that the homeowner had several concerns regarding the windows at the subject residence and that there is significant rot damage around the windows. He continued that Windows USA installs windows all over Mobile and deals with historic windows on a daily basis. The company attempts to preserve what is there. He claimed that the proposed product matches the existing windows in light pattern, is a better product, and one will not be able to tell that they are vinyl.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Wagoner stated that the Board appreciates the repair of rot around windows but that they must look to the Guidelines, and he did not see any way around the fact that vinyl is not an acceptable material.

Ms. Van Antwerp asked Mr. Wilbanks if aluminum-clad wood had been considered as it is an acceptable material. Mr. Wilbanks responded that his company does not provide aluminum-clad windows.

Ms. Maurin asked if the proposed window has a wood grain finish look. Mr. Wilbanks responded the finish is smooth.

FINDING FACTS

Mr. Allen 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 replacement of twenty (20) historic windows with vinyl windows at 36 McPhillips would impair the architectural and historic character of the subject property and surrounding district, and a Certificate of Appropriateness should not be granted.

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

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

ADDRESS	406 Marine Street	APPLICATION NO.	2023-05-CA
SUMMARY OF REQUEST	New construction: one-story single-family residence with an optional wood framed carport.		
APPLICANT	Douglas B. Kearley	OWNER, IF OTHER	Porchlight, LLC
HISTORIC DISTRICT	Oakleigh Garden Historic District	MEETING DATE	1/18/2023
CLASSIFICATION	Vacant Lot	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 406 Marine Street is currently vacant. The 1904 Sanborn Map labels the subject lot as 306 Marine, and depicts a one-story frame dwelling with a front partial-width porch, a rear projecting wing and a rear side porch. The 1925 Sanborn map (republished 1956) shows the same dwelling with the street number having been changed to 406. According to aerial photographs, this house was extant in 1980, but was no longer extant in 1997, the subsequent aerial photo. MHDC vertical files contain a photo of the vacant lot taken in 1989. Therefore, the house was demolished sometime between 1980 and 1989. According to MHDC files, this property has appeared once before the Architectural Review Board in 2000, when a request to move a one-story frame house from 8750 Jeff Hamilton Road to 406 Marine was denied.

SCOPE OF WORK (per submitted application)

1. Construct a one-story 1747 square foot framed single-family dwelling.
 - a. The proposed residence would be rectangular in shape and measure 30'-1" wide by 66'-0" deep with a front-gabled roof. The height at the peak of the roof would measure 17'- 5 ½".
 - b. The building would be orientated on the property such that the front yard setback would be 11'-9" from the right-of-way (ROW). The side yard spacing to the north and south of the proposed structure would measure 16'-6" and 13'-4", respectively.
 - c. The proposed structure would be of frame construction with a partial width gable roof porch spanning the northern bay of the east façade. The porch would measure 14'-11" wide by 10'0" deep.
 - d. A proposed rear wood deck would extend from the west elevation and measure 30'-0" wide by 20'-0" deep on the north and 10'-0" deep on the south.
 - e. The proposed structure would be clad in fiber lap siding with a 6" reveal. The roof would be clad in asphalt shingles (with two proposed alternative roof materials of 5 V-Crimp metal or dimensional asphalt shingles).

- f. All windows would be aluminum clad wood.
- g. The foundation would be raised to a height of 1'-9" on concrete piers with stucco parging. Between piers, horizontal pressure treated wood pickets measuring 1"x2" with ½" spaces would be installed.
- h. Elevations would appear as follows:
 - 1) East façade
 The two-bay façade, from south to north, would consist of a pair of six-over-one windows, each measuring 2'-9" x 4'-11", centered on the bay.
 A partial width gable roof porch would span the northern bay of the elevation and would be supported by two pairs of wood box columns measuring 10" by 10". This bay (from south to north) would consist of a painted fiberglass pane-and-panel door and storm door and a pair of six-over-one windows each measuring 2'-9" x 4'-11. Decorative knee brackets would be evenly spaced under the gable end eaves of both the porch roof and the main dwelling roof. Four (4) pressure treated wood steps measuring 11'-2" wide would be centered on and give access to the front porch. These steps would be flanked by painted wood balustrades consisting of 1 ½" x 1 ½" vertical pickets set at 3 ½" intervals.
 - 2) West (rear) elevation
 A gable roof projecting wing would span the southern bay of the west elevation and would consist of two six-over-one windows, equally spaced across the projected bay. The northern bay would consist of a fiberglass pane-and-panel entry door and storm door. Decorative knee brackets would be evenly spaced under the gable end eaves of both the roof of the projecting bay and the main dwelling roof. A wood balustrade consisting of 1 ½" x 1 ½" vertical pickets set at 3 ½" intervals would span the western end of the rear deck (which would measure 30'-1") and on either side of four wood steps located toward the southern end of the elevation. The steps would be flanked by painted wood handrails which match the design of the balustrade.
 - 3) North elevation
 This elevation (from east to west) would consist of one wood box column; a balustrade would extend approximately 10'-0", spanning the depth of the front porch to the front wall plane. The northern side wall would consist of two (2) pairs of six-over-one windows, with each window measuring 2'-9" x 4'-11", and a single six-over-one window measuring 2'-9" x 3'-11", evenly spaced across the elevation. Beyond the side wall, the deck balustrade would extend 20'-0" westward, spanning the northern depth of the rear deck.
 - 4) South elevation
 This elevation (from west to east) would consist of a 10'-0" balustrade which would span the southern depth of the rear deck and end at the western end wall. The southern side wall would consist of a single six-over-one window measuring 2'-9" x 4'-11"; a single six-over-one window measuring 2'-9" x 3'-11"; a single six-over-one window measuring 2'-9" x 3'-11"; a single six-over-one window measuring 2'-9" x 4'-11"; a single six-over-one window measuring 2'-9" x 4'-11"; and a single six-over-one window measuring 2'-9" x 3'-11", all evenly spaced across the elevation. Beyond the eastern end wall, a balustrade would extend approximately 10'-0" eastward, spanning the southern depth of the front porch, abutting a wood box column.
- i. The existing concrete driveway would be extended westward to run parallel to the structure's north elevation. The extension would be either of concrete or rock.
- j. A wood gate is proposed to cross the driveway roughly halfway down (westward) the north side wall of the residence. A proposed 6'-0" wood privacy fence would begin at the proposed gate and run westward along the north property line to the northwest corner; then run southward along the west property line to the southwest corner; then run eastward along the southern property line, ending parallel to the southwest (rear) corner of the proposed

- dwelling. A second wood gate is proposed to run from the privacy fence northward to abut the southwest (rear) corner of the dwelling.
2. An optional framed carport.
 - a. The proposed structure would be rectangular in shape and measure 22'-0" wide by 26'-0" deep, with a hipped roof.
 - b. The carport would sit to the rear, or northwest of the main dwelling. The east façade would sit 35'-0" west of the main residence's west elevation.
 - c. The structure would be clad in cementitious wood siding with a 6" reveal. The roof would be clad in 3 tab asphalt shingles.(with two proposed alternative roof materials of 5 V-Crimp metal or dimensional asphalt shingles).The foundation would be slab on grade.
 - d. The structure would consist of an open carport area on the east measuring 19'-6" deep; and a storage area on the west end measuring 6'-0" deep. The open carport would be supported by four 8"x8" painted wood columns. The storage portion would be accessed by a fiberglass flush door measuring 3'-0" x 6'-8" centered on the east elevation.
 - e. Elevations would appear as follows:
 - 1) East elevation
Column; door; column
 - 2) West elevation
No proposed fenestration for this elevation.
 - 3) North elevation
Column; column; corner board; corner board.
 - 4) South elevation
Corner board; corner board; column; column.

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)

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. 10.7 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)

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 residence at 406 Marine Street. 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 11'-9", along with the side yard spacings of 16'-6" and 13'-4" 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 stielier two-story structures with projecting side wings located further afield in the district. The proposed design for 406 Marine Street is consistent in massing, proportions, and heights with surrounding historic structures. The contributing buildings in its immediate vicinity sit on raised foundations which appear to be comparable, if not equal to the finished floor height proposed for the subject project (A.3, 4).

The street on which the subject property is located, along with immediate cross streets, are predominately populated with one-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. Proposed features of the two bay, one-story shotgun-like design such as the front porch, subordinate rear deck, and foundation design would uphold conventions of the district, and assimilate the proposed new construction with neighboring historic buildings, as the *Guidelines* advise. The proposed materials of fiber lap siding and wood are both acceptable building materials for new construction within Mobile's historic districts, which respect the traditional building materials observable on nearby historic structures and throughout the historic district. Further, the proposed window design and placement pattern are also consistent with those of contributing structures in the surrounding district (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". The proposed wood privacy fence at 406 Marine is suitable to the proposed style of the house, matching the many examples of wooden fences in the immediate neighborhood. At 6'0", the fence design also falls within height restrictions imposed by the *Guidelines* and would be appropriately located behind the front building plane. Likewise, the proposed extension of the existing driveway provides parking to the side and rear of the site, as called for in the *Guidelines* (A.13, 14).

The *Guidelines* require new accessory structures to be subordinate in scale to that of the primary structure (A.15). The proposed optional carport structure's approximate 572 square feet demonstrates its inferior scale to that of the proposed house at 406 Marine Street. Therefore, the proposed accessory structure is in adherence to this guideline. Accessory structures should be placed behind or to the side of the primary structure on a property and be composed of materials that are compatible with the primary structure and the district (A.16). The proposed structure would be placed to the west or rear the proposed residence, in accordance with the *Guidelines*. The structure would employ materials considered appropriate in Mobile's historic districts.

C. Summary of Analysis

- The application proposes the construction of a single-story frame residence.
- 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 comply with the *Guidelines*.

- The fence and driveway proposed for the property meet the *Guidelines* mandates regarding materials, measurement, and placement.
- The proposed optional carport structure would be subordinate to the existing house in location, scale, and size and would be composed of materials considered appropriate in Mobile's historic districts.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on Section B above, Staff believes the proposed construction of a single-story frame residence and carport accessory building at 406 Marine 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 had nothing to add.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Rodrigues asked if the setback measurement stated in the Staff report was taken from the front of the porch. Ms. Dawson replied that the measurement was taken from the actual building's front wall plane and did not include the porch.

FINDING FACTS

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. Allen and approved unanimously.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Roberts moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board the construction of a one-story single family residence and potential carport at 406 Marine Street would not impair the architectural and historic character of the surrounding district, and a Certificate of Appropriateness should be granted.

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

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:15 p.m.