

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
June 18, 2014 – 3:00 P.M.
Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Harris Oswalt, Sr., called the meeting to order at 3:00. Cart Blackwell, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
Members Present: Bob Allen, Robert Brown, Kim Harden, Harris Oswalt, and Craig Roberts.
Members Absent: Bradford Ladd, Carolyn Hasser, Harris Oswalt, and Steve Stone.
Staff Members Present: Devereaux Bemis, Cart Blackwell, and Keri Coumanis.
2. Mr. Roberts moved to approve the minutes for the June 4, 2014. The motion received a second and was unanimously approval.
3. Mr. Roberts moved to approve midmonth COA's granted by Staff. The motion received a second and was unanimously approval.

B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED.

1. **Applicant: Gordon Boone**
 - a. Property Address: 275 Park Terrace
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/2/14
 - c. Project: Repair and when necessary replace siding to match the existing in composition, material, profile, and dimension. Repaint the house per the existing color scheme.
2. **Applicant: James Wagoner and Charles Howard**
 - a. Property Address: 1805 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/2/14
 - c. Project: Repaint the house per the existing color scheme. Repair and when necessary replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing.
3. **Applicant: Mike Henderson Roofing and Repair**
 - a. Property Address: 1658 Laurel Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/28/14
 - c. Project: Replace roof with GAF Driftwood, dimensional shingle; replace damaged flat roof and decking; replace soffit as needed. All repairs to match existing in profile, dimension, and material.
4. **Applicant: Baytown Builders**
 - a. Property Address: 750 Government Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 5/27/14
 - c. Project: Build new dumpster pad, 10 by 10 feet with six inch lip, same site as existing pad.
5. **Applicant: Bob Peck**
 - a. Property Address: 200 Rapier Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/2/14
 - c. Project: Repaint per the existing color scheme. Repair and when necessary replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material.
6. **Applicant: Wanda Dearman**
 - a. Property Address: 20 Hannon Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/3/14
 - c. Project: Repair any deteriorated woodwork to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material. Touch up black paint on the iron fence and security door. Repaint

the house per the Valspar submitted color scheme: body, Pale Powder; trim, white; detailing, black; porch, Gardener's Soil. Pave the driveway with concrete.

- 7. Applicant: P. M. Gardner Construction**
 - a. Property Address: 251 Dexter Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/3/14
 - c. Project: Reroof the house with architectural shingles.
- 8. Applicant: Chris Bailey for Steve and Melissa Miller**
 - a. Property Address: 202 Rapier Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/5/14
 - c. Project: Construct a covering over an existing deck.
- 9. Applicant: David Calametti**
 - a. Property Address: 12 Macy Place
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/5/14
 - c. Project: Reroof the house with asphalt shingles. Repaint the house per the existing color scheme. Repair and when necessary replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material.
- 10. Applicant: Chris Huff**
 - a. Property Address: 11 Semmes Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/5/14
 - c. Project: Replace sills underneath the house. Said work will not be visible.
- 11. Applicant: William M. Moore, Jr.**
 - a. Property Address: 200 Lanier Avenue
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/5/14
 - c. Project: Construct either a 6' tall interior lot wooden fence or masonry wall. Said wall/fence will extend along alley-facing/rear lot line from edge of the garage onward.
- 12. Applicant: Noel Clarke**
 - a. Property Address: 1014 Dauphin Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/6/14
 - c. Project: Mothball the building. Apply plyboarding over windows, doors, and other fenestrated units in such a manner as to prevent unauthorized access and continued deterioration of the interior. Said applications will be installed in such a manner as to not damage historic fabric.
- 13. Applicant: Henry Coleman Wood**
 - a. Property Address: 953 Augusta Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 6.6/14
 - c. Project: Repair and when necessary replace deteriorated porch baseboards, columnar bases, and associated woodwork to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material. Touch up the paint on said locations as per the existing color scheme. Repair and replaced deteriorated foundation screening to match the existing.
- 14. Applicant: Dennis Devette**
 - a. Property Address: 17 North Ann Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/6/14
 - c. Project: Replace deteriorated supports of the porte-cochere to match the existing as per profile, dimension, design, and material.
- 15. Applicant: Carmen and Guy Miller**
 - a. Property Address: 157 South Cedar Street
 - b. Date of Approval: 6/9/14
 - c. Project: Level the foundations (making repairs to and if necessary replacing deteriorated sills). Repair foundation piers (usually appropriate mortar). Repair and when necessary replace deteriorated woodwork, siding, porch decking, and details to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material. Reroof the house with either asphalt

shingles or period appropriate metal roof (5-V crimp or standing seam metal). Repaint the house per the existing color scheme.

16. Applicant: Joia Juzang

- a. Property Address: 8 South Conception Street
- b. Date of Approval: 6/9/14
- c. Project: Reinstall gutters. Replace deteriorated woodwork to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material. Make repairs to deteriorated stucco (using appropriate mortar compositions, etc...). Repair and if necessary replace a window to match the existing as per material, light configuration, and construction. Touch up the paint per the existing color scheme.

17. Applicant: Melanie Scogin

- a. Property Address: 109 Beverly Court
- b. Date of Approval: 6/9/14
- c. Project: Reroof with 30 year architectural shingle, gray in color.

18. Applicant: Imogene Jackson

- a. Property Address: 15 North Julia Street
- b. Date of Approval: 6/6/14
- c. Project: Replace rotten boards as needed matching existing in profile, dimension and materials. Paint repairs to match.

19. Applicant: Stacy Wellborn

- a. Property Address: 1054 Palmetto Street
- b. Date of Approval: 5/19/14
- c. Project: Replace existing privacy fence in kind (six foot dog eared), remove chainlink fence and add privacy fence in that sector.

20. Applicant: Do Right Construction

- a. Property Address: 160 South Warren Street
- b. Date of Approval: 6/9/14
- c. Project: Repair and when necessary replace deteriorated woodwork and detailing to match the existing as per profile, dimension, design, and material. Repaint per the submitted BLP color scheme: body - Monticello Red; decking, shutters, and doors – Conti Street Gray Green; and trim, doors, and windows – DeTonti Square Off White.

21. Applicant: Marie Mattern

- a. Property Address: 157 South Catherine Street
- b. Date of Approval: 6/9/14
- c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material. Touch up the paint as per the existing color scheme.

22. Applicant: Chuck Dixon

- a. Property Address: 157 South Catherine Street
- b. Date of Approval: 6/9/14
- c. Project: Repair/rebuild shed utility lean-to roof on side of house as per original.

23. Applicant: Jeff Haller

- a. Property Address: 1320 Dauphin Street
- b. Date of Approval: 6/9/14
- c. Project: Install gutters.

24. Applicant: Esther Andrews

- a. Property Address: 13 Houston Street
- b. Date of Approval: 6/9/14
- c. Project: Reroof to match the existing.

25. Applicant: Sally Breitung

- a. Property Address: 1261 Selma Street
- b. Date of Approval: 6/9/14
- c. Project: Reroof to match the existing. Repair deteriorated woodwork to match to the existing as per profile, dimension, and material. Touch up the paint as per the existing color scheme.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2014-28-CA: 266 Park Terrace

- a. Applicant: Cullen Jacobs with RCJ Construction with Fairway Investments
- b. Project: Demolition – Demolish a derelict 1950s residence in preparation for the construction of a new single family residence.

APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

2. 2012-29-CA: 15 McPhillips

- a. Applicant: Sue Wagner
- b. Project: Fenestration – Remove and replace later windows.

TABLED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

3. 2012-30-CA: 58 South Julia Street

- a. Applicant: Paul A. Dagenais
- b. Project: Fenestration – Remove and replace original windows.

WITHDRAWN. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

D. OTHER BUSINESS

- 1. Discussion

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2014-28-CA: 266 Park Terrace
Applicant: Cullen Jacobs with RCJ for Fairway Real Estate Investments
Received: 6/2/14
Meeting: 6/18/14

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Leinkauf
Classification: Contributing (See analysis)
Zoning: R-1
Project: Demolition – Demolish a derelict 1950s residence in preparation for the construction of a new single family residence.

BUILDING HISTORY

The documentation of the local expansion of the Leinkauf Historic District assigns this two-story “Minimal Traditional” dwelling a 1945 construction date. The building dates from late 1950s.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the change...will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the district...”

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The applicant acquired the property in December of 2013 with the intention of rehabilitating the building. After assessing the condition of the long vacant house, the applicant came to the realization that the demolition of the house and ancillary building would be more cost effective means of revitalizing the lot. If granted demolition, the applicant would like to construct historically informed residential infill upon the site.
- B. With regards to demolition, the Guidelines read as follows: “Proposed demolition of a building must be brought before the Board for consideration. The Board may deny a demolition request if the building’s loss will impair the historic integrity of the district.” However, our ordinance mirrors the Mobile City Code, see §44-79, which sets forth the following standard of review and required findings for the demolition of historic structures:
 - 1. *Required findings; demolition/relocation.* The Board shall not grant certificates of appropriateness for the demolition or relocation of any property within a historic district unless the Board finds that the removal or relocation of such building will not be detrimental to the historical or architectural character of the district. In making this determination, the Board shall consider:
 - i. The historic or architectural significance of the structure;
 - 1. Termed “Minimal Traditional” in style, this contributing residence is representative of the mass produced housing of the mid 20th-Century American suburbs.

- ii. The importance of the structures to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures;
 - 1. The footprint and mass of this residence impact the spacing and density of Park Terrace, a single block development located off of Government Street. As evidenced by Sanborn Maps and hinted at by existing features (curbcut), the building is a second generation dwelling on the lot.
- iii. The difficulty or the impossibility of reproducing the structure because of its design, texture, material, detail or unique location;
 - 1. The building is constructed of a mixture of period (asbestos tiles and aluminum windows) and traditional materials. While some materials are capable of being reproduced, others are not.
- iv. Whether the structure is one of the last remaining examples of its kind in the neighborhood, the county, or the region or is a good example of its type, or is part of an ensemble of historic buildings creating a neighborhood;
 - 1. Houses of this style, construction, and plan are found across the United States.
- v. Whether there are definite plans for reuse of the property if the proposed demolition is carried out, and what effect such plans will have on the architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological, social, aesthetic, or environmental character of the surrounding area.
 - 1. If granted demolition approval, the applicant would demolish the building, level the lot, and construct new residential infill. The new residential construction will be reviewed in full in a second application.
- vi. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
 - 1. The applicant acquired the property on December 12, 2013.
- vii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
 - 1. The applicant acquired the property with the intent of renovating the dwelling. After assessing the structural, environmental, and cosmetic deterioration of the dwelling, the applicant found that it would be cost prohibitive to rehabilitate the building.
- viii. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
 - 1. The property has not been listed for sale by the current owner. The applicant acquired the long vacant house in a foreclosure sale.
- ix. Description of the options currently held for the purchase of such property, including the price received for such option, the conditions placed upon such option and the date of expiration of such option;
 - 1. N.A.
- x. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
 - 1. N.A.
- xi. Financial proof of the ability to complete the replacement project, which may include but not be limited to a performance bond, a letter of credit, a trust for completion of improvements, or a letter of commitment from a financial institution.
 - 1. Application submitted.
- xii. Such other information as may reasonably be required by the board.
 - 1. See submitted materials.

2. *Post demolition or relocation plans required.* In no event shall the Board entertain any application for the demolition or relocation of any historic property unless the applicant also presents at the same time the post-demolition or post-relocation plans for the site.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plan):
1. Demolish a contributing, but deteriorated residential building and ancillary building.
 2. Level the lot.
 3. Submit in general concept form initial review of residential infill construction.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The inventory lists this house as being built circa 1945. However, it does not appear on the 1955 Sanborn Map which is the end date for the period of significance. So this building should be considered non-contributing to the district. This application involves the demolition of a single-family residence. Demolition applications entail the review of the following concerns: the architectural significance of the building; the condition of the building; the effect of the demolition on the streetscape and surrounding district; and the nature of the proposed development.

According to the paperwork from the local expansion of the Leinkauf Historic District this building was assigned a 1945 date of construction. The house actually dates from after 1955. While listed as contributing, the house is neither architectural significant in its own right, nor a fine representative example of a pervasive building typology. The building is a simple two-storied block with an engaged single-story garage. Countless examples of this typology were constructed across the United State during the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s.

Prior to the 2013 purchase by the present owner this building had been vacant for a decade. The house suffers from years of deferred maintenance. Structural (foundation) and health (invasive mold) related issues are of particular concern.

The building’s massing contributes to the built density and rhythmic spacing of the streetscape.

If granted demolition approval the applicant’s would level the lot and plant grass on the site. A façade rendering has been provided for initial review in concept form. The historically informed residential infill proposed for this lot will be addressed in full in a later application.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2), Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the building. It will be a loss to the streetscape. However, taking into account the style, construction, and condition of the main building and ancillary structure and the plans to construct another house on the site, Staff recommends approval of the demolition as part one in the historically informed revitalization of the lot.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Cullen Jacobs was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt welcomed the applicant's representative. He asked Mr. Jacobs if he had any clarifications to address, comments to make, or questions to ask.

Mr. Jacobs explained that while the new owners had first looked into remodeling the house, assessment of existing conditions caused them to realize that renovation was not economically feasible.

Mr. Oswalt thanked Mr. Jacobs.

Mr. Oswalt asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. Lynn Bagley, a resident of Park Terrace, spoke in favor of the application. She explained that she represented the whole of the neighborhood in expressing support for the proposed demolition and historically attuned residential redevelopment.

Mr. Oswalt asked his fellow Board members if they had any questions to ask the applicant's representative.

Mr. Roberts advised Mr. Jacobs as to the design review process. Mr. Blackwell explained that the applicant had been informed and realized that conceptual approval of the initial design would have to be followed up by the submission and the approval of plans and elevations for the proposed new construction. Mr. Jacobs stated that he understood the process. Mr. Roberts complimented the project.

Mr. Oswalt asked his fellow Board members if they had any additional comments to make or questions to ask. No further Board discussion ensued.

Mr. Oswalt closed the period of public comment.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony, the Board finds the facts in the Staff report as written.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the facts as approved by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 6/18/15

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2014-29-CA: 15 McPhillips Avenue
Applicant: Sue Wagner
Received: 5/19/14 (initially received)
Meeting: 6/18/14

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Fenestration – Remove and replace later windows.

BUILDING HISTORY

With its stuccoed walls, parapet walls, and low-pitched roof, this house features seminal characteristics of the Mission-informed variant of the Colonial Revival design impulse.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the change...will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the district...”

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property has never appeared before the Architectural Review. With the exception of the façade’s fenestration, all of the house’s original windows have been removed. In this application, the owner proposes the removal of four later (metal and vinyl) window groupings located on the South (side) Elevation and the installation of vinyl windows in said locations.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “The type, size and dividing lights of windows and their location and configuration (rhythm) on a building help establish the historic character of a building.”
 - 2. “Where [historic] windows cannot be repaired, new windows must be compatible with the existing. The size and placement of new windows for additions and alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.”
 - 3. Vinyl windows are listed as an inappropriate material for window construction in Mobile’s Historic Districts (Test case approvals for new construction and later replacement windows have been approved.).
- C. Scope of Work:
 - 1. Remove four later metal and vinyl window groupings from the house’s South (side) Elevation.
 - 2. Install vinyl windows.

CLARIFICATIONS/REQUESTS

1. Provide renderings of the four proposed window units (elevation and section). Dimensions and sections should be provided.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the removal and replacement of four later window groupings located on the house's South (side) Elevation. The only original windows to survive, those located on the façade and protected by the porch, will remain in place.

While the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts do not specifically address the replacement of later windows, the Guidelines state that the size and placement of new windows for additions and alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building (See B-2.). The four later window groupings proposed for replacement are of three different configurations. The West to East sequence is as follows: tripartite, single, kitchen type, and paired windows. All four openings currently feature either metal or vinyl windows that are casement, picture, or jalousie form. The proposed windows would be vinyl in construction.

Though vinyl windows are listed as an inappropriate window material in the Design Review Guidelines, the Board has issued a test case approval for the use of vinyl windows on a historic building located at 58 Bradford Avenue. On May 4, 2011, the Board approved the removal of later metal windows and the installation of vinyl windows at the aforementioned location. As with 15 McPhillips Avenue, the house in question was masonry in construction. The construction, appearance, texture, and installation of the windows of the Bradford Avenue residence were analyzed at length. The manner in which the windows fitted into the reveal was subject to particular discussion. Models and renderings were submitted for review. The Board deemed the finished scope of work a successful intervention in that it recaptured lost architectural and historical character.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

While Staff does not object to the removal of the later windows, clarifications as to the design and installation of the subject windows are required for a recommendation of approval. As submitted, Staff is unable to assess the application in full. Based on lack of information and B (1-3), Staff believes the application would impair the architectural and historical integrity of the building and the district. Staff requests more detailing renderings of the appearance and installation of the windows.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Sue Wagner was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswald welcomed the applicant. He asked Ms. Wagner if she had any clarifications to address, comments to make, or questions to ask.

Ms. Wagner expressed her concern that her window manufacturer had failed to follow up with the requested renderings.

Ms. Harden asked for clarification as to the design of the façade's original windows. Mr. Blackwell stated that the façade's windows, which will remain in place, were multi-light in design and casement in construction. Ms. Harden explained to Ms. Wagner that new replacement windows should complement the original windows.

Mr. Roberts asked Mr. Blackwell for explanation as to the procedure and precedents for replacing non-original windows. Mr. Blackwell addressed Mr. Roberts query by citing the 58 Bradford Avenue as an instance of precedence for the replacement of later windows. He went on to state that while the Design Review Guidelines do not specifically address the issue, replacement should be compatible the historic character of the building and historic windows (if known).

Ms. Harden and Mr. Roberts encouraged Ms. Wagner to select a design that would be complementary to the house's original windows.

Mr. Roberts explained that visuals and models would answer many of the Board's concerns. He said that in addition to the design, construction, material, finish, and components needed to be considered.

After discussion as to the most advisable course of action, Roberts moved to table the application for reason of lack of information and further clarification. Mr. Blackwell volunteered to assist the applicant by providing the names of additional window manufacturers.

TABLED.

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2014-30-CA: 58 Julia Street
Applicant: Paul A. Dagenais
Received: 6/2/14
Meeting: 6/18/14

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Fenestration – Replace original windows.

BUILDING HISTORY

With its asymmetrical massing and varied roof forms, this house falls within the realm of a 20th-Century Picturesque vein of the Period Revival Aesthetic.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the change...will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the district...”

STAFF REPORT

- A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on November 18, 2014. At that time, the Board approved the removal of later sliding metal doors enclosing the house’s side porch and the installation of aluminum clad wooden windows (and fill) within the same location. With this application, the applicant proposes the wholesale replacement of the house’s original wooden windows with aluminum clad wooden windows.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
 - 1. “The type, size and dividing lights of windows and their location and configuration (rhythm) on a building help establish the historic character of a building. Original window opening should be retained, as well as original windows sashes and glazing.”
 - 2. “Where [historic] windows cannot be repaired, new windows must be compatible with the existing. The size and placement of new windows for additions and alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted materials):
 - 1. Remove original wooden windows.
 - 2. Install aluminum clad wooden windows.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the wholesale removal of original wooden windows and their replacement with aluminum clad wooden windows.

The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that original window opening should be retained, as well as original windows sashes and glazing (See B-1.). While the Guidelines go on to address appropriate replacement considerations, they clearly state that replacements are allowed when windows cannot be repaired. This house possesses nineteen windows. An exterior examination of all of the house's windows reveals that only one bottom rail exhibits external signs of structural decay.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2), Staff believe this application does impair the architectural and the historical character of the building and the district. Staff does not recommend approval of this application. If energy conservation is the motivating concern, Staff encourages the use of operable and appropriately installed storm windows. Retention of the original windows combined with the installation of storm windows, a reversible intervention, would maintain historical integrity while at the same increasing environmental/economic efficiency.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Dr. Paul Dagenais was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt welcomed the applicant. He asked Dr. Dagenais if he had any clarifications to address, comments to make, or questions to ask.

Dr. Dagenais stated that he had acquired the property in 1994. He explained that the windows been painted and nailed shut prior to his purchase of the house. Dr. Dagenais said that fillers had been employed to secure and strengthen the windows. He told the Board that black mold develops on the window's interior facings and that a finger could be through some portions of the windows. Dr. Dagenais added that the age and previous treatments of the windows result in related concerns as well. He informed the Board that the application up for review proposes a better quality window that would match design of the original windows. He said that from the curb, the windows would look the same and that they would match (in terms of construction) the windows that had been approved and installed on a previously enclosed porch/sunroom. The aforementioned windows Dr. Dagenais noted feature aluminum cladding and double-paned construction. He spoke of the balance of aesthetic, economic, and environmental concerns.

Mr. Roberts asked Mr. Blackwell the rationale behind the Staff recommendation. Mr. Blackwell explained that the Design Review Guidelines state that original window opening should be retained, as well as original windows sashes and glazing. He elaborated by saying that with regard to windows, previous Board policy called for replacement windows (when and where necessary) to match the originals as per material and construction. He said that unlike the preceding application, this application addresses the replacement of original windows. He reiterated the Staff Report which notes that the review was based upon an assessment of the exterior condition of the house's windows alone. Mr. Blackwell stated that if the Board was to entertain replacing the windows as proposed, best practice would call for a window schedule showing the extent of the damage.

Ms. Harden reiterated the value of a window schedule. She explained that a schedule done by an independent third party often reveals that repair is often more economically effective than replacement.

A discussion ensued as to the construction and appearance of the sunroom's windows. When questioned as to how those windows were authorized. Mr. Blackwell explained that the once open porch had been enclosed with metal sliding doors at an unknown date and prior to historic regulations. He stated that the current applicant had applied and received approval to install the subject windows. It was noted that the preceding units were not original and that aluminum clad windows are allowed on new construction and the additions.

Discussion ensued as to what would constitute an acceptable percentage of deterioration that would qualify for replacement. The Board and Staff explained that the answer was hard to determine.

Mr. Blackwell explained that a schedule was a means by which the application could move forward as proposed.

Ms. Harden further explained and nuanced the benefits of a schedule.

Storm windows were suggested as an alternative to replacement that would bring about greater energy conscientiousness.

Ken O'Hanlon, a neighbor of the applicant, expressed concern and asked for clarification as to the regulations informing the recommendation. He cited sections on the City of Mobile's municipal code. Ms. Coumanis explained that the MHDC's Ordinance and the Design Review Guidelines constitute the legal and procedural underpinnings of staff recommendations. She elaborated by saying the provision of a schedule was an unwritten means by which applications of this nature can proceed.

Mr. O'Hanlon cited the International Building Code. Ms. Coumanis stated that buildings located within official historic districts have code exemptions.

Discussion ensued as to the compatibility of the proposed replacement windows.

Mr. Blackwell addressed the applicant and the Board. He explained the rulings which the Board could entertain, as well as how said rulings would impact the applicant/application. He encouraged Dr. Dagenais to withdraw the application and conduct an assessment/schedule of the windows. Mr. Blackwell agreed to provide the applicant with a list of independent third parties capable of conducting such an assessment, as well the necessary forms and paperwork.

Dr. Dagenais withdrew the application.

WITHDRAWN.