

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
November 16, 2022 – 3:00 P.M.
Assembly Room, Government Plaza
205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

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

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

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

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

2. Ms. Van Antwerp moved to approve the minutes from November 2, 2022 meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Roberts and approved unanimously.
3. Mr. Blackwell moved to approve the Mid-Month COAs granted by Staff. The motion was seconded by Mr. Rodrigues and approved unanimously.

MID-MONTH APPROVALS - APPROVED

1. **Applicant: Ethos General Contractors LLC**
 - a. Property Address: 1552 Monterey Place
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/25/2022
 - c. Project: Reroof in-kind with Timberline shingles. Color: Shakewood
2. **Applicant: Chad E. Foster**
 - a. Property Address: 1263 Selma Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/25/2022
 - c. Project: Reroof in-kind with architectural shingles. Color: Charcoal
3. **Applicant: Anne Read**
 - a. Property Address: 1225 Selma Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/25/2022
 - c. Project: Replace front door, transom, and sidelights to match existing. Continue repair and replacement in-kind where needed of siding, spindles, deck flooring, and front steps.
4. **Applicant: Franchise Management Services Inc.**
 - a. Property Address: 110 Beverly Court
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/25/2022
 - c. Project: Reroof in-kind with new shingles in Pewter color
5. **Applicant: Jerry Graham Roofing**
 - a. Property Address: 456 S. Broad Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/27/2022
 - c. Project: Reroof in-kind with architectural shingles. Color: Black
6. **Applicant: Roof Doctor**

- a. Property Address: 258 Stocking Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 10/28/2022
 - c. Project: Reroof in-kind with shingles. Color: Shakewood
- 7. Applicant: Arthur Coleway**
- a. Property Address: 117 Garnett Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/1/2022
 - c. Project: Reroof with asphalt shingles in charcoal black.
- 8. Applicant: Nathan Jones**
- a. Property Address: 8 S. Monterey Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/2/2022
 - c. Project: Repair/replace rotten wood to match existing in material, profile, and dimension.
- 9. Applicant: Charles Salisbury**
- a. Property Address: 1056 Palmetto Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 11/2/2022
 - c. Project: Install 8'x12' pre-fab storage shed (11'-4" at roof peak) at north end of driveway. Siding will be wood lap, windows will be aluminum one-by-one sash, and door will be paired vertical board wood. Shed will rest on cement slab foundation, and front-gabled roof will be covered with gray shingles.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2022-70-CA: 352 and 500 Marine Street

- a. Applicant: Todd Fowler
- b. Project: Move existing shotgun type house from 500 Marine Street to 352 Marine Street

APPROVED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

2. 2022-71-CA: 355 and 502 Marine Street

- a. Applicant: Todd Fowler
- b. Project: Move existing shotgun type house from 502 Marine Street to 355 Marine Street

APPROVED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

3. 2022-72-CA: 63 N. Monterey Street

- a. Applicant: Don Bowden on behalf of Nicholas and Anna Clapper
- b. Project: Repair fire damage and rebuild rear portion of house

APPROVED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

D. OTHER BUSINESS

- 1. The next ARB meeting is scheduled for December 7, 2022.

Public comment regarding items on this agenda will be accepted via e-mail (mhdc@cityofmobile.org) or USPS (Mobile Historic Development Commission, P.O. Box 1827, Mobile, AL 36633) until 5PM on Tuesday, November 15, 2022. Please include your name, home address, and the item number about which you are writing.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

ADDRESS	500/352 Marine St.	APPLICATION NO.	2022-70-CA
SUMMARY OF REQUEST	Move existing shotgun house from 500 Marine Street to vacant lot at 352 Marine Street		
APPLICANT	Todd Fowler	OWNER, IF OTHER	
HISTORIC DISTRICT	Oakleigh Garden (local only/National Register)	MEETING DATE	11/16/2022
CLASSIFICATION	Contributing/Vacant	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 wood-frame shotgun type house proposed to be moved to 352 Marine Street currently resides at 500 Marine Street, which is just within the locally-only designated portion of the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. The house was constructed c. 1900. The 1904 Sanborn map (the earliest available) shows a one-story frame shotgun type house at this location, then numbered 400 Marine Street. As now, the house had a full-width front porch and a rear porch at its southwest corner. A one-story frame shed was located at the southwest corner of the property. The 1925 Sanborn map, updated in 1956, shows a shed on the property, but it is located closer to the house. The footprint of this property has remained static since at least 1904, except that it was joined to the house at 502 Marine Street via a single-story hyphen at some point between 1980 and 2002. Aerial photography for the intervening years is unclear, but the properties were owned by the same family from 1989 until last year, a fact that may slightly narrow the window in which the change was made. The house was damaged by fire in October 2022.

The vacant lot at 352 Marine Street is located within the Oakleigh Garden National Register District. It was the southern end of the lot known as 752 Savannah Street and was occupied by a one-story frame outbuilding at its west end in 1904, as reflected on the Sanborn map of that year. By 1925, the current lot had been subdivided off, and the deep, narrow house with full width front porch located on the lot likely was a shotgun type. A 1952 aerial photo appears to show the same structure on the parcel. Tree cover in photos from 1955 through 2009 obscures the east end of the parcel, but the lot was occupied until some point between 2009 and 2011. Survey photographs from 1979, 1989, and 1995 on file at the Historic Development office show a one-story frame shotgun type house with small addition at the northwest corner on the property. Google Street View images from 2007 and 2008 show the same structure on the site. A Street View image from May 2011 reveals severe fire damage to the house, suffered as a result of the house to the immediate north being destroyed by fire. By the time the April 2013 Street View image was captured, the lot had been cleared.

The property at 500 Marine Street has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board (ARB) before. The property at 352 Marine Street has appeared before the ARB three times previously. In August 1991, the ARB approved minor repairs after a fire. In October 2019, the ARB approved the construction of a one-story shotgun type house on the property. In May 2022, the ARB approved moving a shotgun type house from Hercules Street to this location.

SCOPE OF WORK (per submitted application and communications):

1. Remove frame hyphen connecting 500 Marine Street to 502 Marine Street.
2. Move the frame shotgun house at 500 Marine Street to the vacant lot at 352 Marine Street, placing the structure 7'-2" west of the Marine Street ROW and approximately 3' from the southern property line.
3. Remove security bars.
4. Repair/rehabilitate the exterior of the house as follows.
 - a. The building would be placed on a brick pier foundation with framed, vertical pressure-treated wood infill such that the finished floor would be 3' above grade.
 - b. The existing wood six-over-six windows would be repaired or replaced in-kind, if irreparably damaged.
 - c. The existing vinyl siding would be removed, and any existing wood siding would be repaired or replaced in-kind on the east, west, and north elevations. The south elevation would be clad in cementitious fiber siding to achieve adequate fire rating at the lot line.
 - d. The existing historic turned wood porch supports at the north and south ends of the façade (east elevation) would be duplicated at the outer edge of the porch, replacing the three existing plain posts.
 - e. The non-historic front porch balustrade would be replaced with 1"x1" wood pickets with a 1"x4" wood cap handrail and bottom rail.
 - f. Install new pressure treated wood steps and handrail at the south end of the front porch.
 - g. Install a three-light transom over the front door.
 - h. Replace the front door with a period-appropriate salvaged wood pane-and-panel door.
 - i. Construct a shed roof to shelter the new landing at the rear door.
 - 1) The shed roof would measure approximately four (4) feet deep by four (4) feet wide and would be supported by wooden knee brackets.
 - 2) Install new pressure treated wood stoop, steps, and handrail at the north end of the west elevation. The stoop would be enclosed by horizontal 2"x4" wood boards with a 1"x4" wood cap handrail.
 - 3) The steps would extend down from south to north.
 - j. The rear door would be replaced with a period-appropriate salvaged pane-and-panel door.
 - k. Install one (1) new wood six-over-six window measuring approximately 2'x3' toward west end of south elevation and one (1) new wood six-over-six window measuring approximately 3'x5' to the west of the existing window on the south elevation.
 - l. Restore gingerbread trim at outside corners of front-facing gable.
 - m. Repair and/or replace in-kind damaged fascia and soffit.
5. Site Improvements
 - a. Install an 8' wide gravel driveway on the north side of the house, extending to approximately midway between the front and rear of the house.
 - b. Install a brick-paved walkway between the sidewalk and front steps of the house.

STAFF REPORT

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

1. Impact on the Street and District
 - “Consider the impact of removing the historic structure relative to its context.
 - Consider whether the building is part of an ensemble of historic buildings that create a neighborhood.” (12.0)
2. Nature of Proposed Development
 - “Consider the future utilization of the site.” (12.0)
3. Relocation Guidelines
 - New Location: “Consider whether or not a structure will be relocated within the same district and in a similar context. Relocation may be more appropriate when the receiving site is in the district. Relocated buildings shall be placed in situations that do not impair the architecture or the historic character of the surrounding buildings and district.”
 - Building Placement: “When relocating a building, maintain its general placement and orientation on the new site so as to maintain the architectural and historical character of the streetscape and district.
 - Where possible, relocate a building to a site that is similar in size as perceived from the street.” (12.0)
4. “Preserve original building materials.”
 - Repair deteriorated building materials by patching, piecing-in, consolidating, or otherwise reinforcing the materials.
 - Remove only those materials which are deteriorated and beyond reasonable repair.
 - Do not remove original materials that are in good condition.” (5.4)
5. “Use original materials to replace damaged materials on primary surfaces where possible.”
 - Use original materials to replace damaged building materials on a primary façade if possible. If the original material is wood clapboard, for example, then the replacement material should be a material that matches the original in finish, size, and the amount of exposed lap. If the original material is not available from the site, use a replacement material that is visually comparable with the original material.
 - Replace only the amount of material required. If a few boards are damaged beyond repair, for example, then only they should be replaced, rather than the entire wall.
 - Do not replace building materials on the primary façade, such as wood siding and masonry, with alternative or imitation materials unless it cannot be avoided.
 - Wholesale replacement of exterior finishes is generally not allowed.” (5.6)
6. “When replacing materials on a non-primary façade or elevation, match the original material in composition, scale, and finish.”
 - Use original materials to replace damaged materials on a non-primary façade when possible.
 - The ARB will consider the use of green building materials such as those made with renewable and local resources to replace damaged materials on a non-primary façade if they do not impact the integrity of the building or its key features.
 - Replace exterior finishes to match original in profile, dimension, and materials.” (5.7)
7. “Preserve the decorative and functional features of a primary door.”
 - Original doors and openings, including their dimensions, should be retained along with any moldings, transoms, or sidelights.
 - Maintain the original position and proportions of a historically significant door.” (5.14)
8. “Repair or replace a damaged historic door to maintain its general historic appearance.”

- Replacements should reflect the age and style of the building.
 - Use materials that are visibly comparable to that of the original.
 - Do not use solid core or flush doors.” (5.15)
9. “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.” (5.20)
10. “Preserve the original piers, foundations, and foundation infill wherever possible.” (6.7)
11. “Repair and, when necessary, replace piers, foundations, and foundation infill to reflect historic character.
- Maintain the original rhythm of a foundation.
 - Do not secure lattice to the face of the building.
 - If used, hang lattice below the skirt board or siding between piers and frame with trim.
 - Recess foundation screening from the front of the foundation piers.” (6.8)
12. “Design a new porch to be compatible with the existing historic building.
- Design the scale, proportion, and character of a porch addition element, including columns, corner brackets, railings, and pickets to be compatible with the existing historic residential structure.
 - Match the foundation height of a porch addition to that of the existing historic structure.
 - Design a porch addition roofline to be compatible with the existing historic structure. However, a porch addition roofline need not match exactly that of the existing historic building. For example, a porch addition may have a shed roof.
 - Use materials for a porch addition that are appropriate to the building.” (6.18)
13. “Visually connect the street and building.
- Maintain or install a walkway leading directly from the sidewalk to the main building entry.” (10.5)
14. “Minimize the visual impact of parking.
- Locate a parking area at the rear or to the side of a site whenever possible.
 - 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.” (10.7)

B. Staff Analysis

The subject properties, 500 and 352 Marine Street, are both within the Oakleigh Garden Historic District, but 352 is within the National Register district and 500 is within the locally-only designated portion of the district. The application under review involves moving the house currently located at 500 Marine Street to 352 Marine Street, rehabilitating the exterior, constructing a rear stoop, and making site improvements.

The structure to be moved is located in a locally designated historic district. Because the house will be removed from its original site, the end result for its block of Marine Street is identical to a demolition. When demolition is considered, the *Guidelines* direct, “Consider the future utilization of the site” and, “Consider whether the building is part of an ensemble of historic buildings that create a neighborhood.” The subject block of Marine Street has experienced a much lower rate of building loss than nearby blocks on Texas Street within the last sixty years. As with much of the southern portion of Oakleigh, the block has suffered significant levels of disinvestment. However, the house currently is located in close

proximity to other shotgun houses of similar vintage and with similar levels of material and design integrity. The removal of the building would result in an empty lot and accelerate building loss on the block. Further, it would leave a very obviously empty corner lot (A.1, 2)

Regarding the proposed new location for the house at 352 Marine Street, the *Guidelines* state, “Consider whether or not a structure will be relocated within the same district and in a similar context. Relocation may be more appropriate when the receiving site is in the district. Relocated buildings shall be placed in situations that do not impair the architecture or the historic character of the surrounding buildings and district.” The application proposes to move the structure within the same district and to a similar visual context; the architectural context would be similar to the one from which the building would come, i.e., smaller frame single-family residences dating from the turn of the twentieth century. The relocated building would blend well with the existing buildings on this stretch of Marine Street, even ostensibly duplicating the shotgun house formerly on the site that was lost to fire. The submitted site plan shows it would be located 11’-2” west of the Marine Street right-of-way (ROW), a similar setback to the approximate 10’ the house currently sits west of the Marine Street ROW. Further, the proposed setback negotiates the setbacks of nearby houses on Marine Street, such as 359 Marine (approximately 12’), 358 Marine (approximately 8’-4”), 357 Marine (approximately 17’), and 356 Marine (approximately 18’-4”). The proposed setback would be in conformance with the *Guidelines*, which encourage that relocated buildings maintain their general placement and orientation on the new site “so as to maintain the architectural and historical character of the streetscape and district.” (A.3)

After the house is moved and placed upon a brick pier foundation, rehabilitation of the exterior would be undertaken. (A.10, 11) To that end, the existing wood six-over-six windows would be repaired or replaced in-kind, the existing vinyl siding would be removed, the underlying wood lap siding would be repaired or replaced in-kind on the east, west, and north elevations, the front door would be replaced with a salvaged wood pane-and-panel door, and a three-light transom would be installed over. (A.4, 5, 7, 8, 9) The south elevation would be clad in cementitious fiber siding, a replacement material permitted in Mobile’s historic districts on non-primary elevations, to achieve adequate fire rating at the lot line. (A.6)

The front porch of the house would be rehabilitated through the duplication of the existing historic turned porch supports, and the non-historic front porch balustrade would be replaced with 1”x1” wood pickets with a 1”x4” wood cap handrail and bottom rail.

. The front steps and handrail would be replaced with new pressure treated wood steps and handrail, in accordance with the *Guidelines*. A new rear stoop would be constructed of wood on the rear (west) elevation, and it would be covered by a new shed roof (A.12)

A brick walkway linking the front steps to the sidewalk would be installed, and a gravel driveway would be installed to the north of the house on its new site at 352 Marine Street. Both the walkway and driveway would be created in accordance with the *Guidelines*. (A.13, 14)

C. Summary of Analysis

- The house at 500 Marine Street is located in the locally-only designated portion of the Oakleigh Garden Historic District.
- The lot to which the shotgun house would be moved is currently vacant but formerly was the site of a similar shotgun type house.
- The proposed exterior rehabilitation of the house is in conformance with the *Guidelines*.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on Section B above, Staff believes the proposed removal of the house at 500 Marine Street would impair the architectural or historic character of the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. However, Staff

believes the placement of the house at 352 Marine Street would not impair the architectural or historic character of the immediate vicinity of Oakleigh Garden National Register District. Staff recommends approval of the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Todd Fowler was present to discuss the application. He stated that the current owner of the houses at 500 and 502 Marine Street intends to demolish them, and Mr. Fowler would save them by moving them a few blocks north.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Blackwell verified that 500 Marine Street is in the locally designated-only portion of Oakleigh Garden District and that 502 Marine Street is not in any district.

Mr. Allen asked whether the Board had previously approved moving houses to 352 and 355 Marine Street. Ms. Dawson stated the Board had approved moving two shotgun type houses from Hercules Street to these addresses on Marine Street in May. Mr. Fowler noted the two houses on Marine Street would be easier and less expensive to relocate.

FINDING OF FACT

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

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Roberts moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, the removal of existing shotgun house from 500 Marine Street and its replacement at the vacant lot at 352 Marine Street would not impair the architectural or historic character of the subject properties or 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	502/355 Marine St.	APPLICATION NO.	2022-71-CA
SUMMARY OF REQUEST	Move existing shotgun house from 502 Marine Street to vacant lot at 355 Marine Street		
APPLICANT	Todd Fowler	OWNER, IF OTHER	

HISTORIC DISTRICT	None/Oakleigh Garden	MEETING DATE	11/16/2022
CLASSIFICATION	none/Vacant	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 wood-frame shotgun type house proposed to be moved to 355 Marine Street currently resides at 502 Marine Street, which is not located within a historic district. The house was constructed c. 1900. The 1904 Sanborn map (the earliest available) shows a one-story frame shotgun type house at this location, then numbered 402 Marine Street. As now, the house had a full-width front porch and a rear porch at its southwest corner. A one-story frame shed was located at the northwest corner of the property. The 1925 Sanborn map, updated in 1956, shows a shed on the property, does not depict the shed; however, the house had been expanded to the west. The footprint of this property has remained static since at least 1925, except that it was joined to the house at 500 Marine Street via a single-story hyphen at some point between 1980 and 2002. Aerial photography for the intervening years is unclear, but the properties were owned by the same family from 1989 until last year, a fact that may slightly narrow the window in which the change was made. The house was damaged by fire in October 2022.

The vacant lot at 355 Marine Street was vacant until some point between 1904 and 1925, as no structure appears on the Sanborn map of 1904 but one does appear in 1925. The dating summary in the department's property file concludes, based on tax records, that the long, narrow, one-story frame house (likely a shotgun) depicted on the 1925 Sanborn was constructed in 1907. The house shared the lot with another long, narrow house, and a one-story frame garage located at the east end behind the houses. Aerial photographs from 1952, 1955, and 1967 show the same arrangement, but by 1987, the garage structure had disappeared. A 1979 file photo shows a front-gabled, wood-frame shotgun type house with a pane-and-panel front door and transom, masonry front steps, turned porch supports, jigsaw bargeboard, and simple wooden porch balustrade. The 1989 file photo shows the same detailing, though the house appeared to be better maintained. The 1997 aerial photograph revealed that the house located at the southeast corner of Marine and Savannah streets, north of the two shotgun houses, had been removed. By 2004, the shotgun house to the north of 355 Marine had been removed and a new, larger house had been constructed at the southeast corner of Marine and Savannah streets. Google Street View images show a

shotgun house at 355 Marine Street from November 2007 through May 2011. By April 2013, the lot had been cleared.

355 Marine Street has appeared before the Architectural Review Board (ARB) four times previously. In May 1999, the ARB approved the replacement of damaged wood on the front and rear porches and the installation of new wood window frames. In December 2012, the ARB approved the demolition of the house, which had been gutted in a fire. An application to construct a single-family residence on the lot was approved by the ARB in October 2019. In May 2022, the ARB approved moving a shotgun type house from Hercules Street to this location.

SCOPE OF WORK (per submitted application and communications): *(All references to cardinal directions below are for the structure after being moved to Marine Street.)*

1. Remove frame hyphen connecting 500 Marine Street to 502 Marine Street.
2. Remove non-historic rear addition.
3. Move the frame shotgun house at 502 Marine Street to the vacant lot at 355 Marine Street, placing the structure 17'-6" east of the Marine Street ROW and approximately 3' from the northern property line.
3. Remove security bars.
4. Repair/rehabilitate the exterior of the house as follows.
 - a. The building would be placed on a brick pier foundation with framed, vertical pressure-treated wood infill such that the finished floor would be 3' above grade.
 - b. The existing wood six-over-six windows would be repaired or replaced in-kind, if irreparably damaged.
 - c. The existing vinyl siding would be removed, and any existing wood siding would be repaired or replaced in-kind on the east, west, and south elevations. The north elevation would be clad in cementitious fiber siding to achieve adequate fire rating at the lot line.
 - d. The existing non-historic shed-roofed addition on the rear (west) elevation would be removed.
 - e. The non-historic front porch balustrade would be replaced with 1"x1" wood pickets with a 1"x4" wood cap handrail and bottom rail.
 - f. Install new pressure treated wood steps and handrail at the south end of the front porch.
 - g. Install a three-light transom over the front door.
 - h. Replace the front door with a period-appropriate salvaged wood pane-and-panel door.
 - i. Construct a shed roof to shelter the new landing at the rear door.
 - 1) The shed roof would measure approximately four (4) feet deep by four (4) feet wide and would be supported by wooden knee brackets.
 - 2) Install new pressure treated wood stoop, steps, and handrail at the south end of the east elevation. The stoop would be enclosed by horizontal 2"x4" wood boards with a 1"x4" wood cap handrail.
 - 3) The steps would extend down from north to south.
 - j. The rear door would be replaced with a period-appropriate salvaged pane-and-panel door.
 - k. Install one (1) new wood six-over-six window measuring approximately 2'x3' toward east end of south elevation and one (1) new wood six-over-six window measuring approximately 3'x5' at the approximate center of the south elevation.
 - l. Restore gingerbread trim at outside corners of front-facing gable.
 - m. Repair and/or replace in-kind damaged fascia and soffit.
5. Site Improvements
 - a. Install an 8' wide gravel driveway on the south side of the house, extending to approximately midway between the front and rear of the house.

- b. Install a brick-paved walkway between the sidewalk and front steps of the house.

STAFF REPORT

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

1. Impact on the Street and District
 - “Consider the impact of removing the historic structure relative to its context.
 - Consider whether the building is part of an ensemble of historic buildings that create a neighborhood.” (12.0)
2. Nature of Proposed Development
 - “Consider the future utilization of the site.” (12.0)
3. Relocation Guidelines
 - New Location: “Consider whether or not a structure will be relocated within the same district and in a similar context. Relocation may be more appropriate when the receiving site is in the district. Relocated buildings shall be placed in situations that do not impair the architecture or the historic character of the surrounding buildings and district.”
 - Building Placement: “When relocating a building, maintain its general placement and orientation on the new site so as to maintain the architectural and historical character of the streetscape and district.
 - Where possible, relocate a building to a site that is similar in size as perceived from the street.” (12.0)
4. “Preserve original building materials.”
 - Repair deteriorated building materials by patching, piecing-in, consolidating, or otherwise reinforcing the materials.
 - Remove only those materials which are deteriorated and beyond reasonable repair.
 - Do not remove original materials that are in good condition.” (5.4)
5. “Use original materials to replace damaged materials on primary surfaces where possible.”
 - Use original materials to replace damaged building materials on a primary façade if possible. If the original material is wood clapboard, for example, then the replacement material should be a material that matches the original in finish, size, and the amount of exposed lap. If the original material is not available from the site, use a replacement material that is visually comparable with the original material.
 - Replace only the amount of material required. If a few boards are damaged beyond repair, for example, then only they should be replaced, rather than the entire wall.
 - Do not replace building materials on the primary façade, such as wood siding and masonry, with alternative or imitation materials unless it cannot be avoided.
 - Wholesale replacement of exterior finishes is generally not allowed.” (5.6)
6. “When replacing materials on a non-primary façade or elevation, match the original material in composition, scale, and finish.”
 - Use original materials to replace damaged materials on a non-primary façade when possible.
 - The ARB will consider the use of green building materials such as those made with renewable and local resources to replace damaged materials on a non-primary façade if they do not impact the integrity of the building or its key features.
 - Replace exterior finishes to match original in profile, dimension, and materials.” (5.7)
7. “Preserve the decorative and functional features of a primary door.”
 - Original doors and openings, including their dimensions, should be retained along with

- any moldings, transoms, or sidelights.
 - Maintain the original position and proportions of a historically significant door.” (5.14)
8. “Repair or replace a damaged historic door to maintain its general historic appearance.
 - Replacements should reflect the age and style of the building.
 - Use materials that are visibly comparable to that of the original.
 - Do not use solid core or flush doors.” (5.15)
 9. “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.” (5.20)
 10. “Preserve the original piers, foundations, and foundation infill wherever possible.” (6.7)
 11. “Repair and, when necessary, replace piers, foundations, and foundation infill to reflect historic character.
 - Maintain the original rhythm of a foundation.
 - Do not secure lattice to the face of the building.
 - If used, hang lattice below the skirt board or siding between piers and frame with trim.
 - Recess foundation screening from the front of the foundation piers.” (6.8)
 12. “Design a new porch to be compatible with the existing historic building.
 - Design the scale, proportion, and character of a porch addition element, including columns, corner brackets, railings, and pickets to be compatible with the existing historic residential structure.
 - Match the foundation height of a porch addition to that of the existing historic structure.
 - Design a porch addition roofline to be compatible with the existing historic structure. However, a porch addition roofline need not match exactly that of the existing historic building. For example, a porch addition may have a shed roof.
 - Use materials for a porch addition that are appropriate to the building.” (6.18)
 13. “Visually connect the street and building.
 - Maintain or install a walkway leading directly from the sidewalk to the main building entry.” (10.5)
 14. “Minimize the visual impact of parking.
 - Locate a parking area at the rear or to the side of a site whenever possible.
 - 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.” (10.7)

B. Staff Analysis

The subject property, 355 Marine Street, is a vacant lot within the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. The application under review involves moving the house currently located at 502 Marine Street to 355 Marine Street, rehabilitating the exterior, constructing a rear stoop, and making site improvements.

The structure to be moved is not located in a historic district, though, if surveyed, it might be considered eligible for listing in the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. Because the house will be removed from its original site, the end result for Marine Street is identical to a demolition. When demolition is considered, the *Guidelines* direct, “Consider the future utilization of the site” and, “Consider whether the building is part of an ensemble of historic buildings that create a neighborhood.” The subject block of Hercules

Street has experienced a moderate rate of building loss and significant levels of disinvestment; however, the house currently is located in close proximity to other shotgun houses of similar vintage and with similar levels of material and design integrity. The removal of the building would result in an empty lot (literal disinvestment) and accelerate building loss on the block. (A.1, 2)

Regarding the proposed new location for the house at 355 Marine Street, the *Guidelines* state, “Consider whether or not a structure will be relocated within the same district and in a similar context. Relocation may be more appropriate when the receiving site is in the district. Relocated buildings shall be placed in situations that do not impair the architecture or the historic character of the surrounding buildings and district.” The application proposes to move the structure to a different neighborhood; however, the architectural context would be similar to the one from which the building would come, i.e., smaller frame single-family residences dating from the turn of the twentieth century. The relocated building would blend well with the existing buildings on this stretch of Marine Street, even ostensibly duplicating the shotgun house formerly on the site. However, the submitted site plan shows it would be located 17’-6” east of the Marine Street right-of-way (ROW), almost twice as far as the approximate 10’ the house currently sits west of the Marine Street ROW. While the proposed setback would virtually match that of 357 Marine (approximately 17’-1”), it would be farther set back than the houses at 359 Marine (approximately 12’-1”) and 358 Marine (approximately 8’-4”), but less than 356 Marine (approximately 18’-4”). The proposed setback would be in conformance with the *Guidelines*, which encourage that relocated buildings maintain their general placement and orientation on the new site “so as to maintain the architectural and historical character of the streetscape and district.” (A.3)

After the house is moved and placed upon a brick pier foundation, rehabilitation of the exterior would be undertaken. (A.10, 11) To that end, the existing wood six-over-six windows would be repaired or replaced in-kind; the existing vinyl siding would be removed; the underlying wood lap siding would be repaired or replaced in-kind on the east, west, and south elevations; the front door would be replaced with a salvaged wood pane-and-panel door, and a three-light transom would be installed above. (A.4, 5, 7, 8, 9) The north elevation would be clad in cementitious fiber siding, a replacement material permitted in Mobile’s historic districts on non-primary elevations, to achieve adequate fire rating at the lot line. (A.6)

The front porch of the house would be rehabilitated through the repair of the existing historic turned wood porch supports. The front steps and handrail would be replaced with new pressure treated wood steps and handrail, in accordance with the *Guidelines*. A new rear stoop would be constructed of wood on the rear (east) elevation, and a shed roof would shelter the rear door. (A.12)

A brick walkway linking the front steps to the sidewalk would be installed, and a gravel driveway would be installed to the south of the house on its new site at 355 Marine Street. Both the walkway and driveway would be created in accordance with the *Guidelines*. (A.13, 14)

C. Summary of Analysis

- The house at 502 Marine Street is not located in a historic district, though if surveyed, the area may retain sufficient material and design integrity to be added to the Oakleigh Garden Historic District.
- The lot to which the shotgun house would be moved is currently vacant but formerly was the site of a similar shotgun type house.
- The proposed exterior rehabilitation of the house is in conformance with the *Guidelines*.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on Section B above, Staff believes the proposed removal of the house at 502 Marine Street would impair the architectural or historic character of the street, though it is not located in a designated historic district. However, Staff believes the placement of the house at 355 Marine Street would not impair the architectural or historic character of the surrounding Oakleigh Garden District. Staff recommends approval of the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Todd Fowler was present to discuss the application. He stated that the current owner of the houses at 500 and 502 Marine Street intends to demolish them, and Mr. Fowler would save them by moving them a few blocks north.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Blackwell verified that 500 Marine Street is in the locally designated-only portion of Oakleigh Garden District and that 502 Marine Street is not in any district.

Mr. Allen asked whether the Board had previously approved moving houses to 352 and 355 Marine Street. Ms. Dawson stated the Board had approved moving two shotgun type houses from Hercules Street to these addresses on Marine Street in May. Mr. Fowler noted the two houses on Marine Street would be easier and less expensive to relocate.

FINDING OF FACT

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

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Roberts moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, the removal of existing shotgun house from 502 Marine Street and its replacement at the vacant lot at 355 Marine Street would not impair the architectural or historic character of 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	63 N. Monterey Street	APPLICATION NO.	2022-72-CA
SUMMARY OF REQUEST	Construct a two-story addition to rear elevation; construct a small addition on second-story of east façade; repairs and alterations.		
APPLICANT	H. Don Bowden/Bowden Architecture	OWNER, IF OTHER	Nicholas Clapper

HISTORIC DISTRICT	Old Dauphin Way	MEETING DATE	11/16/2022
CLASSIFICATION	Contributing	REVIEWER	A. Allen

DISTRICT/PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

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

The property at 63 N. Monterey is two-story American Foursquare with Classical Revival detailing. According to MHDC files, the house was constructed c. 1913 and is attributed to James H. and Sarah Huey Patterson. The structure does not appear on the 1904 Sanborn Map. The 1925 Sanborn Map depicts a frame structure with a porch spanning the façade. The rear of the residence was extended c. 1970, and a rear deck was added in 2003. In 2022, the house sustained significant damage from a fire, which eliminated all evidence of the non-historic rear deck.

This property has appeared before the Architectural Review Board once before. In 2007, an application to replace an existing door and install a wooden hood at the rear elevation was approved.

SCOPE OF WORK (per submitted application and communication)

1. Construct a two-story addition to west (rear) elevation after fire damage.
 - a. The addition would measure 13’-4” deep by 32’-2” wide.
 - b. The proposed hipped roof would extend westward from the existing roof’s ridgeline and sit slightly lower than the original roof line.
 - c. The foundation would consist of brick piers and framed lattice panel infills, all to match existing.
 - d. Materials: The proposed addition would be clad in wood lap siding to match the existing historic building, and the roof would be topped with Timberline architectural shingles in charcoal color to match existing. All windows and doors would be wood.
 - e. The west elevation would appear as follows:

First Story

 - 1) Eight vertical screened panels would be installed in pairs between 8”x8” wood columns (six in total) with 6” caps and 10” bases, set at 5’-10” intervals and spaced regularly across the elevation.
 - 2) Double paneled doors would be centered on the elevation, between the third and fourth columns (from north to south). Each would measure 7’-8” tall by 3’-0” wide. A wood canopy would be constructed above the doors, topped with architectural shingles and

supported by two wooden corbels which would be attached to the third and fourth columns.

- 3) A wooden cornice would run the width of the elevation at the second story floor level.
- 4) Construct six new brick steps centered on the rear porch entry doors. The bottom step would measure 19'-7" wide, with each subsequent step decreasing in width, with the top step measuring approximately 14'.

Second Story

- 1) The second story would be clad in lap siding.
 - 2) The elevation would consist of one (2) four-over-one window measuring 2'-0" wide by 5'-5" tall installed on the outer ends close to the end wall on the north and south. Two (2) pairs of six-over-one windows measuring 3'-0" wide by 5'-5" tall would sit inside the four-over-one windows and be centered on the elevation.
- f. The north elevation of the addition would consist of the following (from east to west):

First Story

- 1) One (1) 8"x8" wood column which abuts the existing end wall; one (1) vertical screen panel; lap siding bay which would measure 6'-0" wide; one (1) vertical screen panel; one (1) 8"x8" wood column.
- 2) A wood cornice would run the length the addition bay at second floor level.

Second Story

- 1) Lap siding.
- g. The south elevation would consist of the following (from west to east):

First Story

- 1) One (1) 8"x8" wood column; a pair of vertical screen panels; one (1) 8"x8" wood column; a paneled entry door flanked by two (2) vertical screen panels which would measure approximately 8" wide; one (1) 8"x8" wood column which abuts the existing end wall.
- 2) Six (6) wooden steps flanked by wood railing and balustrades would lead to the entry door and would measure approximately 6'-4" wide.
- 3) A wood cornice would run the length the addition bay at second floor level.

Second Story

- 1) One (1) six-over-one window measuring 3'-0" wide by 5'-5" tall which would sit approximately 6" east of the end wall; one (1) six-over-one window measuring 3'-0" wide by 5'-5" tall which would be centered on the existing end wall.
2. Construct a small addition which would project from the center of the east façade's second story.
- a. This addition would measure 12'-4" wide by 5'-5" deep and be topped by a hipped roof which would extend from the existing front roof plane.
 - b. This proposed addition would be clad in wood lap siding to match existing.
 - c. One (1) four-over-one wood window measuring 2'-0" wide by 4'-0" tall would be centered on the east (front) wall of the addition.
 - d. The roof would be clad in architectural shingles to match existing.
3. Carry out repairs and alterations to existing north and south (side) elevations as follows:

North Elevation

- 1) Replace wood lap siding in-kind where necessary.
- 2) On the second story, the existing small fixed window would be replaced with a wood four-over-one wood window to match existing; an additional wood four-over-one window would be installed west of the existing six-over-one window; the existing six-over-one window would be replaced with a four-over-one window.
- 3) The existing stairwell window would be removed and replaced with wood lap siding to match existing.
- 4) On the first floor, the existing double four-over-one window will be replaced with a set of three four-over-one wood windows.

South Elevation

- 1) On the first floor, from west to east, the double six-over-one windows would be altered to consist of a paneled door in the position of the eastern window, with the existing upper sash left as a transom above. A 4" concrete slab would be installed at grade below the door. The western existing six-over-one window would remain. A new hipped canopy would stretch across the window and door, supported by two wooden brackets and topped with architectural shingles to match existing. An extant first floor window opening on the existing third bay of the elevation would be removed and replaced with lap siding in-kind.
- 2) On the second floor, from west to east, the existing double six-over-one windows would remain with missing panes replaced in kind; original six-over-one windows (which survived the fire) would be reinstalled to fit the two subsequent existing window openings on the elevation.
4. Repaint the entire house as follows:
 - a. The siding, trim and decorative features would be painted in Sherwin Williams City Loft ISW7631)
 - b. The front porch deck will be painted in Sherwin Williams Antique Pewter (DCR 057)
 - c. Accent areas and foundation will be painted in Sherwin Williams Historic Charleston Green (DCR 099)
 - d. The front porch ceiling will be painted in Sherwin Williams Window Pane (SW6210)

STAFF REPORT

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

1. 5.4 Preserve original building materials.
 - Repair deteriorated building materials by patching, piecing-in, consolidating or otherwise reinforcing the material.
 - Remove only those materials which are deteriorated, and beyond reasonable repair.
 - Do not remove original materials that are in good condition.
2. 5.7 When replacing materials on a non-primary façade or elevation, match the original material in composition, scale and finish.
 - Use original materials to replace damaged materials on a non-primary façade when possible.
 - The ARB will consider the use of green building materials, such as those made with renewable and local resources to replace damaged materials on a nonprimary façade if they do not impact the integrity of the building or its key features.
 - Use alternative or imitation materials that match the style and detail of the original material to replace damaged non-primary building materials.
 - Replace exterior finishes to match original in profile, dimension and materials.
3. 5.21 When historic windows are not in a repairable condition, match the replacement window design to the original.
 - In instances where there is a request to replace a building's windows, the new windows shall match the existing as per location, framing, and light configuration.
 - Use any salvageable window components on a primary elevation.
4. 6.7 Preserve the original piers, foundations, and foundation infill wherever possible.
 - Retain original materials where possible.
 - Place plantings far enough from the home to avoid future maintenance problems.
5. 6.8 Repair and, when necessary, replace piers, foundations and foundation infill to reflect historic character.
 - Maintain the original rhythm of a foundation.

- Do not secure lattice to the face of the building.
- If used, hang lattice below the skirts board or siding between piers and frame with trim.
- Recess foundation screening from the front of the foundation piers.
- Use a construction that results in screening that respects the historic character of the building.

ACCEPTABLE REPLACEMENT MATERIALS

Materials that are the same as the original, or that appear similar in character are acceptable.

These often include:

- Stucco piers or infill
- Brick piers or infill
- Stuccoed concrete block
- Wood lattice or vertical picket infill
- Vinyl (if appropriately cased)

UNACCEPTABLE REPLACEMENT MATERIALS

Materials that do not appear similar to the original in character are unacceptable. These often include:

- Metal infill
- Plywood panels
- Mineral board panels
- Plastic or vinyl sheeting
- Unfinished concrete block
- Imitation brick or stone

Historic Residential Buildings: Additions

- 6.9 Place an addition so that it is subordinate to the historic residential structure.
 - Place and design an addition to the rear or side of the historic building wherever possible.
 - Place a vertical addition in the rear so it is not visible from the street.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 6.13 Use exterior materials and finishes that are comparable to those of the original historic residential structure in profile, dimension and composition. Modern building materials will be evaluated for appropriateness or compatibility with the original historic structure on an individual basis, with the objective of ensuring the materials are similar in their profile, dimension, and composition to those of the original historic structure.
 - Utilize an alternative material for siding as necessary, such as cement-based fiber board, provided that it matches the siding of the historic building in profile, character and finish.

- Use a material with proven durability.
 - Use a material with a similar appearance in profile, texture and composition to those on the original building.
 - Choose a color and finish that matches or blends with those of the historic building.
 - Do not use a material with a composition that will impair the structural integrity and visual character of the building.
 - Do not use a faux stucco application.
11. 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.
 12. 6.15 Design roofs such that the addition remains subordinate to the existing historic buildings in the district.
 - Where possible, locate a dormer or skylight on a new addition in an inconspicuous location.
 - In most cases, match a roof and window on a dormer to those of the original building.
 13. 6.16 Design doors and doorways to an addition to be compatible with the existing historic building.
 - If a historic door is removed to accommodate the addition, consider reusing it on the addition.
 - Design a door and doorway to be compatible with the historic building.
 - Use a door material that is compatible with those of the historic building and the district.
 - Use a material with a dimensionality (thickness) and appearance similar to doors on the original historic building.
 - Design the scale of a doorway on an addition to be in keeping with the overall mass, scale and design of the addition as a whole.
 14. 6.18 Design a new porch to be compatible with the existing historic building.
 - Design the scale, proportion and character of a porch addition element, including columns, corner brackets, railings and pickets, to be compatible with the existing historic residential structure.
 - Match the foundation height of a porch addition to that of the existing historic structure.
 - Design a porch addition roofline to be compatible with the existing historic structure. However, a porch addition roofline need not match exactly that of the existing historic building. For example, a porch addition may have a shed roof.
 - Use materials for a porch addition that are appropriate to the building.
 15. 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.
 16. 6.20 Use details that are similar in character to those on the historic structure.
 - Match a detail on an addition to match the original historic structure in profile, dimension and material.
 - Use ornamentation on an addition that is less elaborate than that on the original structure.
 - Use a material for details on an addition that match those of the original in quality and feel.
 - Match the proportions of details on an addition to match the proportions used on the original

historic structure.

17. 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 proposes the construction of a two-story addition to the west (rear) elevation, a small projecting addition centered on the second floor of the east façade, and repairs and alterations to the north and south elevations.

The *Guidelines* call for an addition to an existing historic structure to be subordinate to the main structure, including the addition's roof, which is achieved by this application. The proposed two-story addition on the rear of the structure would be approximately 854 square feet, as opposed to the existing structure which is over 3000 square feet. The proposed second story addition for the east façade would be approximately 67 square feet. The alteration in rooflines on both additions also serve to differentiate new construction from original. A physical break in the wall plane is achieved with the porch columns on the north and south elevations (for the rear addition) and on the east façade with the projecting addition walls, which further distinguish the additions as required by the *Guidelines*. Although the proposed addition for the east façade does not comply with the *Guidelines*, which call for additions to be made to side or rear elevations whenever possible, an argument can be made that, due to its small scale, it does not visibly disrupt the architectural integrity of the façade, and its design integrates seamlessly with the historic structure. Also, it should be noted that the addition of a shared bath on a side or rear elevation would present practical difficulties and cause more significant disruption to the stylistic integrity of the building than its proposed location. Foundation and floor heights of the additions would align with those of the existing. (A. 6-9, 14-15)

The materials and finishes proposed for exterior walls, roof, fenestration and foundation of the proposed additions match those of the original historic structure, maintaining its architectural integrity and visual character. Likewise, the design, scale, and size of the proposed windows are in keeping with the existing historic windows on the structure, as directed by the *Guidelines* (A.10-13, 16).

In regard to the repairs and alterations, the applicant proposes the use of in-kind materials where replacement is needed, and the scale and design of all replacement features reflect the historic character of the building, as mandated by the *Guidelines*. The alterations to window and door configurations on both the north and south elevations maintain a fenestration pattern typical of the style of the subject structure. Further, the addition of the canopy over the door and window on the south elevation echoes the roof design of the existing first-floor projection, which is a practice consistent with the *Guidelines*. The paint colors proposed for the exterior of the building are consistent with those approved for use in Mobile's historic districts. (A. 1-5)

C. Summary of Analysis

- The application proposes the construction of a two-story addition to the west (rear) elevation, a small projecting addition centered on the second floor of the east façade, and repairs and alterations to the north and south elevations.
- The proposed additions would be differentiated by an alteration in roofline and visible breaks between original and new.
- The proposed rear addition would be subordinate to the existing historic structure in scale and placement.

- The proposed addition for the east façade does not comply with the *Guidelines* in regard to placement. However, the addition integrates seamlessly with the façade, maintaining the structure’s architectural integrity.
- The proposed materials and finishes for additions, repairs, and alterations comply with the *Guidelines*.
- The proposed alterations reflect the historic character of the subject structure and maintain patterns consistent with its style.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on Section B above, Staff believes the proposed construction of a two-story addition to the west (rear) elevation, a small projecting addition centered on the second floor of the east façade, and repairs and alterations at 63 N. Monterey would not impair the architectural or historic character of the existing historic structure or the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Don Bowden was present to discuss the application. He stated that the house had experienced a serious fire in August, and the rear “addition” would be on the footprint of the burned portion of the building.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Roberts noted that the fenestration on the façade (east elevation) is spaced such that the proposed addition on the second floor will look like it was always intended.

FINDING OF FACT

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

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Roberts moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, the proposed construction of a two-story addition to rear elevation, construction of a small addition on second-story of east façade and repairs and alterations would not impair the architectural or historic character of the subject property or surrounding district, and a Certificate of Appropriateness should be granted.

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

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:29 p.m.