

**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES**  
**May 21, 2014 – 3:00 P.M.**  
**Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street**

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

1. The Chair, Bradford Ladd, called the meeting to order at 3:00. Cart Blackwell, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:  
**Members Present:** Robert Allen, Robert Brown, Catarina Echols, Kim Harden, Carolyn Hasser,, Bradford Ladd, Harris Oswalt, Craig Roberts, Steve Stone, and Jim Wagoner.  
**Members Absent:** Nick Holmes III.  
**Staff Members Present:** Devereaux Bemis, Cart Blackwell, and Keri Coumanis.
2. Steve Stone moved to approve the minutes of the May 4, 2014 meeting as amended. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.
3. moved to approve the midmonth COA's granted by Staff. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.

**B. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED.**

**1. Applicant: Robin Strickland**

- a. Property Address: 303 South Ann Street
- b. Date of Approval: 4/28/14
- c. Project: Replace a six foot tall rear lot line privacy fence to match the existing as per height, location, and materials. Extend a picket fence that encloses the front lawn. The design of the extension (gothic picket) will match the existing. Repair/reconstruct an interior lot lattice/picket fence to match the existing. Repair and when necessary replaced deteriorate woodwork to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material (including decking to match, tongue-and-groove). Repair deteriorated windows to match the existing as per light pattern, construction, and material. Remove a later concrete walkway accessing the front porch and install brick pavers in the location of the aforementioned concrete paving. Make repairs to the front porch's concrete steps. Install pavers and/or gravel in the driveway. Install an overhang over the rear entrance.

**2. Applicant: Restore Mobile**

- a. Property Address: 456 Chatham Street
- b. Date of Approval: 4/28/14
- c. Project: Repaint the building per the submitted BLP color scheme: Theatre Street Gold (body); Fort Morgan Sand (trim); and Old Dauphin Way Gold (accent). When necessary, woodwork will be replaced to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material.

**3. Applicant: John Baker**

- a. Property Address: 956 Charleston Street
- b. Date of Approval: 5/2/14
- c. Project: Remove later wooden steps. Construct brick steps accessing the front porch. Construct concrete steps accessing the side porch. Reroof the house.

**4. Applicant: Ted Dial and Renea Paul**

- a. Property Address: 200 South Monterey Street
- b. Date of Approval: 5/5/14
- c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material. Paint building per the submitted Sherwin Williams color scheme. the foundation will be Garden Gate; the trim will be Basque Green, and window sashes will be Bitter Chocolate. Make repairs to the rear eaves.

- 5. Applicant: Holmes and Holmes**
  - a. Property Address: 257 North Conception Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 5/5/14
  - c. Project: Install iron handrails from the parking enclosure to the walkway and the walkway to the gallery.
- 6. Applicant: Harold Williamson with Old Dauphin Way United Methodist Church**
  - a. Property Address: 28 and 30 Lee Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 5/6/14
  - c. Project: Install a lot line fence. A six foot tall will extend along the property's south lot line. Said fence will not extend beyond the front plane of the main house or the house located on the lot to south of the subject property.
- 7. Applicant: Christina Rodgers**
  - a. Property Address: 961 Selma Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 5/7/14
  - c. Project: Repair and repoint foundation piers. Remove concrete blocks employed as foundation screening located between the aforementioned piers. Repair and when necessary replace deteriorated and/or fire damaged woodwork, siding, and detailing to match the existing as per profile dimension and material. Rebuild the porch deck and install new tongue-and-groove porch decking. Reconfigure the later porch roof to adopt the slope of the original porch. Install period appropriate wooden porch posts and railings. Repair/reroof with asphalt shingles matching the existing. Repair and install period appropriate wooden sash windows. Install a three foot tall picket fence enclosing the front yard. Install a new six foot tall interior lot privacy fence.
- 8. Applicant: Paul Storrs**
  - a. Property Address: 115 Providence Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 4/25/14
  - c. Project: Install a six foot dog eared privacy fence on the rear of the property 25+ feet from the Catherine Street right of way. The fence will run 50.8 feet connecting the existing side yard fences.
- 9. Applicant: Antonio Petite**
  - a. Property Address: 1109 Elmira Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 5/7/14
  - c. Project: Remove flaking paint. Repair deteriorated woodwork to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material. Repaint per the existing color scheme.
- 10. Applicant: Antonio Petite**
  - a. Property Address: 1111 Elmira Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 5/7/14
  - c. Project: Remove flaking paint. Repair deteriorated woodwork to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material. Repaint per the existing color scheme.
- 11. Applicant: Kevin Cross**
  - a. Property Address: 457 Chatham Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 5/9/12
  - c. Project: Install six foot tall interior lot wooden privacy fence.
- 12. Applicant: Cynthia Nelms**
  - a. Property Address: 12 Semmes Avenue
  - b. Date of Approval: 5/9/14
  - c. Project: Replace the rear elevation's French doors. The replacements will match the existing.

- 13. Applicant: Mobile Carnival Museum**
- a. Property Address: 355 Government Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 5/12/14
  - c. Project: Replace wooden doors to match the existing as per material, design, proportion, and detail.
- 14. Applicant: JESCO**
- a. Property Address: 10 North Royal Street (portion joining 26 North Royal Street)
  - b. Date of Approval: 5/12/14
  - c. Project: Install a construction trailer on the site for the period of construction of a parking lot on the adjacent lot.
- 15. Applicant: Christy and Allan Gustin**
- a. Property Address: 8 Houston Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 5/12/14
  - c. Project: Paint the house per the submitted Behr color scheme: Main body color: Princess Ivory; Trim color: Extra Pure White; Porch Deck: Sagey; and Shutters: Sagey.
- 16. Applicant: Carrie Russell**
- a. Property Address: 1562 Old Shell Road
  - b. Date of Approval: 5/12/14
  - c. Project: Install interior lot fencing. Said wood rail fencing will be four feet in height and extend along a recessed portion of the west lot line.
- 17. Applicant: Ken Harper**
- a. Property Address: 1062 Church Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 5/13/14
  - c. Project: Place steel beams and piers underneath house. Place new floor joists.
- 18. Applicant: Catarina Echols with Goodwyn Mills & Cawood for the RSA**
- a. Property Address: 101 Dauphin Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 5/7/14
  - c. Project: Repair and remediate damage to deteriorated terracotta blocks and details. Repair, clean, and remediate damage to the building's marquee.
- 19. Applicant: Trustmark Bank**
- a. Property Address: 107 Saint Francis Street/31 North Royal Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 5/7/14
  - c. Project: Install an ATM machine in recently constructed commercial storefront facing North Royal Street.
- 20. Applicant: Dr. Ray Hester**
- a. Property Address: 955 Augusta Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 5/7/14
  - c. Project: Make repairs to an existing interior lot privacy fence. Install a free standing or engaged lattice screen at the front porch's (terminal) east bay. The screen will be painted to match the house's trim.
- 21. Applicant: Thomas Herring**
- a. Property Address: 209 South Georgia Avenue
  - b. Date of Approval: 5/14/14
  - c. Project: Remove later fenestration on the rear elevation. Install windows matching the historic windows on the rear elevation. Install pilaster-like projections on the rear lot's privacy fence. Make repairs to the façade's upper-story French doors. Enclose a laundry area on the rear elevation (not visible from the public view). Install two-light storm windows. The storm windows will fit within the window reveals.

## C. APPLICATIONS

1. **2014-CA-21: Unnumbered Vacant Lot located between Nos. 903 and 915 Palmetto Street**
  - a. Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley with Douglas Burtu Kearley Architect for John Avent
  - b. Project: New Residential Construction – Construct a single-family residence.  
**APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**
2. **2014-CA-22: Unnumbered Vacant Lot located between Nos. 938 and 950 Conti Street**
  - a. Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley with Douglas Burtu Kearley Architect for John Avent
  - b. Project: New Residential Construction – Construct a single-family residence.  
**APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**
3. **2014-CA-23: 210 Dauphin Street**
  - a. Applicant: John Switzer with J. L. Swit, LLC
  - b. Project: Fenestration – Replace unauthorized windows.  
**APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**
4. **2014-CA-24: 1707 Hunter Avenue**
  - a. Applicant: Don Williams
  - b. Project: Porch Piers and Fenestration – Alter porch posts and fenestration on the side elevation.  
**APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**
5. **2014-CA-25: 23 Houston Street**
  - a. Applicant: Sin Ming Au
  - b. Project: Renovation – Replace windows and install a new exterior facing.  
**APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**
6. **2014-CA-26: 204 South Dearborn Street**
  - a. Applicant: Joseph Patterson with JPS Construction for Debra Forrest
  - b. Project: After-the-Fact-Approval - Retain unauthorized windows.  
**TABLED FOR DESIGN REVIEW.**

## D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Guidelines
2. Discussion

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**CERTIFIED RECORD**

**2014-CA-21: Unnumbered Vacant Lot located between Nos. 903 and 915 Palmetto Street**  
**Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley with Douglas Burtu Kearley Architect for John Avent**  
**Received: 5/5/14**  
**Meeting: 5/21/14**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden  
Classification: Non-Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: New Residential Construction – Construct a single-family residence.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According to the 1904 Sanborn Map of Mobile, a single-story framed dwelling occupied this lot.

**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 new owner/applicant proposes the construction on the long vacant lot.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for New Residential Construction in Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. “The goal of new construction should be to blend into the historic district, but to avoid creating a false sense of history by copying historic examples.”
  - 2. “Because of development trends and patterns, the visual character of Mobile’s historic districts can vary within the districts and from street to street. It is possible that a design which is appropriate for one street in a historic district could be inappropriate on an adjacent street. In order obtain compatibility, designers for new buildings may reference “nearby” buildings.” The term “nearby buildings” includes those buildings located on adjacent properties, on the same street, and on streets of a similar character within the historic district. The term applies only to historic buildings or those which contribute to the historic significance or visual character of the various historic districts and excludes non-contributing buildings.”
  - 3. “With regard to placement and scale “Placement has two components: setback, the distance between the street and a building; and spacing, the distance between its property lines adjacent structures. New construction should be placed on the lot so that setback and spacing approximate those of nearby historic buildings, maintaining a visual line created by the fronts of buildings along a street. An inappropriate setback disrupts the façade line and diminishes the visual character of the streetscape. Current setback requirements of the City of Mobile Zoning Ordinance may not allow the majority of

existing buildings. If the traditional façade line or “average” setback is considerably less than allowed under the Zoning Ordinance, the Review Board will support an application from the Board of Adjustment to allow for new construction closer to the street and more in character with the surrounding buildings.”

4. “With regard to mass “Building mass is established by the arrangement and proportion of its basic geometric components – the main building, wings, porches, the roof and the foundation. Similarity of massing helps to create a rhythm along a street, which is one of the appealing aspects of the historic districts. Therefore, new construction should reference the massing of forms of nearby historic districts.”
  5. “The foundation, the platform upon which a building rests, is a massing component of a building. Since diminished foundation proportions have a negative effect on the massing and visual character, new buildings should have foundation heights similar in height to those of nearby historic buildings. In most residential areas, buildings are usually elevated above a crawl space on a pier foundation. Pier foundations are encouraged for new residential construction. When slab foundations are constructed, it is important that the height of the foundations relate to that of nearby historic buildings. For this reason, slab-on-grade foundations are not allowed for single family residences. For multi-family, where slab-on-grade is most practical, other design elements such as water tables and exaggerated bases can be effective in creating the visual appearance of a foundation”
  6. “A building’s roof contributes significantly to its massing and to the character of the surrounding area. New construction may consider, where appropriate, roof shapes, pitches and complexity similar to or compatible with those of adjacent buildings.”
  7. “To preserve the continuity of a historic district, new construction should be in scale with nearby historic buildings.”
  8. “New construction should reflect the use of façade elements of nearby historic buildings.”
  9. “Designs for new porches should consider porch location, proportion, rhythm, roof form, supports, steps, rails and ornamentation.”
  10. “The number and proportion of openings – windows and entrances – within the façade of a building creates a solid-to-void ratio (wall-to-opening). One way of achieving compatibility may be to use windows and entrances that approximate the placement and solid-to-void ratio of nearby historic buildings. In addition, designs for new construction may incorporate the traditional use of window casements and door surrounds. Where a side elevation is clearly visible from the street, proportion and placement of elements will have an impact upon the visual character of the neighborhood and must be addressed in the design.”
  11. The degree of ornamentation used in new construction should be compatible with the degree of ornamentation found upon nearby historic buildings. Although new buildings should use decorative trim, windows casings, and other building materials similar to nearby historic buildings, the degree of ornamentation should not exceed that characteristic of the area.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted site plans):
1. New Construction – Construct a single family residence on a vacant lot.
    - a. The house possess the following setbacks: 15’ from the inner edge of the side walk to the façade (North Elevation); 13’ 2” from the lot line to West (side) Elevation; and 22’ 3” & 5’ from the lot line to the two pertinent points on the East Elevation.
    - b. A 4’ continuous brick foundation (with white mortar joints) will be employed on the body of the house. Diamond shaped ventilation points will punctuate the foundation. Brick piers with framed, recessed, and suspended lattice foundation skirting will be employed beneath the house’s porch.

- c. The walls will be faced with hardiboard siding.
  - d. The house will feature six-over-six aluminum clad wooden windows.
  - e. Operable wooden shutters with fixed louvers will flank the windows.
  - f. A 5-V Crimp metal roof will sheath the house's gable and hipped roof structure.
  - g. North Elevation (Façade)
    - i. The Facade will take the form of three part grouping of elements: a hipped roof piazza screen; a gabled middle block; and hipped roof end.
    - ii. A flight of brick steps and stop flanked by picketed railings terminated by capped newels will provide access to piazza screen.
    - iii. The façade's entrance, a four paneled wooden door surmounted by a six light transom, will be located within the piazza screen.
    - iv. The center gable will feature cornice returns and friezes.
    - v. Two six-over-six windows will and a centered six light window punctuate the central gabled section of the façade.
  - h. West Elevation
    - i. The five bay West Elevation will feature three pairs of double French doors with surmounting fanlights and two sash windows (one six-over-six and a second four-over-four in composition).
    - ii. Two Tuscan columns will be employed on the West Elevation's porch (The piazza wall and body of the house will comprise the outer terminations of the porch.).
    - iii. Picketed railings will extend between the porch bays.
    - iv. Tongue-and-groove wooden decking will be employed on the porch.
  - i. South (Rear) Elevation
    - i. The three part Rear Elevation will feature two six-over-six windows.
    - ii. The middle gabled portion of Rear Elevation will feature a fixed louvered window.
  - j. East Elevation
    - i. The East Elevation will feature four six-over-six windows and a four paneled door surmounted by a three light transom.
    - ii. A wooden stoop with boxed, recessed, and suspended lattice foundation skirting will be located off the aforementioned doorway.
    - iii. Picketed railings with capped newel posts will be employed the stoop, as well as on the stairs which will access the stoop.
    - iv. A hipped roof will extend over and beyond the stoop. A bracket will be employed at hipped roof end.
2. Install a concrete walkway between the front steps and the inner edge of the sidewalk.
  3. Make repairs to an existing curbcut.
  4. Either install concrete ribbons or gravel from the curbcut. Said drive will not go beyond the end plane of the house.

## STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of a single family residence atop a vacant lot. According to the Guidelines for New Residential Construction in Mobile's Historic Districts, the goal of new construction should be to blend into the historic district, but to avoid creating a false sense of history by copying historic examples (See B-1.). In accord, the New Residential Construction Guidelines, the proposed design takes into account the placement, massing, components, and detailing/materials of nearby historic buildings (See B-2.).

With regard to placement, the proposed setback from the street respects the traditional façade line of nearby and adjacent contributing and non-contributing buildings (See B-3). The side setbacks are in compliance with either City wide or historic district sittings. As the proposed site is an inner lot property, the building is oriented to face the street.

The three part grouping of the façade and three remaining elevations serves to break up the building mass. Foundations, porches, wall expanses, and roof forms are arranged in such way to complement the massings of nearby historic buildings (See B-4.). The foundation height of four feet commiserates with nearby historic buildings and serves as a base for ceiling and roof heights that are in keeping with scale established by nearby historic buildings (See B 5-7).

The composition, components, and details of the façade and other elevations borrow from classical and later Victorian design sources that typify buildings located in the immediate environs of this sections of the Oakleigh Garden District (See B-8.). The asymmetrical composition and varied roof structure affords favorable comparison to Queen Anne inspired massings (903 and 912 Palmetto Street), while the classical detailing and proportioning of components such as windows and volumes works looks to and complements traditional design sources of other nearby buildings (906 and 908 Palmetto Street). A number of traditional single-story side halls located in the area featured side galleries. The screen wall of the proposed house provides a visual experience likable to the recessed porches of those structures. The detailing of the porch is in keeping with motifs and proportions of nearby historic examples (See B-9.). The distribution and proportion of windows affords a favorable solid to void relationship (See B-10.).

The degree of ornamentation is compatible with the degree of ornamentation found upon nearby historic buildings (See B-11).

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-11), Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the historic district. Staff recommends approval of this application.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Douglas B. Kearley was present to discuss the application.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant's representative. He asked Mr. Kearley if he had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make. Mr. Kearley answered no. He explained that Mr. Blackwell had addressed the application in full.

Mr. Roberts complimented the design. No further Board discussion ensued.

Mr. Ladd asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. Upon hearing no response, Mr. Ladd closed the period of public comment.

### **FINDING OF FACT**

Mr. Stone 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. Stone moved that, based upon the facts as amended 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: 5/21/15**

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**CERTIFIED RECORD**

**2014-CA-22: Unnumbered Vacant Lot located between Nos. 938 and 950 Conti Street**  
**Applicant: Douglas B. Kearley with Douglas Burtu Kearley Architect for John Avent**  
**Received: 5/5/14**  
**Meeting: 5/21/14**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way  
Classification: Non-Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: New Residential Construction – Construct a single-family residence.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

According 1904 Sanborn Map of Mobile, a single-story double pile residence once occupied this lot.

**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 proposes the construction of a single family residence atop the long vacant lot.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for New Residential Construction in Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. “The goal of new construction should be to blend into the historic district, but to avoid creating a false sense of history by copying historic examples.”
  - 2. “Because of development trends and patterns, the visual character of Mobile’s historic districts can vary within the districts and from street to street. It is possible that a design which is appropriate for one street in a historic district could be inappropriate on an adjacent street. In order obtain compatibility, designers for new buildings may reference “nearby” buildings.” The term “nearby buildings” includes those buildings located on adjacent properties, on the same street, and on streets of a similar character within the historic district. The term applies only to historic buildings or those which contribute to the historic significance or visual character of the various historic districts and excludes non-contributing buildings.”
  - 3. “With regard to placement and scale “Placement has two components: setback, the distance between the street and a building; and spacing, the distance between its property lines adjacent structures. New construction should be placed on the lot so that setback and spacing approximate those of nearby historic buildings, maintaining a visual line created by the fronts of buildings along a street. An inappropriate setback disrupts the façade line and diminishes the visual character of the streetscape. Current setback

requirements of the City of Mobile Zoning Ordinance may not allow the majority of existing buildings. If the traditional façade line or “average” setback is considerably less than allowed under the Zoning Ordinance, the Review Board will support an application from the Board of Adjustment to allow for new construction closer to the street and more in character with the surrounding buildings.”

4. “With regard to mass “Building mass is established by the arrangement and proportion of its basic geometric components – the main building, wings, porches, the roof and the foundation. Similarity of massing helps to create a rhythm along a street, which is one of the appealing aspects of the historic districts. Therefore, new construction should reference the massing of forms of nearby historic districts.”
  5. “The foundation, the platform upon which a building rests, is a massing component of a building. Since diminished foundation proportions have a negative effect on the massing and visual character, new buildings should have foundation heights similar in height to those of nearby historic buildings. In most residential areas, buildings are usually elevated above a crawl space on a pier foundation. Pier foundations are encouraged for new residential construction. When slab foundations are constructed, it is important that the height of the foundations relate to that of nearby historic buildings. For this reason, slab-on-grade foundations are not allowed for single family residences. For multi-family, where slab-on-grade is most practical, other design elements such as water tables and exaggerated bases can be effective in creating the visual appearance of a foundation”
  6. “A building’s roof contributes significantly to its massing and to the character of the surrounding area. New construction may consider, where appropriate, roof shapes, pitches and complexity similar to or compatible with those of adjacent buildings.”
  7. “To preserve the continuity of a historic district, new construction should be in scale with nearby historic buildings.”
  8. “New construction should reflect the use of façade elements of nearby historic buildings.”
  9. “Designs for new porches should consider porch location, proportion, rhythm, roof form, supports, steps, rails and ornamentation.”
  10. “The number and proportion of openings – windows and entrances – within the façade of a building creates a solid-to-void ratio (wall-to-opening). One way of achieving compatibility may be to use windows and entrances that approximate the placement and solid-to-void ratio of nearby historic buildings. In addition, designs for new construction may incorporate the traditional use of window casements and door surrounds. Where a side elevation is clearly visible from the street, proportion and placement of elements will have an impact upon the visual character of the neighborhood and must be addressed in the design.”
  11. The degree of ornamentation used in new construction should be compatible with the degree of ornamentation found upon nearby historic buildings. Although new buildings should use decorative trim, windows casings, and other building materials similar to nearby historic buildings, the degree of ornamentation should not exceed that characteristic of the area.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted site plans):
1. New Construction – Construct a single family residence on a vacant lot.
    - a. The house possess the following setbacks: 10’ 5” from the inner edge of the side walk to the façade (South Elevation); 8’ from the lot line to West (side) Elevation; and 10’ from the lot line to North (rear) Elevation; and 18’ 8” from the East Elevation.
    - b. A 4’ continuous brick foundation (with white mortar joints) will be employed on the body of the house. Diamond shaped ventilation points will punctuate the

- foundation. Brick piers with framed, recessed, and suspended lattice foundation skirting will be employed beneath the house's porch.
- c. The walls will be faced with hardiboard siding.
  - d. The house will feature six-over-six aluminum clad wooden windows.
  - e. Operable wooden shutters with fixed louvers will flank the windows.
  - f. A 5-V Crimp metal roof will sheath the house's gable and hipped roof structure.
  - k. South Elevation (Façade)
    - i. The Façade will take the form of three part grouping of elements: a hipped roof piazza screen; a gabled middle block; and a recessed hipped roof end.
    - ii. A flight of brick steps and stoop, which will be flanked by picketed railings and terminated by capped newels, will provide access to piazza screen.
    - iii. The façade's entrance, a four paneled wooden door surmounted by a six light transom, will be located within the piazza screen.
    - iv. The center gable will feature cornice returns and friezes.
    - v. Two six-over-six windows and a centered six light window will punctuate the central gabled section of the façade.
    - vi. The recessed terminating bay will take the form of a single bay, west-facing porch (See the description of the West Elevation for more description of said porch.).
  - l. South (Rear) Elevation
    - i. The three part Rear Elevation will feature two six-over-six windows.
    - ii. The middle gabled portion of Rear Elevation will feature a fixed louvered window.
  - m. West Elevation
    - i. Four six-over-six wooden windows and a four paneled door will comprise the West Elevation's fenestration.
    - ii. A shallow hipped roof surmounted porch stoop, the recessed bay mentioned in the description of the Façade, will provide access to the aforementioned door.
    - iii. The hipped roofed porch stoop will feature the following: wooden steps; a picketed railing with a terminal capped newel posts on the stair end; Square section porch posts, tongue-and-groove porch decking; and a shuttered South Elevation.
  - n. North Elevation
    - i. The part North Elevation will be comprised of the aforementioned recessed porch stoop, a gabled middle portion, and hipped roof bay.
    - ii. Two six-over-six windows will be located on the North Elevation.
    - iii. The six-over-six window located with the gabled portion of the North Elevation will be located beneath a louvered window.
    - iv. A hipped roof will extend over and beyond the stoop. A bracket will be employed at hipped roof.
  - o. East Elevation
    - i. The five bay West Elevation will feature three pairs of double French doors with surmounting fanlights and two sash windows (one six-over-six and a second four-over-four in composition).
    - ii. Two Tuscan columns will be employed on the West Elevation's porch (The piazza wall and body of the house will comprise the outer terminations of the porch.).
    - iii. Picketed railings will extend between the porch bays.

- iv. A flight of wooden steps with picketed railings and terminal newels access the porch.
  - v. Tongue-and-groove wooden decking will be employed on the porch.
2. Install a six foot wooden privacy fence enclosing the side (west) yard. The street-facing sections of fence will not extend beyond the front and rear planes of the house.
  3. Install a concrete walkway between the front steps and the inner edge of the side walk.

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application involves the construction of a single family residence atop a vacant lot. According to the Guidelines for New Residential Construction in Mobile’s Historic Districts, the goal of new construction should be to blend into the historic district, but to avoid creating a false sense of history by copying historic examples (See B-1.). In accord, the New Residential Construction Guidelines, the proposed design takes into account the placement, massing, components, and detailing/materials of nearby historic buildings (See B-2.).

With regard to placement, this property has frontages on three streets (Conti, Common, and Caroline). The siting of the house respects and negotiates the traditional façade line of nearby and adjacent contributing buildings on all three streets (See B-3).

The three part grouping of the façade and three remaining elevations serves to break up the building mass. Foundations, porches, wall expanses, and roof forms are arranged in such way to complement the massings of nearby historic buildings (See B-4.). The foundation height of four feet commiserates with nearby historic buildings and serves as a base for ceiling and roof heights that are in keeping with the scale established by nearby historic buildings (See B 5-7).

The composition, components, and details of the façade and other elevations borrow from classical and regional vernacular sources (See B-8.). The massing and roof structure hark to the rhythm of the numerous shotguns found on Caroline Street and recapture the rhythm of those that once lined Conti Street. The classical detailing and proportioning of components such as windows and volumes look to and complement traditional design sources of other nearby historic buildings. The detailing of the porch is in keeping with motifs and proportions of nearby historic examples (See B-9.). The distribution and proportion of windows affords a favorable solid to void relationship (See B-10.).

The degree of ornamentation is compatible with the degree of ornamentation found upon nearby historic buildings (See B-11).

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-11), Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the historic district. Staff recommends approval of this application.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Douglas B. Kearley was present to discuss the application.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant's representative. He asked Mr. Kearley if he had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make. Mr. Kearley answered no.

Charles McLeod, resident of 18 Common Street, asked for clarification as the sitting and design of the house. The Board, Staff, and Mr. Kearley addressed his concerns.

The applicant, Mr. John Avent, spoke from the audience. He stated that he was amendable to reorienting the house to face Caroline Avenue.

No further Board discussion ensued.

Mr. Ladd asked if there was anyone else from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. Upon hearing no response, he 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, amending facts to note that the house would be reoriented to face Caroline Avenue.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

### **DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the facts as amended 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: 5/21/15**

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**CERTIFIED RECORD**

**2014-23-CA: 210 Dauphin Street**  
**Applicant: John Switzer with J. L. Swit, LLC**  
**Received: 7/24/13**  
**Meeting: 5/21/14**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial  
Classification: Contributing (as listed before the fire); now Non-Contributing  
Zoning: B-4  
Project: Fenestration – Replace unauthorized windows.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

Bavarian born architect Rudolf Benz designed this two-story commercial building in 1882. Completed the following year, the building cost was \$3,000.

**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 August 21, 2013. At that time, the Board denied an application calling for the after-the-fact approval of unauthorized windows installed within the façade’s upper-story. The applicant appears before the Board with a request to install windows whose design would the original windows on the façade and the relocation of the façade’s existing windows to the rear elevation.
- 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 the building help establish the historic character of a building. Original window openings should be retained as well as original window sashes and glazing.”
  - 2. “Where windows cannot be repaired, new windows must be compatible to the existing. The size and placement of new windows for alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted renderings):
  - 1. Remove the façade’s unauthorized upper-story windows units.
  - 2. Install four four-over-two windows to match original windows.
  - 3. Relocate the façade’s existing windows to the Rear Elevation.

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application involves the retention and relocation of windows. The windows currently installed on the building’s second story façade do not match the ones approved by the Board on March 19, 2008. At that time, the Board approved the installation of two-over-two wooden windows. Period appropriate windows

were either lost during or as of the consequence of a fire that consumed the building's interior. The Board denied a request to retain the unauthorized windows on September 21, 2013. The proposed windows match those documented in historic photographs with regard to design, material, and light configuration. The applicant would like to use double-paned glass and aluminum cladding (over wood). He investigated the use of single-paned windows but was informed that in order to meet Code-related requirements, the windows would have to be faced with a coating. Another alternative for Code compliance would be the installation of operable shutters. The applicant is not amenable to either option for aesthetic and practical reasons.

The Board has approved double-paned windows for the Battle House Hotel at 26 North Royal Street (January 2, 2013) and the Van Antwerp Building at 101 Dauphin Street (May 1, 2013), two notable commercial projects located within the Lower Dauphin Commercial Districts. On February 6, 2013, the Board approved the installation of one-over-one double-paned wooden windows at 63 North Georgia Avenue as replacements for non-conforming vinyl windows. In 2007, the Board approved the installation of double-paned windows at 1217 Government Street, a non-contributing commercial building. Staff has contacted the Alabama Historical Commission (AHC) as per the proposed replacement windows. The AHC's National Register Coordinator, Certified Local Government Coordinator, and Grants Director stated that the windows submitted for review would be in keeping with current interpretations of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Preservation.

This application also involves the reinstallation of the unauthorized vinyl windows on the rear elevation. These are the same windows that were denied by the Board at the August 21, 2013 meeting. The existing Rear Elevation dates from 2013 and is therefore not historic. The Guidelines for New Commercial Construction in Mobile's Historic Districts do not list vinyl as an inappropriate material. Rear elevations of buildings fronting Dauphin Street have received allows as per fenestration (a case in point the use of metal doors). The subject area will not be visible to the public view on account of the construction of a hotel facing North Conception Street.

It should be noted that the Mobile Historic Development Commission (MHDC) holds a preservation easement on this property. The MHDC's Properties Committee voted to approve both components of the aforementioned scope of work.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based B (1-2), Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the historic district. Staff recommends approval of this application.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

John Switzer was present to discuss the application.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

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

Mr. Switzer said that it had been his intention to have his window contractor in attendance. He went on to say that his contractor was unable to attend for health related reasons. Mr. Switzer stated that the proposed windows would match the appearance of the original windows. He said that in response to previous Board concerns, said windows would not be tinted.



Mr. Stone asked for clarifications to how the existing front windows would be reconditioned on the Rear Elevation. Mr. Switzer addressed Mr. Stone's query.

Mr. Switzer voiced a general hesitancy that he perceived on the part of buyers looking into purchasing properties in historic districts. Mr. Blackwell said that Staff looked forward to assisting any potential buyers of the subject property. Upon Mr. Switzer's mention of the construction of a balcony by any future owner, Mr. Blackwell noted that a balcony had been approved at an earlier date. He reiterated Staff's willingness to encourage, assist, and/or guide any new owners. Mr. Switzer thanked Mr. Blackwell.

No further Board discussion ensued.

Mr. Ladd asked if there was anyone else from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. Upon hearing no response, he 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.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 5/21/15**

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**CERTIFIED RECORD**

**2014-CA-24: 1707 Hunter Avenue**  
**Applicant: Don Williams**  
**Received: 5/5/14**  
**Meeting: 5/21/14**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Porch Piers and Fenestration – Alter the treatment of later porch piers and alter fenestration on the side elevations.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This Arts and Crafts bungalow dates from the first quarter of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century.

**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 application calls for the replacement of later porch supports and the alteration to fenestration on the side elevations.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture. Historic porches should be maintained and repaired to reflect their period. Particular attention should be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking posts/columns, proportions and decorative details.”
  - 2. “The type, size and dividing lights of windows and their location and configuration (rhythm) on the building help establish the historic character of a building. The size and placement of new windows for additions or alterations should be compatible with the general character of a building.”
- C. Scope of Work (Per Submitted Plans Photographs):
  - 1. Remove later cast iron porch supports located atop the front porch’s inner pedestal-like piers.
  - 2. Construct battered wooden piers with accompanying bases and caps matching atop the aforementioned pedestal-like supports. Said piers will match those which set atop the porch’s outer pedestals which support the porch’s roof.
  - 3. Remove narrow slit-like windows from the gabled-roof side elevations (East and West Elevations).

4. Install windows matching the ground floor windows (taller variety) in the location of the aforementioned windows.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application involves the replacement of later porch supports and the alteration to fenestration on the side elevations.

With regard to removal and replacement of the front porch's two later supports, those located atop the inner pedestal flanking the front steps, the Board has approved both contemporary and traditional designs in similar instances in which the originally unsupported spans require additional support. The existing cast iron supports are mass produced and without historic importance. In accord with the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts, particular care will be taken the design of the replacement piers (See B-1.). Said piers will match the existing as per material, design, detail, and proportion.

As per the alteration of the fenestration on side elevations, the East and West Elevations feature narrow slit windows located within the gabled upper-story. Said windows are minimally visible from the public view. In accord with the Design Review Guidelines, the proposed replacement windows, which would match windows located on the house's lower-story, would replicate and be compatible with the general character of a building (See B-2.).

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-2), Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the building or the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of this application.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Don Williams was present to discuss the application.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant's representative. He asked Mr. Williams if he had any clarifications to make, questions to ask, or comments to make.

Mr. Williams answered no. He added that Mr. Blackwell had addressed the application in full.

Mr. Ladd asked if there was anyone else from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. Upon hearing no response, he closed the period of public comment.

## **FINDING OF FACT**

Mr. Stone abstained from the voting on the application.

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.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 5/21/15**

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**CERTIFIED RECORD**

**2014-CA-25: 23 Houston Street**  
**Applicant: Sin Ming Au**  
**Received: 5/5/14 (in final form)**  
**Meeting: 5/21/14**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Renovation – Install a new exterior facing and replace windows.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This Arts and Crafts informed “bungalow” dates from the first quarter of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century.

**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 was last reviewed on September 14, 1983. At that time, the Old Dauphin Way Review Board approved the installation of aluminum siding. With this application the new owner/applicant proposed the removal of the siding, the facing of the building with brick, the removal of windows, and the installation of windows.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts and the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. “The exterior material of a building helps define its style, quality, and period. The original siding should be retained and repaired. Replacement of exterior finishes, when required, must match the original in profile, dimension, and material.”
  - 2. “The type, size, and dividing lights of windows and their location and configuration (rhythm) on the building help establish the historic character of a building. Original window openings should be retained as well as original window sashes and glazing.”
  - 3. “Where windows cannot be repaired, new windows must be compatible with the existing.”
- C. Scope of Work (Per Submitted photographs and models):
  - 1. Remove aluminum siding which faces the house’s walls.
  - 2. Face the house with brick.
  - 3. Remove – surviving original windows and – later metal, solid glass, and other replacement windows.
  - 4. Install one-over-one vinyl windows within framed wooden casings.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application involves the renovation of a contributing residential building. The application up for review entails the installation of new exterior facings and replacement of windows.

This house is faced with aluminum siding. The aforementioned aluminum siding was installed over wooden siding. As revealed by investigations taken by the owner/applicant, a stucco-like paint surface was applied to walls and detailing prior to the installation of the siding. The applicant proposes removal the later aluminum siding and facing the building with a brick veneer of “Old Mobile” inspired bricks. The Design Review Guidelines state that the exterior material of a building helps define its style, quality, and period. Replacement of exterior finishes, when required, must match the original in profile, dimension, and material (See B-1.).

The Design Review Guidelines state that original window openings should be retained as well as original window sashes and glazing and where windows cannot be repaired, new windows must be compatible with the existing (See B 2-3.). This property’s main house features seventeen windows. Of the total windows, eight are original. Earlier replacement windows are metal in composition and casement in type, as well as large plate glass windows. The distribution of windows is as follows: Façade (West Elevation) – a tripartite grouping of multi-light over single light windows and a large metal window; South Elevation – three large metal windows and one plate glass window; East Elevation – a paired grouping of wooden windows, two single wooden window, and two metal windows; and North Elevation – two wooden and one metal windows. Regardless of material and type, all the window casings are faced with aluminum.

On May 4, 2011, The Board approved the removal aluminum jalousie windows and the installation of vinyl sash windows at 58 Bradford Avenue. As with subject application, original windows were not intact (for the whole of that house). The replacement windows replicated the type of missing original windows. The construction, appearance, texture, and installation of the windows was discussed and proved successful upon installation.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends approval in part and denial in part.

Based on B (1), Staff believes the use of brick facings on the building would impair the architectural and historical character of the building. Staff does not recommend approval of that portion of the application.

Based on B (2-3), Staff believes the wholesale replacement of windows would impair the architectural and historical character of the building or the district. Staff does not recommend approval of that portion of the application.

Based on a previous ruling regarding the replacement of non-original windows, Staff does recommend approval of the replacement of the aluminum windows with vinyl windows installed in wooden casings and set into the reveals. Staff does not believe the aforementioned intervention would impair the architectural or the historical character of the building or the district.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Sin Ming Au was present to discuss the application.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd stated that application posed to two issues – siding and windows. He welcomed the applicant. Before addressing the applicant, Mr. Ladd asked Mr. Blackwell how best to proceed with the application. Mr. Blackwell recommended a two part approach for reasons of discussion and direction.

Mr. Ladd asked Mr. Au if he had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make.

Mr. Au first addressed the siding component of the application. He stated that his first impulse was to remove the aluminum siding and expose the wooden siding. Upon examination of the condition and treatment of the siding, Mr. Au explained that he then received estimates for hardiboard siding. He stated hardiboard proved more cost prohibitive than brick. Mr. Au said that bricks would resemble “Old Mobile” bricks. He stated that in his mind estimation that the brick would be more historically appropriate than the existing aluminum siding.

Mr. Roberts described the difference between wood mold and metal mold bricks.

Mr. Blackwell explained that in changing the exterior facing from siding to masonry the character of the house would be so altered as to change the designation of the building from contributing to noncontributing.

Discussion turned to the replacement of the windows. After discussing various alternatives, Mr. Au voiced his amenability to replacing only the metal casement windows with wood-framed vinyl sash windows. He also agreed to replace the façade’s northernmost window with wooden windows.

Mr. Ladd asked if there was anyone else from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. Upon hearing no response, he closed the period of public comment.

## **FINDING OF FACT**

Mr. Harden 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 amended to reflect the following: the siding would remain in place; only the metal casement windows would be replaced with wood cased vinyl sash windows; the siding would remain in place; and the façade’s northernmost window would be replaced with a pair of wooden windows matching the design, material, and construction of the wooden windows.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Mr. Harden moved that, based upon the facts as amended 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.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 5/21/15**



**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**  
**CERTIFIED RECORD**

**2014-15-CA: 204 South Dearborn Street**  
**Applicant: Joseph Patterson with JPS Construction for Debra J. Forrest**  
**Received: 3/5/14 (initial application)**  
**Meeting: 5/21/14**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Church Street East  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: After-the-Fact-Approval – Retain unauthorized replacement windows.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This one-and-one-half-a-story wooden dwelling dates circa 1871. With its side hall plan, all encompassing gable roof (over the original portion of the house), and porch-fronted façade, this house ranks among Mobile’s most exemplary extant Workman’s Cottages.

**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 April 16, 2014. At that time, the Board approved the installation of six-over-six wooden windows as replacements for unauthorized vinyl windows (the ten most visible). It was noted that if the approved windows, which were made available free of charge to the applicants, did not fit the openings, staff was authorized to work with the applicants regarding a replacement schedule. The applicants have elected to apply for the retention of the unauthorized windows. An earlier application for the same request was tabled at the April 2, 2014 meeting.
- 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 the building help establish the historic character of a building. Original window openings should be retained as well as original window sashes and glazing.”
  - 2. “Where windows cannot be repaired, new windows must be compatible with the existing.”
  - 3. “Snap-in or artificial muntins” are listed as inappropriate window construction.

- C. Scope of Work:
1. After-the-Fact-Approval – Retain ten unauthorized windows.
  2. Retain inoperable shutters flanking the façade’s windows.

### **STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application involves the after-the-fact-approval of unauthorized work. During the previous meeting, the Board discussed several applications involving the replacement of unauthorized and/or nonconforming windows. The applications discussed fell into three different categories: replacements of long existing (58 Bradford Avenue; 11 Macy Place); the staggered replacement of unauthorized windows (63 North Georgia Avenue); and a public viewed informed replacement approach of nonconforming windows (77 South Lafayette Street). The significance of the subject building, one of few extant Mobile workman’s cottages, weighed in on the discussion. The Board singled out the ten most visible windows for replacement. Said windows comprise the fenestration of body of the main house’s original side elevations. The applicants representatives received midmonth approvals for the replacement of rotten woodwork in kind on July 23, 2013 and the repainting of the building on August 27, 2013, no approval was issued for the replacement of windows. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state that original window openings should be retained as well as original window sashes and glazing. The Guidelines go on to clarify that where windows cannot be repaired, new windows must be compatible with the existing (See B 1-2.).The replacement of windows was not included in the approved scope of work. While the six-over-six light replacement windows installed on the Side and Rear Elevations match the light configuration of the original windows, slap-in or artificial muntins are listed as inappropriate for use on both replacements and new construction in Mobile’s historic districts (See B-3).

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-3), Staff believes this application would impair the architectural and historical character of the building. Staff does not recommend approval of this application

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Debra Forrest, Joseph Patterson, and Tommie Sanders were present to discuss the application.

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Ladd welcomed the applicant and her representatives.

The applicant’s representatives explained that after measuring the windows offered at the last meeting, they realized that said windows would not fit within the house’s window openings. Mr. Sanders said that he and Mr. Patterson were present to figure out how to proceed.

A gradual replacement policy was discussed. Mr. Ladd and Ms. Harden explained that they were trying to work with the applicants while at the same time respect the Guidelines and the historic character of the building.

Mr. Stone and Mr. Oswalt suggested a test case approval. Mr. Allen stated that even if the muntins were removed, the issue of the double-paned class, the alterations to the casings, and the change of dimensions of the sashes still posed concern.

The Board moved to table the application for Design Review.

A meeting was scheduled for May 27, 2014.

**TABLED FOR DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE.**