

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD AGENDA

March 1, 2023 – 3:00 P.M.

Auditorium, Government Plaza
205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Acting Chair, Mr. Cartledge Blackwell, called the meeting to order at 3:04 pm. Annie Allen, Historic Development staff, called the roll as follows.

Members Present: Bob Allen, Cart Blackwell (alternate), Craig Roberts, Joseph Rodrigues, and Gysie Van Antwerp

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

Staff Members Present: Annie Allen, Marion McElroy, Kim Thomas, Lisa Watkins, and Meredith Wilson

2. Mr. Roberts moved to approve the minutes from February 15, 2023 meeting. The motion was seconded by Ms. Van Antwerp and approved unanimously.
3. Mr. Roberts 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: Johnathan Todd

- a. Property Address: 17 North Ann Street
- b. Date of Approval: 02/07/2023
- c. Project: 1. Remove unused staircase at side entrance door located on the western or rear portion of the south elevation.
2. Repair the southern wall; paint and stucco to match existing.

2. Applicant: Tyler Jackson

- a. Property Address: 964 Palmetto Street
- b. Date of Approval: 02/07/2023
- c. Project: 1. Replace missing/damaged plastic lattice skirting with framed, wood lattice.
2. Reglaze original windows.
3. Sand and paint house exterior with BLP Mobile Paint color: Monroe Street Green.
4. Paint house trim, windows, piers and lattice skirting with BLP Mobile Paint color: DeTonti Square Off White.
5. Add pea gravel to existing gravel driveway.

3. Applicant: Mike Henderson Roofing & Repair Service

- a. Property Address: 959 Charleston Street Unit A
- b. Date of Approval: 02/08/2023
- c. Project: Reroof in-kind with shingles in Slate color.

4. Applicant: A&D Remodeling LLC

- a. Property Address: 12 North Dearborn Street
- b. Date of Approval: 02/09/2023
- c. Project: Remove and reinstall one (1) window on north elevation.

5. Applicant: Mack Lewis Contractor Inc

- a. Property Address: 357 George Street
- b. Date of Approval: 02/10/2023
- c. Project: 1. Remove and replace porch flooring in kind with 5/4"x 4" T&G KDAT flooring
2. Remove three columns and railing and replace with matching material per submitted manufacturer product sheet
3. Paint to match existing colors

6. Applicant: K &J Enterprises LLC

- a. Property Address: 1117 Old Shell Road
- b. Date of Approval: 02/14/2023
- c. Project: Reroof asbestos tile roof with silver galvalume.

7. Applicant: Douglas Kearley

- a. Property Address: 1562 Monterey Place
- b. Date of Approval: 02/15/2023
- c. Project: Renewal of COA initially issued 2/17/2022:
 - 1. Construct a two-story frame workshop toward the rear of the lot.
 - 2. Construct an 8'-deep, full-width addition to the two-story rear of the house.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2023-10-CA: 957 Church Street

- a. Applicant: Douglas Kearley on behalf of Elizabeth Oliver
- b. Project: Construct one-story 15'x10'-8" addition to rear of residence

APPROVED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

2. 2023-11-CA: 113 Houston Street

- a. Applicant: Karen Beaton
- b. Project: New construction: One-story single-family residence

TABLED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

3. 2023-12-CA: 154 S. Warren Street

- a. Applicant: Don Bowden on behalf of Robert Bronstein
- b. Project: New construction: Expansion within rear porch footprint for kitchen and bathroom; covered outdoor kitchen

APPROVED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

D. OTHER BUSINESS

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

Public comment regarding items on this agenda will be accepted via e-mail (mhdc@cityofmobile.org) or USPS (Mobile Historic Development Commission, P.O. Box 1827, Mobile, AL 36633) until 5PM on Tuesday, February 28, 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	957 Church Street	APPLICATION NO.	2023-10-CA
SUMMARY OF REQUEST	Remove rear deck; construct a rear addition		
APPLICANT	Douglas Kearley	OWNER, IF OTHER	Elizabeth Oliver
HISTORIC DISTRICT	Oakleigh Garden	MEETING DATE	03/01/2023
CLASSIFICATION	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.

According to MHDC vertical files, the one-story frame house with full-width front porch at 957 Church Street was constructed c. 1926. The property appears as an overlay on the 1925 Sanborn Map, and there is a dramatic differentiation in tax value from 1926 and 1927. The 1904 Sanborn Map (the earliest to include this portion of the district) shows a frame dwelling of a different form with a narrower façade and a projecting side and rear wings on the subject property.

957 Church Street has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board.

SCOPE OF WORK (per submitted application)

1. Demolish existing rear deck.
2. Construct a wood frame addition on south (rear) elevation.
 - a. The footprint of the addition would measure 15'-0" wide by 10'-8" deep, and 9'-4" to the top of the wall plate.
 - b. The addition would extend from the west side of the south elevation and measure approximately half the width of the existing house.
 - c. A gable roof would top the addition and be covered in asphalt shingles.
 - d. The walls would be clad in wood siding to match the existing.
 - e. Exposed rafters, corner boards and trim would all match those on the existing structure.
 - f. The addition would sit on 2'-0"-tall brick piers to match the existing foundation in height and material.
 - g. Fenestration would consist of one (1) one-over-one wood single-hung window measuring 2'-6" wide by 4'-0" high just west of center on the south elevation and one (1) relocated pane and panel door on the east elevation.

- h. A wood landing, steps and rail would extend from the door on the east elevation. The landing would measure 4'-0" by 3'-0" deep. The steps would measure 4'-0" wide, and the railing, placed on the northern side of the steps, would measure 3'-0" high.
- i. Elevations would appear as follows:
 - South elevation (from west to east)
Corner board; window; corner board
 - East elevation (from south to north)
Corner board; door
 - West elevation (from north to south)
Existing corner board; corner board (no fenestration is proposed for this elevation)

STAFF REPORT

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

1. **6.9** Place an addition so that it is subordinate to the historic residential structure.
 - Place and design an addition to the rear or side of the historic building wherever possible.
2. **6.10** Design an addition to be compatible in massing and scale with the original historic structure.
 - Design the massing of an addition to appear subordinate to the historic building.
 - Where feasible, use a lower-scale connecting element to join an addition to a historic structure.
 - Where possible, match the foundation and floor heights of an addition to those of the historic building.
3. **6.11** Design the exterior walls of an addition to be compatible in scale and rhythm with the original historic structure.
 - Design the height of an addition to be proportionate with the historic building, paying particular attention to the foundation and other horizontal elements.
 - Design the addition to express floor heights on the exterior of the addition in a fashion that reflects floor heights of the original historic building.
4. **6.12** Clearly differentiate the exterior walls of an addition from the original historic structure.
 - Use a physical break or setback from the original exterior wall to visually separate the old from new.
 - Use an alteration in the roofline to create a visual break between the original and new, but ensure that the pitches generally match.
5. **6.13** Use exterior materials and finishes that are comparable to those of the original historic residential structure in profile, dimension and composition. Modern building materials will be evaluated for appropriateness or compatibility with the original historic structure on an individual basis, with the objective of ensuring the materials are similar in their profile, dimension, and composition to those of the original historic structure.
 - Use a material with proven durability.
 - Use a material with a similar appearance in profile, texture and composition to those on the original building.
 - Choose a color and finish that matches or blends with those of the historic building.
 - Do not use a material with a composition that will impair the structural integrity and visual character of the building.
6. **6.14** Design a roof of an addition to be compatible with the existing historic building.
 - Design a roof shape, pitch, material and level of complexity to be similar to those of the existing historic building.
 - Incorporate overhanging exposed rafters, soffits, cornices, fascias, frieze boards, moldings or other elements into an addition that are generally similar to those of the historic building.
 - Use a roofing material for an addition that matches or is compatible with the original historic building and the district.

7. **6.15** Design roofs such that the addition remains subordinate to the existing historic buildings in the district.
8. **6.16** Design doors and doorways to an addition to be compatible with the existing historic building.
 - Design a door and doorway to be compatible with the historic building.
 - Use a door material that is compatible with those of the historic building and the district.
 - Use a material with a dimensionality (thickness) and appearance similar to doors on the original historic building.
 - Design the scale of a doorway on an addition to be in keeping with the overall mass, scale, and design of the addition as a whole.
9. **6.19** Design piers, foundations and foundation infill on a new addition to be compatible with those on the historic building.
 - Match the foundation of an addition to that of the original.
 - Use a material that is similar to that of the historic foundation.
 - Match foundation height to that of the original historic building.
 - Use pier foundations if feasible and if consistent with the original building.
 - Do not use raw concrete block or wood posts on a foundation.
10. **6.20** Use details that are similar in character to those on the historic structure.
 - Match a detail on an addition to match the original historic structure in profile, dimension and material.
 - Use ornamentation on an addition that is less elaborate than on the original structure.
 - Use a material for details on an addition that match those of the original in quality and feel.
 - Match the proportions of details on an addition to match the proportions used on the original historic structure.
11. **6.21** Design a window on an addition to be compatible with the original historic building.
 - Size, place and space a window for an addition to be in character with the original historic building.

B. Staff Analysis

The application under review involves the removal of a deteriorated rear deck and the construction of a small addition on the western end of the south (rear) elevation. The *Guidelines* offer instruction on designing compatible additions to existing historic structures, stating that additions should be subordinate to and of compatible massing and scale to the original structure. The proposed addition would be to the rear of the house, in accordance with the *Guidelines*. The addition would have a footprint of approximately 150 square feet, which is inferior to the approximate 1434 square feet of the residence. (A.1) Likewise, the proposed addition is inferior in height and width to the main dwelling, which creates compatibility in massing. (A.2)

The exterior walls of additions should be compatible in rhythm and materials with the existing structure, but they also should be clearly distinguishable. The exterior walls of the subject addition, which would be clad in wood siding to match the existing structure, would also continue the established rhythm (wall to windows/doors) of the other elevations of the house. (A.3) As instructed by the *Guidelines*, the proposed addition would be distinguishable from the existing structure in multiple areas. First, the point at which the proposed addition meets the existing structure would be apparent on the west elevation through the retention of the existing corner board, and on the east elevation through the projection of the addition from the south elevation. Also, the lower roofline of the addition further differentiates the new fabric from the existing (A.4).

The *Guidelines* encourage the use of roofs on additions that are compatible with existing roofs in shape, pitch, level of complexity, covering, and details. The proposed addition would have a gable roof,

matching that of the existing dwelling. (A.6) The *Guidelines* further instruct that the roofs of additions should remain subordinate to the existing historic buildings in the district. The peak of the addition's roof sits halfway up the existing roof's western rake on the southern elevation, demonstrating its subordinate height to that of the existing and in compliance with the *Guidelines*. (A.7)

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

The relocation of an existing door to the addition complies with the *Guidelines* which state "if a historic door is removed to accommodate the addition, consider reusing it on the addition." (A. 8) Further, the *Guidelines* state that the windows of additions should be in character with the original historic building in regard to size and spacing. (A.11) The proposed one-over-one wood window on the addition is in character with windows on the existing structure.

The proposed addition will continue the use of restrained detailing seen on the existing structure such as exposed rafters, etc., which comply with the *Guidelines*' call to use details that match the character of the original structure. (A.10)

C. Summary of Analysis

- The proposed rear addition to the existing house would be subordinate to the existing historic building in massing and scale.
- The rhythm of solids to voids, use of differentiating corner boards, proposed wall cladding material, proposed window and door materials, matching foundation, and compatible roof are in compliance with the *Guidelines*.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on Section B above, Staff believes the proposed construction of a rear addition at 957 Church Street would not impair the architectural or historic character of the subject building or the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

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

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board had no comments.

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. Rodrigues and approved unanimously.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Roberts moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, the removal of the rear deck and construction of a rear addition at 957 Church Street would not impair the architectural and historic character of the structure or the surrounding district, and a Certificate of Appropriateness should be granted.

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

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

ADDRESS	113 Houston Street	APPLICATION NO.	2023-11-CA
SUMMARY OF REQUEST	New construction: frame single-family residence and stand-alone garage		
APPLICANT	Todd and Karen Beaton	OWNER, IF OTHER	

HISTORIC DISTRICT	Old Dauphin Way	MEETING DATE	03/01/2022
CLASSIFICATION	Vacant	REVIEWER	A. Allen

DISTRICT/PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

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

The property at 113 Houston is a vacant lot. The 1925 Sanborn Map (the first to include the area of the subject property in their survey) depicts a large two-story frame structure labeled as an apartment building with a five-car garage to the rear. According to MHDC files, these structures were destroyed in a fire in 1998.

This property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board.

SCOPE OF WORK (per submitted application and communication)

STAFF REPORT

1. Construct a one-and-a-half-story frame residence.
 - a. The proposed residence would be a cottage with Victorian era and Craftsman style detailing. The three-bay façade would consist of (from north to south) a gable roofed projecting first bay and a porch spanning the second and third bay. A porte-cochère would project from the north elevation, and a shed roof dormer would project from the roof on the south elevation.
 - b. The structure would be located on the lot such that the front wall plane would sit 34’-0” back from the street front. The north and south side yards will measure 16’-0” and 4’-0” wide, respectively.
 - c. A gable roof would top the structure, measuring 30’-0” at its peak. Both the main structure roof and the shed roof porte-cochère would be clad in fiberglass shingles.
 - d. The proposed structure would be clad in Hardie board horizontal siding, with Hardie board faux cedar shake shingles installed in the front (west) gable. The siding would be painted a grey-blue color approved by Staff. All trim would be of wood and painted white.
 - e. The proposed residence would measure 30’-0” wide by 71’-0” deep, and 30’-0” high at the peak of the roof.
 - f. The structure would rest on 18” brick piers with wood lattice infill.
 - g. Fenestration material: All doors, sidelights and transoms would be wood. All windows on the west façade would be wood. All windows on east, north and south elevations would be vinyl clad wood.

h. Elevations would appear as follows:

1) West façade

The west façade would consist of three (3) bays. The first bay (from north to south) would comprise a gable roof projection measuring approximately 14'-0" wide. A pair of two-over-two windows measuring 2'-8" wide by 7'-0" tall would be centered on the bay, and a Hardie board louvered vent measuring 18" wide by 30" tall would be centered in the gable above the windows.

The second and third bays would include a front porch measuring 16'-0" wide by 9'-0" deep, supported by two (2) equally spaced 16"-wide wood tapered columns, painted white and set on 18"-wide by 3'-0" tall brick pediments. Three (3) brick steps measuring 8'-6" wide would access the porch and would be located on the second bay, in line with the entry door.

The front wall plane sheltered by the porch would consist of a 3'-0" wide by 8'-0" pane-and-panel door (or other Staff approved wood door to be determined by applicant) flanked by sidelights and topped by a three-lite transom located on the central bay and a pair of two-over-two windows measuring 2'-8" wide by 7'-0" tall in the third bay.

2) East elevation

The east (rear) elevation, from south to north, would consist of a pane and panel door measuring 3'-0" wide by 8'-0" tall (or other Staff approved wood door to be determined by applicant) and a fixed window measuring 5'-0" wide by 2'-0" tall, regularly spaced on the elevation. A two-over-two window measuring 3'-0" wide by 5'-0" tall would be centered in the gable.

A brick landing, measuring 5'-0" wide by 3'-0" deep would project from the door and be flanked on the north and south side by three brick steps descending to ground level. Above the door, a wooden shed roof would project 3'-0", supported by two wood brackets.

3) North elevation

The first bay of the north elevation, from east to west, would consist of two (2) two-over-two windows, each measuring 2'-8" wide by 6'-0" tall. The second bay would consist of a recessed open porch area measuring 11'-0" wide by 12'-0" deep. A pane and panel door measuring 3'-0" wide by 8'-0" tall (or other Staff approved wood door to be determined by applicant) would be located in the recess. The third bay would consist of one two-over-two window measuring 2'-8" wide by 6'-0" tall and one (1) fixed window measuring 3'-0" wide by 1'-0" tall, regularly spaced across the bay.

A porte-cochère topped with a shed roof would project from the approximate center of the wall and in front of the recessed area. This structure would project northward by 12'-0" and have a depth of 18'-6". The shed roof would be clad in fiberglass shingles and supported by two (2) 10" by 10" wood posts each measuring approximately 11'-0" high.

4) South elevation

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

The sidewall portion would consist two pairs of two-over-two windows measuring 2'-8" wide by 7'-0" tall, regularly spaced across the elevation.

The southern depth of the brick landing on the rear elevation would project eastward by 3'-0".

A shed dormer would project from the eastern third of the roof and consist of a pair of two-over-two windows, each measuring 3'-0" wide by 5'-0" tall, centered on the dormer. The dormer roof would be clad in fiberglass shingles to match the residence.

2. Construct a garage.
 - a. The proposed structure would be located to the east or rear of the proposed dwelling, on the northeastern corner of the property.
 - b. The proposed structure would measure 24'-0" wide by 23'-0" deep and 26'-0" at the peak of the roof.
 - c. A front-gabled roof clad in fiberglass shingles would top the structure.
 - d. The proposed structure would be clad in Hardie board horizontal siding and painted to match the residence.
 - e. Fenestration: The west (front) façade would consist of a pair of paneled fiberglass garage doors, each measuring 10'-0" wide by 8'-0" tall, equally spaced on the elevation. One (1) louvered vent of Hardie board material would measure 18" wide by 30" tall, and be centered on the west gable above the garage doors. The south elevation would consist of one (1) two-over-two vinyl clad window measuring 2'-8" wide by 3'-0" tall and a six-paneled wood door measuring 3'-0" wide by 6'-8" tall.
 - f. The foundation would be slab on grade.
 - g. Elevations would appear as follows:
 - 1) West façade
Corner board; garage door; garage door; corner board.
 - 2) East elevation
No fenestration is proposed for this elevation.
 - 3) North elevation
No fenestration is proposed for this elevation.
 - 4) South elevation
Corner board; two-over-two window; six-paneled door; corner board. A concrete slab landing measuring 4'-0" wide by 4'-0" deep would project from the door.
3. Proposed site improvements include a concrete driveway measuring approximately 12'-0" wide, which would be accessed on the northwest side of the property and would run eastward from the street, continuing to the entrance of the garage. A concrete parking/turnaround area would extend be located adjacent to the residence's east (rear) elevation.

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-and-a-half story frame residence and a garage. 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 34'-0", along with the side yard spacings of 16'-0" and 4'-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 statelier two-story structures with projecting side wings. The proposed one-and-a-half story cottage design for 113 Houston Street is consistent in massing, proportions, and heights with surrounding historic structures. (A.3,4)

The decorative elements and design details proposed for the subject structure such as the steeply pitched gable roof, paneled door with sidelights and transom, projecting shed dormer, two-over-two windows, etc. lend respect to the Victorian styles and to the character of the district. The proposed materials of brick, wood, smooth Hardie board siding, and vinyl-clad wood windows are acceptable for new construction and are sympathetic to the character of the surrounding historic district. Further, many of the lots on Houston Street and nearby cross streets such as Laurel Street and Hunter Avenue are narrow and deep with single-story homes which boast gable 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 lattice infill 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 roof height of 30'-0" at 113 Houston would be observably similar to those of nearby structures. (A.5-12, 17)

The existing walkway on the lot would join the sidewalk to the steps of the front porch, providing a visual connection between the street and the proposed residence as mandated in the *Guidelines*. (A.13) The driveway and parking/turnaround area are compliant in material, and their placement on the property would minimize the visual impact of parking. (A.14)

The proposed placement of the garage structure 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 garage (26'-0" at the peak) versus the primary structure (30'-0" at the peak) and its smaller footprint (552 square feet versus approximately 2130 square feet) make the accessory structure clearly subordinate to the proposed house. Siding and window materials are compliant with the *Guidelines*. Fiberglass is not an approved material for doors within Mobile's historic districts. However, the proposed garage doors are for a non-historic accessory structure which would be minimally visible from the street. (A.15, 16)

C. Summary of Analysis

- The application proposes the construction of a single-story frame residence and garage 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*, with the exception of the fiberglass doors proposed for the garage doors. However, these doors are intended for a non-historic structure which is not highly visible from the street.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on Section B above, Staff believes the proposed construction of a one-and-a-half story frame residence and garage at 113 Houston Street would not impair the architectural and historic character of the surrounding district and recommends approval of the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Todd Beaton 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 how the attic room would be accessed.
Mr. Beaton provided a hard copy of the floor plan to clarify.

Ms. Van Antwerp asked Staff to clarify that vinyl clad wood windows were being considered in the subject application and that Staff had recommended approval in light of the denial of vinyl windows at previous meetings and discussions being undertaken by the Board to reconsider and understand the integrity of certain alternative materials including vinyl.

Ms. Wilson stated that vinyl clad wood windows are an accepted material as the *Design Guidelines* are currently written.

Ms. Allen responded that Staff is obligated to write reports and formulate recommendations based off of what the *Guidelines* state in the moment. Although the Board is in discussions about possibly amending the acceptance of certain alternative materials, Staff must adhere to the current *Guidelines*, which state that vinyl clad wood windows are an accepted material for Mobile's historic districts.

Mr. Allen asked the applicant why the plan proposes wood windows for the front and vinyl clad windows on all other elevations.

Mr. Beaton responded that this choice was made on recommendation from his architect.

Mr. Allen stated that his concern is that the ARB is learning about durability issues of vinyl-clad windows.

Mr. Roberts stated that the Board must abide by the Guidelines as written.

Mr. Allen stated that the Board does not know what the specific proposed window would look like.

Mr. Roberts stated that the Board could grant approval to the application with exception of windows until a sample could be provided.

Mr. Beaton stated that he is currently living in a temporary apartment with metal and vinyl windows; that he is aware of the inferiority of these windows and in no way would put an inferior product on his house. He added that he wishes to use good quality materials that respect the character of the surrounding historic houses, including the windows.

Mr. Rodrigues suggested that a manufacturer's cutsheet be provided for the Board to review the proposed window product.

Mr. Roberts stated that an actual sample would be better as the Board would have proof to defend the *Guidelines*.

Mr. Allen stated a concern with approving a project without approving the windows.

Mr. Roberts asked the applicant if he would agree to return in two weeks and provide a sample of the proposed vinyl clad window product.

Mr. Beaton said that he would.

Mr. Blackwell asked if there was any further Board discussion as to this structure. He stated that he believes the applicant is amenable to holding over the application to the next meeting and having material delivered in a time where Staff can write the report. He asked if there was a motion to holding over the application as discussed.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Joseph Rodrigues moved to table the application until the next meeting.

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

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

ADDRESS	154 S. Warren Street	APPLICATION NO.	2023-12-CA
SUMMARY OF REQUEST	New construction: Expansion within rear porch footprint for kitchen and bathroom; covered outdoor seating area		
APPLICANT	Don Bowden	OWNER, IF OTHER	Robert Bronstein

HISTORIC DISTRICT	Church Street East	MEETING DATE	3/1/2023
CLASSIFICATION	Non-Contributing	REVIEWER	C. Dawson

DISTRICT/PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

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

The two-story brick veneered house at 154 S. Warren Street was constructed c. 1995. The 1885 Sanborn map of the area shows a one-story rectangular frame dwelling on the southern half of the current parcel. The house had a full-width front porch, an ell extending from the rear elevation, and a partial-width back porch. A one-story frame outbuilding was located at the rear lot line. The lot to the north was vacant. The 1891 Sanborn map shows the same arrangement of the house and outbuilding, but they were separated from the lot to the north by a fence or wall enclosing two one-story frame structures of unknown purpose. The buildings, located at 152 S. Warren Street, are shown as open on one side, so they may have been run-in barns or open sheds. The Sanborn map of 1904 shows the rear porch of the house on the southern lot had been expanded in the intervening years to shelter the entire south side of the rear ell. The two modest outbuildings on the lot to the north were replaced by one larger stable located against the western property line. By the time of the 1924 Sanborn map, updated in 1955, the rectangular house at 154 S. Warren Street and the stables at 152 had been demolished, and a larger, square-shaped, two-story frame house had been constructed over both lots. The two lots had been combined to create the existing parcel known as 154 S. Warren Street. Aerial photographs from 1952 and 1960 show the house extant. The 1967 aerial photograph is unclear, but the lot was cleared by the time of the 1980 photograph.

The property at 154 S. Warren Street has appeared once previously before the Architectural Review Board (ARB). The construction of the extant two-story residence was approved by the ARB in 1993.

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

1. Infill the central 20'-1" of the existing first floor rear porch and central 21'-11 1/2" of the second floor rear porch with living area.
 - a. The infill would be constructed beneath the existing roof and would be clad in stucco to match the existing rear elevation.
 - b. The existing porch support columns on the north and south ends of each floor would remain, as would the existing railing and balustrades between the columns and the infill at center and the existing rear (west) wall of the house.
 - c. The existing five-light fixed horizontal window at the north end of the second floor of the

- west elevation, the dogleg exterior stairs at the north end of the west elevation, and the French doors with transom at the south end of the west elevation would be removed.
- d. New windows would be aluminum clad, and new doors would be fiberglass. The proposed shutters would be functional louvered wood types.
 - e. The doors at the north and south ends of the west elevation would be accessed via concrete steps.
 - f. The first-floor elevations would appear as follows.
 - 1) North, from east to west: three (3) louvered wood shutters filling space between rear wall and existing porch support column
 - 2) West, from north to south: existing porch support column, louvered wood shutter, fiberglass pane-and-panel door measuring 3'x8', two (2) sets of paired 4'-6"x2' aluminum clad eight-light casement windows centered on the addition and flanked by wood louvered shutters, one (1) pair of 4'-6"x2' aluminum clad eight-light casement windows flanked by wood louvered shutters, existing porch support column
 - 3) South, from west to east: existing porch support column, louvered wood shutter, fiberglass pane-and-panel door measuring 3'x8', existing rear southwest corner of the house
 - g. The second-floor elevations would appear as follows.
 - 1) North, from west to west: 3'x8' fiberglass pane-and-panel door behind existing railing and balustrade, existing porch support column
 - 2) West from north to south: existing porch support column, existing railing and balustrade, one (1) 2'x2'10" aluminum-clad six-light casement window centered on the addition and flanked by louvered wood shutters, paired 2'6"x8' fiberglass pane-and-panel doors flanked by louvered wood shutters behind the existing railing and balustrade, existing porch support column
 - 3) South from west to east: existing porch support column, existing rail and balustrade, existing southwest corner of the house
2. Replace the existing central door and double-leaf doors on the east (front) elevation with paired French doors.
 - a. All new doors would be flanked by functional louvered wood shutters.
 - b. The existing single-leaf paneled door with sidelights and transom at the center of the first-floor elevation would be replaced with a pair of fiberglass pane-and-panel doors with no sidelights or transom.
 - c. All of the existing paired French doors with transoms (5) would be replaced with fiberglass pane-and-panel doors with no transom.
 3. Construct a covered outdoor seating area and covered walkway on the south side of the existing garage.
 - a. The proposed seating area would measure approximately 18'x13'-8".
 - b. The seating area would be sheltered by a side-gabled roof supported by eleven (11) 6" square wood columns with 1"x6" caps and bases. The roof would be clad in shingles to match the existing.
 - c. A stuccoed chimney with terra cotta chimney pot would rise from the roof near the north end.
 - d. 2' tall rectangular wooden louvers would be placed between the support columns.
 - e. The seating area would be paved with bluestone pavers.
 - f. An approximate 4'-wide covered walkway would be constructed between the north end of the west elevation of the house and the covered seating area. The flat roof would be supported by four columns matching those of the seating area, and the walkway would be paved with concrete.

STAFF REPORT

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

1. Design additions and alterations to non-historic structures to be compatible with the placement, massing, and scale of surrounding structures.
 - Design an addition to respect the original orientation of the building and maintain the typical orientation of adjacent historic buildings.
 - Design an addition to a non-historic building to preserve setback distances and spacing between buildings to maintain setbacks and spacing typical of surrounding historic structures. (6.25)
2. Design alterations and additions to non-historic structures to be compatible in massing and scale with surrounding historic structures.
 - Design the massing of an addition to be consistent with the massing of historic structures in the district.
 - Design a roofline, bay, porch, or other element associated with an addition to a non-historic building to be in keeping with the scale of surrounding historic structures. (6.26)
3. Design exterior building walls associated with additions and alterations to non-historic structures to respect the character of the historic district.
 - Design a cornice line, foundation line, window and door height, and floor and ceiling height of an addition to a non-historic building to be similar to those of the original building provided these elements of the original building blend harmoniously with the historic district.
 - Use the alteration or addition to a non-historic building to improve the overall structure's appropriateness within the historic district. (6.27)
4. Design exterior materials and finishes associated with additions and alterations to non-historic structures to be compatible with the historic district.
 - Use materials with a character compatible to those used historically and with proven durability.
 - Maintain original material wherever possible provided the material is durable and compatible with the surrounding historic district. (6.28)
5. Design details and ornamentation to minimize impacts to the historic district.
 - Design details and ornamentation at a scale that is consistent with details and ornamentation on historic buildings in the district. (6.32)
6. 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. (6.33)
7. Design an accessory structure to be subordinate in scale to that of the primary structure. (9.1)
8. Locate a new accessory structure in line with other visible accessory structures in the district, traditionally located at the rear of the 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. The materials often include metal, plastic, and fiberglass. (9.2)

B. Staff Analysis

The subject property, 154 S. Warren Street, was constructed in 1995; it is a Non-Contributing property within the Church Street East Historic District. The application under review involves partially infilling

the two rear porches with living space, replacing doors on the façade of the house, constructing an outdoor seating area, and replacing a door on the existing carport/storage structure.

Regarding additions and alterations to non-historic structures within historic districts, the *Guidelines* instruct that they be compatible with the placement, massing, and scale of surrounding structures; compatible in massing and scale with surrounding historic structures, and that their exterior walls respect the character of the historic district. (A.1, 2, 3) The proposed infill of portions of the first and second floor rear porches at 164 S. Warren would be compatible in massing and scale to nearby historic structures and the district, as the additions would exist beneath an existing roof and would not alter the existing footprint of the building. The proposed walls would be stuccoed to match the existing structure, a treatment compatible with the surrounding district. All of the materials proposed for the infill construction (stucco walls, aluminum-clad windows, wood railings, etc.) are compatible with the surrounding district and the *Guidelines*. (A.4, 5, 6)

The proposed replacement doors for the façade (east elevation) would be similar in design to the existing, non-historic doors and would preserve the rhythm of solids to voids on that elevation. The doors would be fiberglass, a material compatible with the period of the subject property's construction, and they would be flanked by wood shutters, which would add appropriate ornamentation to the façade. (A.4, 5)

The proposed seating area shelter would have a footprint of approximately 246 square feet, and the existing house has a footprint of approximately 1,525 square feet, per the City's GIS; the new shelter would have a footprint equaling approximately 16% of the primary structure. The highest point of the roof of the proposed shelter would be the same height as the existing carport/storage building. The primary structure on the property is two stories in height; therefore, the proposed shelter would be subordinate to the primary structure in size and scale, in conformance with the *Guidelines*. (A.13) Further, the structure would be located traditionally, at the rear of the lot. (A.7, 8)

The wood frame shelter would employ traditional building materials including wooden louvered panels between wooden support columns and roofing to match the carport. (A.8)

C. Summary of Analysis

- The proposed rear addition to the existing house would conform to the *Guidelines* in regard to placement, mass, scale, detailing, and materials.
- The proposed replacement doors and flanking shutters on the façade conform to the *Guidelines*.
- The proposed covered seating area would be subordinate to the existing house, would be located at the traditional rear of the lot, and would employ materials approved for use in Mobile's historic districts.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on Section B above, Staff believes the proposed partial infill of rear porches for use as living space, the proposed replacement of doors on the façade, and construction of a covered outdoor seating area would not impair the architectural or historic character of the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Don Bowden 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

The Board had no comments.

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 partial infilling of the two rear porches with living space, replacing doors on the façade of the house, constructing an outdoor seating area, and replacing a door on the existing carport/storage structure 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 3:47 pm.