

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD Minutes
July 20, 2022 – 3:00 P.M.
Multi-Purpose Room, Government Plaza
205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

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

Members Present: Bob Allen, Cart Blackwell (alternate), Abby Davis, Catarina Echols, Karrie Maurin, Andre Rathle, Craig Roberts, Gypsy Van Antwerp, and Jim Wagoner

Members Absent: Janelle Adams (alternate), Kimberly Harden, Kathleen Huffman (alternate), and Joseph Rodrigues

Staff Members Present: Annie Allen, Bridget Daniel, Christine Dawson, Chris Kern and John Sledge

2. Mr. Blackwell moved to approve the minutes from the July 6, 2022 meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Roberts and approved unanimously.
3. Ms. Van Antwerp moved to approve the Mid-Month COAs Granted by Staff. The motion was seconded by Mr. Roberts and approved unanimously.

MID-MONTH APPROVALS - APPROVED

1. **Applicant: Franchise Management Services Inc.**
 - a. Property Address: 8 Houston Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/28/2022
 - c. Project: Reroof in-kind with shingles in Charcoal color.
2. **Applicant: Mack Lewis Contractor Inc.**
 - a. Property Address: 1208 Selma Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/28/2022
 - c. Project: Replace rear entry door on north elevation (formerly enclosed porch) with 5'4" x 6'8" S2000-LE Smooth-Star glazed double door. Remove non-historic window from west end of north elevation and infill with siding to match.
3. **Applicant: John King**
 - a. Property Address: 8 South Hallett Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/28/2022
 - c. Project: Install Velux galvanized steel roof-top ventilator on west elevation.
4. **Applicant: Peter Wilson**
 - a. Property Address: 14 McPhillips Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/29/2022
 - c. Project: Reroof small accessory building located to the rear of the house with 5V crimp metal.
5. **Applicant: DBK Incorporated**
 - a. Property Address: 260 South Ann Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/30/2022
 - c. Project: Reissue of COA originally issued 7/16/2021: Enlarge the existing rear porch by extending it to the north and east, wrapping around the existing northwest

corner of the house.

6. Applicant: Jason Burce

- a. Property Address: 1059 Augusta Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/01/2022
- c. Project: Repaint entire house in Sherwin Williams: French Moire (siding), Refuge (shutters), White (trim).

7. Applicant: Oral Robert Lombard

- a. Property Address: 1011 Selma Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/05/2022
- c. Project: Install 6'-high treated pine privacy fence to sit behind the front (north) plane of the main structure. On the east side of the house, the fence will extend from the structure's east elevation to the property line, then southward down the eastern property line to the south (rear) property line. On the west side of the house, a gate of the same material will extend from the west elevation across the driveway to the west property line.

8. Applicant: Bernhardt Roofing & General Construction LLC

- a. Property Address: 14 South Hallett Street
- b. Date of Approval: 7/07/2022
- c. Project: Reroof in-kind with architectural shingles in slate color. Reroof flat roof with modified bitumen in slate color.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2022-36-CA: 155 Roberts Street

- a. Applicant: George Powers
- b. Project: Carport and storage area addition to rear of house; enclosure of covered walkway; site improvements

APPROVED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

2. 2022-37-CA: 555 Dauphin Street

- a. Applicant: Noell Broughton
- b. Project: Construct rooftop bar

APPROVED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

3. 2022-39-CA: 204 Lanier Avenue

- a. Applicant: Lucy Barr on behalf of Mr. and Mrs. Guy Oswalt
- b. Project: Demolish existing garage; construct new garage and outdoor living space

APPROVED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

4. 2022-40-CA: 1206 Palmetto Street

- a. Applicant: Douglas Kearley on behalf of Robert Burns
- b. Project: Construct two-story addition to rear of house; install porch roof railing

DEFERRED - APPLICANT NOT PRESENT

5. 2022-25-CA: 809 Government Street

- a. Applicant: Rashawn Figures
- b. Project: Remove and replace existing doors on north and west elevations

APPROVED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

6. 2022-41-CA: 1673 Government Street

- a. Applicant: Felipe Garcia
- b. Project: Construct second floor addition to rear of house; minor fenestration changes

APPROVED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

ADDRESS	155 Roberts Street	APPLICATION NO.	2022-36-CA
SUMMARY OF REQUEST	Carport/storage addition and enclosure of existing covered walkway.		
APPLICANT	George Powers	OWNER, IF OTHER	
HISTORIC DISTRICT	Old Dauphin Way	MEETING DATE	07/20/2022
CLASSIFICATION	Non-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 does not appear on the 1904 Sanborn map, as it is outside the area included on this map. The 1925 Sanborn map depicts an empty lot at 155 Roberts Street. Aerial imagery from 1955 shows the lot still empty. The 1967 aerial image shows a house similar in form to the current structure. Documentation on photographs included in the MHDC file (dated 1984) give a construction date of c.1960 for the house. Due to tree coverage, it is unclear if and when any subsequent additions or alterations occurred.

This property has never previously appeared before the Architectural Review Board.

SCOPE OF WORK (per submitted application and communication)

1. Construct a carport/storage structure on the south elevation, and enclose an existing covered walkway on the south end of the east elevation.
 - a. Measurements: The new carport addition would measure 24’0” wide by 32’0” deep and match existing ceiling/roof heights. The enclosure would measure approximately 24’ wide x 4’ 8” deep.
 - b. Materials: The entire addition and enclosure would be clad in wood siding and the roof would be steel, both to match the existing structure. Overhanging eaves to match the design on the existing structure would extend past the west and east wall planes by 2’6”.
 - c. Foundation: 3 ½” topping slab
 - d. Fenestration on the new integrated addition would appear as follows:
 - a. West elevation: no new fenestration proposed on the addition
 - b. South elevation: One (1) double solid wood door to match existing exterior doors in materials, located on the eastern end of the south elevation. This door would measure approximately 6’0’ wide x 7’6” high.
 - c. East elevation from south to north: One (1) six-over-six window measuring 3’ wide x 6’9 ¼” high; One (1) exterior solid wood door which would measure 3’ wide x 7’6” high; One (1) double six-over-six window measuring 8’6 1/8” wide x 6’9 ¼” high.

2. Site Improvement: Construct a new concrete driveway which would access the proposed carport structure on the west elevation, and would measure approximately 23'11" wide.

STAFF REPORT

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

1. **6.25** Design additions and alterations to non-historic structures to be compatible with the placement, massing and scale of surrounding historic 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.
2. **6.26** 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.
3. **6.27** 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 on 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.
4. **6.28** 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.
5. **6.29** Design replacement roofs and roofs of additions to be compatible with the district.
 - Use a roof material that is in keeping with the historic district.
6. **6.31** Design a foundation to be consistent with those in the district and use a durable foundation material on all sides of a building.
7. **6.32** 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.
8. **6.33** Design window alterations and windows on new additions to non-historic structures to be compatible with the neighborhood.
 - Use a material and window type that is similar to those seen historically in the neighborhood.

B. Staff Analysis

The subject property, 155 Roberts Street, is a non-contributing property within the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. This application proposes an addition of a carport/storage structure to the south elevation, and the enclosure of a rear covered walkway on the east elevation.

The proposed addition and rehabilitation comply with the *Guidelines* in that they keep the original orientation of the structure, and preserve setback distances and spacing between surrounding historic structures. The alterations would maintain the original main entry with no change in orientation. (A.1)

In further keeping with the *Guidelines*, the proposed addition sustains the form and central theme of the original house with equivalent roof lines and wall heights, matching traditional materials, consistent form and corresponding details. As such, the proposed addition does not disrupt the balance of massing and scale, nor the use of compatible materials, which in turn upholds the character of the historic district. (A.2- A.8)

It must be noted that, although this structure is non-contributing to the historic district, it is a fine example of a mid-century ranch. It expresses many features of the style, including the low-pitched side-gabled roof, off-set recessed main entry, and varied cladding material. The distinctive brickwork on the broad low chimney along with the rear covered walkway defining an outdoor living area are distinguishing elements of the ranch design. Although this proposed project respects the style and scale of the existing house, it will diminish both of these architectural features' contribution to the character of the design style.

C. Summary of Analysis

- The proposed addition and alterations to the structure would be compatible in placement, orientation, massing, and scale with surrounding historic structures.
- The applicant's choice of materials and design are consistent with the original structure and minimize the impact to the surrounding historic district.
- With the noted effects of the proposed changes on the existing architectural features, the proposed addition still maintains the architectural integrity of this non-contributing structure.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on Section B above, Staff believes the proposed carport/storage area and enclosed covered walkway at 155 Roberts Street would not impair the architectural or historic character of the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Powers was present to discuss the application. He stated that Roberts Street can be a busy street and this project would provide a safer parking location for his vehicles than street parking. He added that the carport and storage room would provide needed space for personal items after a recent move.

No written comments regarding the application were received from the public; no one was physically present to comment on the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Blackwell complimented Mr. Powers on the subject house, adding that it is a great house which was designed by Ed Baumhauer.

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 Ms. Van Antwerp and approved unanimously.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Roberts moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, the proposed construction of a carport/storage structure and the enclosure of an existing covered walkway would not impair the architectural or historic character of the surrounding district, and a Certificate of Appropriateness should be granted.

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

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

ADDRESS	555 Dauphin Street	APPLICATION NO.	2022-37-CA
SUMMARY OF REQUEST	Construction of rooftop bar		
APPLICANT	Noell Broughton	OWNER, IF OTHER	Wendell Quimby

HISTORIC DISTRICT	Lower Dauphin Street Commercial	MEETING DATE	07/20/2022
CLASSIFICATION	Contributing	REVIEWER	A. Allen

DISTRICT/PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

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

Although the National Register nomination dates this property c. 1960, there have been one-story masonry structures on the site since at least 1885. The 1878 Hopkins ward map shows two structures of unknown height or material on the site, at that time numbers 259 and 261 Dauphin Street. The 1885 Sanborn Fire Insurance map shows three shallow, one-story brick commercial structures (nos. 257, 259, and 261) occupied by a cobbler, a “boots and shoes” store, and the abbreviation for “station”, possibly a stationery store. A wooden canopy ran along the street frontage of 259 and 261. The 1891 Sanborn map depicts an identical situation except the street numbers had changed to 559, 561, and 563. A frame canopy or breezeway ran between no. 561 and a small frame building behind it (labeled 561 ½), and the canopy on the street frontage now extended in front of 559 (formerly 257). By the time the 1904 Sanborn map was prepared, the two units to the west were simply labeled “Store”, and the easternmost unit was labeled “Laundry.” A one-story porch had been appended to the east side of 557, and a frame structure appended to the rear of 561 housed an oven. The 1924 Sanborn map shows all three units connected on the interior and used as a furniture store. A one-story concrete block furniture warehouse had been added to the rear of 559. The frame addition to the rear of 561 had disappeared. A 1952 aerial photo revealed no change to the footprint of the property, but at some point, between 1967 and 1980, an addition was made to the rear that approximately doubled the property’s footprint. The footprint appears unchanged since that time.

This property has appeared before the Architectural Review Board (ARB) once. An (after-the-fact) application for the construction of a rooftop deck and access stair was approved in May 2022.

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

1. Construct a rooftop bar roughly located on the center of the north (front) elevation, setback 26’6” south of the northern plane of the building.
 - a. The structure would measure approximately 19’ wide by 7’8” deep, and will stand approximately 8’6” high.
 - b. The walls of the rooftop bar structure would be clad in vertical Hardieboard siding. The shed roof would be clad in metal V-crimp roofing.

STAFF REPORT

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

1. 5.13 Use new roof materials that convey a scale and texture similar to those used traditionally.
 - Use materials that are consistent with the architectural style of the structure.
 - Use materials with a similar texture, pattern and finish to the original.
 - If installing a new metal roof, apply and detail it in a manner that is compatible with the historic character of the roof, period and style.
 - Use standing seam metal, metal shingles or five v-crimp.
 - Use metal with a matte, non-reflective finish.
 - Install the roof to have low profile seams.
 - Finish roof edges in a similar fashion to those seen traditionally.
2. 7.25 Place and orient a rooftop addition to be subordinate to the main structure.
 - Where base zoning permits, locate a rooftop addition to be set back from the front exterior wall of the original building.
 - Orient a rooftop addition in the same direction as the original building and adjacent buildings. Minimize the visibility of the rooftop addition from the street.
 - Do not place a rooftop building at the front of a historic commercial building.

B. Staff Analysis

This application proposes the construction of a rooftop bar structure to be located on a rooftop deck which has been recently constructed at 555 Dauphin Street to accommodate additional dining space.

The *Guidelines* instruct that visual impacts of rooftop appurtenances should be minimized, and they should be subordinate to the existing historic structure. (A.2) The size and simple rectangular design of the structure with a shed roof recalls historic rooftop additions and is reasonably unobtrusive. The structure, as stated above, will also be set back from the north (front) façade, further reducing its prominence. Additionally, the use of metal roofing and Hardieboard siding are in conformance with the *Guidelines*. (A.1)

C. Summary of Analysis

- The construction of the rooftop bar structure is in conformance with the *Guidelines*.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on Section B above, Staff believes the proposed rooftop bar structure at 555 Dauphin Street would not impair the architectural or historic character of the subject property or the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Noell Broughton was present to discuss the application. He stated he had nothing to add.

No written comments regarding the application were received from the public; no one was physically present to comment on the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Wagoner questioned if other additions depicted on the elevation drawings is work previously approved by the Architectural Review Board.

Ms. Dawson confirmed that the other rooftop addition, stairway, and rooftop deck depicted on the drawings had been part of an after-the-fact application which was approved in May 2022.

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 Ms. Maurin and approved unanimously.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Roberts moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, the proposed construction of a rooftop bar structure at 555 Dauphin Street would not impair the architectural or historic character of the subject property or the surrounding district, and a Certificate of Appropriateness should be granted.

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

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

ADDRESS	204 Lanier Avenue	APPLICATION NO.	2022-39-CA
SUMMARY OF REQUEST	Demolish existing garage. Construct new garage with attached outdoor living space.		
APPLICANT	Lucy Barr	OWNER, IF OTHER	Mr. and Mrs. Guy Oswalt
HISTORIC DISTRICT	Ashland Place	MEETING DATE	07/20/2022
CLASSIFICATION	Contributing	REVIEWER	A. Allen

DISTRICT/PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

Ashland Place Historic District was listed in the National Register in 1987 under Criteria A (community planning) and C (architectural significance). The neighborhood initially was platted in 1907 and centered around land once occupied by the Augusta Evans Wilson homestead. The neighborhood was an early streetcar suburb along the Springhill Avenue trolley line. The district is significant for its concentration of architectural types and styles popular between 1900 and 1955, including Georgian and Federal Revivals, Colonial and Classical Revivals, Craftsman, Mission Revival, and Tudor Revival.

The structure at 204 Lanier Avenue, known as the “Ott’s” House, was designed by C.L Hutchisson, and constructed c. 1910. It is a frame two-and-a-half story dwelling with neo-classical detailing. The property appears on the 1925 Sanborn Map, showing the dwelling similar to its current form and a small square-shaped garage structure sitting in the southeastern corner of the lot.

This property has appeared before the Architectural Review Board three (3) times. In 1992, an application to construct a sunroom on the rear of the house was approved. The construction of a fence was approved in 1993. In 2002, a project was approved which included removing a series of later additions and constructing a new family room, kitchen and master suite.

SCOPE OF WORK (per submitted application and communications)

1. Demolish existing freestanding garage.
2. Construct a freestanding 2-car garage with attached outdoor living space at the east end of the property and behind the house.

**(All fenestration measurements below are approximations. Staff was not provided with fenestration measurements or materials information.)*

- a. The 2-car garage portion would be square in shape with a subordinate rectangular structure (the outdoor living room) centered on its north elevation, leaving 3’0” exposure of the garage’s north wall on either side.
- b. The 2-car garage would measure 24’0” x 24’0” with the living room portion measuring 14’6” wide x 18’0” deep. The height of the 2-car garage would be 11’1 1/8” at the sidewalls with a roof height of approximately 7’. The height of the living room portion would be 11’7” at the sidewalls with a roof height of approximately 6’.

- c. The 2-car garage portion would be covered by a gable roof. The living room structure would be covered by a hipped roof.
 - d. A proposed breezeway would run from the southern end of the east elevation of the house (covering an existing rear porch) to the southern end of the west elevation of the proposed new garage/living room structure. The north side of the breezeway would measure 11'0" from existing house to proposed new structure and would be incorporated into the proposed garage structure's northern roof eave. The south side of the breezeway would measure approximately 3'6", and would abut the garage structure 8'2" in from its southwestern corner.
 - e. Both the roofs of the proposed garage structure and the living room would be clad in Timberline shingles to match the existing roof on the main house.
 - f. The walls would be clad in Hardie concrete Artisan Series lap siding which will be painted white to match existing house. A proposed 42" exterior chimney would be of brick to match existing house.
 - g. A pair of proposed garage doors would be centered on the east elevation of the garage structure. Each would have a double-door appearance and would measure approximately 10'0" wide by 7' high.
 - h. Two proposed six-over-one windows would be installed on the west elevation of the 2-car garage portion.
 - i. One door with a six-lite glass panel set above two wood panels would be installed on the north end of the 2-car garage portion and would measure 3' wide by 6'8" high
 - j. Two proposed sets of 4 six-lite doors would measure approximately 12' wide by 9'7" high with four proposed 24" transoms above each door panel.
- k. The elevations would appear as follows:
- 1) North (from east to west): enclosed area; chimney; enclosed area, four (4) six-lite doors, each with a two-lite transom below a false gable; enclosed area.
 - 2) South (from west to east): no fenestration
 - 3) East (from south to north): Enclosed area; garage door; garage door; enclosed area; chimney; enclosed area.
 - 4) West (from north to south): enclosed area; four (4) six-lite doors, each with a two-lite transom; enclosed area; single door; enclosed area; window; enclosed area; window; enclosed area.

STAFF REPORT

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

1. *Demolition Guidelines (12.0)*

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

- e) Consider whether the building is part of an ensemble of historic buildings that create a neighborhood.

Nature of Proposed Development

- f) Consider the future utilization of the site.
- g) If a development is proposed to replace a demolished historic structure, determine that the proposed replacement structure is consistent with the guidelines for new construction in historic districts

2.9.1 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.

3. 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

When demolition of a structure is proposed, the *Guidelines* direct that the condition and significance of that structure be considered along with the impact that the demolition will have on the street. (A.1) The garage proposed for demolition at 204 Lanier is depicted on the 1925 Sanborn map as a small square structure, a different form than what stands today which has a larger footprint on the lot and is rectangular in form. Although maps and aerial photography do not allow for an accurate account of its evolution, it is apparent that the garage structure has been altered over the years. In particular, it appears that it was at some point extended to the north to accommodate a second vehicle and storage area. It now appears to consist of only part of its original fabric along with that of later additions, thereby lessening its architectural contribution to the property as a whole. The design of this existing structure is such that further rehabilitation is not feasible to fit the needs of the owner for higher clearance vehicles and additional storage space.

The proposed new accessory structure which would replace the existing would sit in the same general area, causing little to no impact to the street or adjacent alley. The proposed new structure would also respect the architectural integrity of the main house in design, materials and ornamentation.

The *Guidelines* require new accessory structures to be subordinate in scale to that of the primary structure. (A.2) The site plan clearly demonstrates the proposed new structure's inferior scale to that of the house at 204 Lanier. Moreover, the garage and living portions of the proposed addition would stand at approximately 17' and 16' respectively; making them both substantially subordinate in height to the two-story dwelling on the property. Therefore, the proposed accessory structure is in adherence to this guideline.

Accessory structures should be placed behind or to the side of the primary structure on a property and be composed of materials that are compatible with the primary structure and the district. (A.3) The proposed structure would be placed to the east side or rear the existing house, in accordance with the *Guidelines*. The structure would employ materials considered appropriate in Mobile's historic districts.

C. Summary of Analysis

- The proposed demolition of the existing garage structure would not impair the architectural or historic character of the property or the surrounding district.
- The proposed new garage/outdoor living area structure would be subordinate to the existing house in location, scale, and size.
- The proposed new garage/outdoor living area would be composed of materials considered appropriate in Mobile's historic districts.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on Section B above, Staff believes the demolition of the existing garage and proposed construction of a garage/outdoor living area at 204 Lanier Avenue would not impair the architectural or historic character of the existing house on the property or the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Ms. Lucy Barr was present to discuss the application. She stated she had nothing to add.

No written comments regarding the application were received from the public; no one was physically present to comment on the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board had no questions or comments.

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. Wagoner and approved unanimously.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Roberts moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, the proposed demolition of existing garage and construction of a new garage with attached outdoor living space at 204 Lanier Avenue would not impair the architectural or historic character of the subject property or the surrounding district, and a Certificate of Appropriateness should be granted.

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

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

ADDRESS	809 Government St.	APPLICATION NO.	2022-25-CA
SUMMARY OF REQUEST	Replace doors on the north (façade) and west elevations with three aluminum and glass doors with sidelights.		
APPLICANT	Rashawn Figures	OWNER, IF OTHER	

HISTORIC DISTRICT	Church Street East	MEETING DATE	7/20/2022
CLASSIFICATION	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 National Register nomination for Church Street East states that the subject building, known as the Junger House, was constructed in 1887. The 1885 Sanborn map for Mobile describes the development on this block bounded by Government Street to the north, S. Bayou Street to the east, Church Street to south, and S. Jefferson Street to the west as simply seven (7) frame dwellings and six (6) sheds and not with the extant two-story brick building. Six years later, the 1891 Sanborn map shows the subject property occupied by a two-story frame building with a full-width front porch and rear ell, facing Government Street. The building was labeled “Drugs”, noting the use of the property by a pharmacy. Two-story frame dwellings were shown to the immediate east and south of the building. By the time the 1904 Sanborn map was prepared, the two-story frame dwelling had been replaced by a two-story brick building with a footprint identical to the extant building. This building also was labeled “Drugs”, and the dwellings to the immediate south and east were shown on the same lot. Therefore, based on evidence in the Sanborn record, the Junger House dates to some point between 1891 and 1904. The 1924 Sanborn map shows identical development of the property; however, the two buildings to the east of the subject building were labeled “Clinic.” The building to the immediate east is no longer extant. An undated photograph in the MHDC file, which appears to be from the late 1940s, shows a second-floor bay window at the center of the north elevation and a balcony spanning the width of the elevation; neither feature is extant. The three sets of doors across the first floor of the elevation are similar in design to the extant doors.

According to the MHDC vertical files, this property has appeared six times previously before the Architectural Review Board (ARB). The Mobile Housing Board, owner of the subject property at that time, proposed development of a parking area south and east of the building in 1980, and a COA was approved by the ARB. A request to erect a cast iron fence on a brick base to enclose a rear parking area was approved in 1989. In 1998, the ARB denied a request from the Mobile Housing Board to erect a 6’ high chain link fence and gates at the property. In August 2021, the ARB denied a request to replace windows, install an aluminum storefront, and install a mural on the east elevation of the building. In October 2021, the ARB approved an application to replace windows and install a mural on the west

elevation of the building. The applicant withdrew a similar version of the current application at the May 4, 2022 ARB meeting.

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

1. Remove existing, non-original doors on the north elevation (façade) and the northernmost door on the west elevation.
2. Replace all four doors noted above with aluminum, oil-rubbed bronze storefront doors with sidelights and to fit the existing openings. The existing wood transoms would remain.

STAFF REPORT

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

1. “Preserve the key character-defining features of a historic commercial façade.” (7.1)
2. “Repair an altered storefront to its original design.
 - Use historic photographs when determining the original character of a storefront design.” (7.2)
3. “Retain the shape of the transom in a historic storefront.
 - Preserve the historic transom shape and configuration.
 - Add new glass if the original glass is missing.
 - Do not remove or enclose a transom.” (7.5)
4. “Preserve and repair doors and doorways of a historic commercial building.
 - Preserve historic doorways in their original location and configuration.
 - Retain original recessed entries and other key features defining a historic entrance.
 - Maintain an original doorway to emphasize the commercial entrance.” (7.10)
5. “If necessary, replace a door in a fashion that is sensitive to the historic commercial character of the building.
 - Use doors with high proportions of transparent glass.
 - If a modern doorway is created, use metal with anodized or painted finished or varnished or painted wood.
 - Design a replacement doorway to emphasize the commercial entrance.” (7.11)

B. Staff Analysis

The Junger House at 809 Government Street is a Contributing property within the Church Street East Historic District. The application under consideration involves the replacement of the rotted, non-original doors on the north (façade) and west elevations.

The *Guidelines* state that the character-defining features of a historic commercial façade should be preserved. (A.1) The application proposes maintaining the historic fenestration pattern of the building faced. The existing doors are not original to the building and would not be considered a character-defining feature, while the fenestration pattern is.

The application proposes replacing the existing pane-and-panel doors with glass doors in aluminum frames. The *Guidelines* instruct that, if replacement of doors is necessary, as it is in this case, the doors should use a high proportion of glass, and metal doors should have a painted or anodized finish. (A.5) The proposed doors would have a very high percentage of glass, and the transom features would be preserved. (A.3) Furthermore, the rubbed bronze finish would present a subdued appearance appropriate for this structure. (A.5)

C. Summary of Analysis

- The proposed replacement of non-original, rotted doors with aluminum doors with sidelights would be in accordance with the *Guidelines*.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on Section B above, Staff believes the proposed replacement of the three façade doors and the paired doors at the north end of the west elevation with aluminum doors with sidelights would not impair the historic integrity of the subject property or the surrounding district and recommends approval.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Figures was present to discuss the application. He stated he had nothing to add.

No written comments regarding the application were received from the public; no one was physically present to comment on the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Blackwell stated that he was one of the two Board member present who sat on the Design Review Committee (DRC). He noted that the area of Government Street where the subject building is located gets very wet when it rains, with drainage long having been an issue. The situation makes wooden doors impractical, but the proposed aluminum doors are a practical solution. Further, the repetition of identical doors across the façade establishes a pleasing rhythm. The DRC, therefore, is comfortable with the revised design presented in the application.

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. Wagoner and approved unanimously.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Roberts moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, the proposed replacement of doors on the north (façade) and west elevations with three aluminum and glass doors with sidelights would not impair the architectural or historic character of the subject property or the surrounding district, and a Certificate of Appropriateness should be granted.

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

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

ADDRESS	1673 Government St	APPLICATION NO.	2022-41-CA
SUMMARY OF REQUEST	Second story addition to west wing on south (rear) elevation. Minor alterations to existing ground floor west wing.		
APPLICANT	Felipe Garcia	OWNER, IF OTHER	Dr. Guillermo Herrera
HISTORIC DISTRICT	Leinkauf	MEETING DATE	July 20, 2022
CLASSIFICATION	Contributing	REVIEWER	A. Allen

DISTRICT/PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

Leinkauf Historic District was initially listed in the National Register in 1987 under Criteria A and C for significant architecture and community planning; the district was expanded in 2009. The neighborhood was settled in the early 20th century as a streetcar suburb adjacent to Government Street and surrounding Leinkauf School (1904). Housing forms and styles in the district reflect the range of styles and forms popular from 1900 through 1955.

The Patterson house, a two-story house at 1673 Government Street is a stucco clad Mission Revival with a hipped roof covered with ceramic tile. It was constructed in 1925 and designed by local architect John Platt Roberts. The lot does not appear on the 1904 Sanborn map as its location was not included at that time. The historic residence and the two adjoined accessory structures which sit south of the main house at the rear of the property are depicted on the 1925 Sanborn map much as they appear today.

This property has appeared once before the Architectural Review Board. In 2019 an application to construct a rear addition (similar to what is proposed in this project), was approved but was not carried out.

SCOPE OF WORK (per submitted application and communications)

1. Construct an addition which would extend from the south (rear) elevation. This second-story addition would set upon the existing southwest wing and extend the west elevation's second story.
 - a. Measurements: The proposed second story addition would measure 14'1" wide by 34'2 5/8" deep. The proposed second story ceiling height from the floor would be 8'0".
 - b. Materials: The proposed addition would be clad in stucco veneer, with a terracotta roof and sill, all to match the existing structure. The windows and doors would be metal.
 - c. Roof: The roof will be flat and sit under the eave of the main block's roof where the addition would abut its south elevation.
 - d. Fenestration:
 - 1) On the west elevation of the proposed second story addition, fenestration would be as follows, from north to south: two (2) six-lite fixed casement windows centered over the second or center stucco recess on the ground floor, each with a three-lite transom measuring 2'0" x 3'8"; a pair of eight-lite double casement windows centered over the third, southernmost stucco recess on the ground floor, each with a four-lite transom and 3" mullions, measuring 2'10 1/2" x 7'0";

- 2) On the east elevation of the proposed second story addition, fenestration would be as follows: three (3) pairs of sixteen-lite double casement windows, each with four-lite transom and 3" mullions, measuring 2'11" x 5'11", evenly spaced across the elevation.
 - 3) On the south elevation: one (1) pair of sixteen-lite double casement windows, each with a four-lite transom and 3" mullions, measuring 2'11" x 5'11", centered on the elevation.
2. Alter fenestration on the ground level of the southwestern wing.
Fenestration changes would be as follows:
- a. West elevation:

The arched area of the first stucco recess from the north would receive new iron work to match that in the other two existing stucco recesses.

 - The transom in the second existing stucco recess from the north would be replaced to match existing.
 - The southernmost existing stucco recess would be replaced with a pair of exterior fifteen-lite metal French doors to fit the opening below the arched transom. Doors would measure 2'10 ½" x 7'0".
 - b. East elevation:
 - The three (3) existing arched French doors would be replaced with three (3) pairs of exterior fifteen-lite metal French doors to fit the openings below the existing arched transoms. Doors would measure 2'10 ½" x 7'0".
 - c. South elevation:
 - The existing French doors centered on the south elevation of the wing would be replaced with one (1) pair of exterior fifteen-lite metal French doors to fit the openings below the existing arched transom. Doors would measure 2'10 ½" x 7'0".

STAFF REPORT

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

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.
 - Place a vertical addition in the rear so it is not visible from the street.
2. **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.
3. **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.
4. **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
5. **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.
6. **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.
7. **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.
8. **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.
 - If an aluminum window is used, use dimensions that are similar to the original windows of the house. An extruded custom aluminum window approved by the NPS or an aluminum clad wood window may be used, provided it has a profile, dimension and durability similar to a window in the historic building.

B. Staff Analysis

The *Guidelines* call for an addition to an existing historic structure to be subordinate to the main structure, including the addition's roof, and that vertical additions be placed as to not be visible from the street. The proposed addition at 1673 Government achieves this standard in that it is set upon an existing secondary

rear projecting wing, maintaining its width and depth. It also would sit below the existing roofline of the main front block of the house, and be subordinate in width and height to the existing two-story wing projecting from the eastern end of the south elevation. Furthermore, the scale and the rhythm of the proposed addition is in sync with that of the original structure in its preservation of consistent ceiling heights. (A.1, A.2, A.15)

As mandated by the *Guidelines*, the proposed addition would be differentiated by the flat roofline which creates a visual break between the original structure and the new addition. (A.3)

The materials and finishes proposed for exterior walls, roof, and fenestration match or complement those of the original historic structure, maintaining its architectural integrity and visual character. Likewise, the design, scale, and size of all proposed doors and windows are in character with the original historic building, as directed by the *Guidelines*. (A.4-A.8)

C. Summary of Analysis

- The proposed addition would be subordinate to the existing historic structure in scale and visibility.
- The proposed addition is identified by an alteration in roofline, creating a visual break between original and old.
- The proposed design, materials, and fenestration are all comparable to those of the original historic structure in profile, dimension and character, preserving the historic integrity of the original structure.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on Section B above, Staff believes the proposed construction of a second-story addition at 1673 Government Street 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. Garcia was present to discuss the application. He stated he had nothing to add.

No written comments regarding the application were received from the public; no one was physically present to comment on the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board had no questions or comments.

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 Ms. Van Antwerp and approved unanimously.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Roberts moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, the proposed replacement of doors on the north (façade) and west elevations with three aluminum and glass doors with sidelights would not impair the architectural or historic character of the subject property or the surrounding district, and a Certificate of Appropriateness should be granted.

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

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Ms. Van Antwerp inquired as to the status of 12 N Lafayette and suggested that one or two Board members meet with the board of the school to discuss possible solutions to the issues surrounding this property.

Ms. Dawson responded that Staff has been monitoring this situation and working closely with McGill-Toolen Catholic High School to resolve the issue.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:30pm.