

**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD Minutes**  
**September 17, 2014 – 3:00 P.M.**  
**Pre-Council Chambers, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street**

1. The Chair, Harris Oswalt, called the meeting to order at 3:00. Cart Blackwell, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:  
**Members Present:** Robert Allen, Robert Brown, Kim Harden, Carolyn Hasser, Nick Holmes III, Harris Oswalt, and Craig Roberts.  
**Members Absent:** Catarina Echols, Bradford Ladd, Steve Stone, and Jim Wagoner.  
**Staff Members Present:** Cart Blackwell, and Keri Coumanis.
2. Mr. Oswalt moved to holdover approval of the minutes of the August 20, 2014 meeting. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.
3. Mr. Roberts moved to approve the midmonth COA's granted by Staff. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.

**B. CALL TO ORDER**

1. Roll Call
2. Approval of Minutes
3. Approval of Mid Month COAs Granted by Staff

**C. MID MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED.**

1. **Applicant: Ronald G. E. Smith**
  - a. Property Address: 1564 Old Shell Road
  - b. Date of Approval: 8/12/14
  - c. Project: Regrade, repave, and partially extend an existing concrete drive into the existing gravel drive. Install new gravel in the existing driveway system located to the front, rear and side (east) of the house. Remove later concrete paving from the covered parking area. Regrade the parking area. Repoint the chimney with the appropriate lime-based or type n mortar.
2. **Applicant: Eugene Moore**
  - a. Property Address: 1362 Conti Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 8/12/14
  - c. Project: Reroof the house with asphalt shingles. Repair deteriorated eaves (wooden) as required and when necessary (to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material.
3. **Applicant: Affordable Roofing and Construction**
  - a. Property Address: 1259 Texas Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 8/12/14
  - c. Project: Patch the roof with shingles to match the existing.
4. **Applicant: Diversified Roofing**
  - a. Property Address: 150 Government Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 8/12/14
  - c. Project: Reroof SE corner of building using 60 mil TPO over 3 inch ISO. Off white in color to match existing roof.
5. **Applicant: Michael and Judith Anderson**
  - a. Property Address: 117 Beverly Court
  - b. Date of Approval: 8/12/14
  - c. Project: Work on altered rear portion of house – Remove two metal windows and install windows matching those found on the body of the house. Install a period appropriate

door. Repair surrounding woodwork and brickwork. Touch up paint as required about subject area.

**6. Applicant: Joe and Dr. Carolyn Ringhoffer**

- a. Property Address: 1211 Government Street
- b. Date of Approval: 8/12/14
- c. Project: Install a cast iron fence in the rear lot off of the final section of that stretch of Church Street (setbacks to be in compliance with Urban Development). The five foot tall sections of fencing will match existing fencing found elsewhere on the property.

**7. Applicant: Goodwyn, Mills & Cawood for the RSA**

- a. Property Address: 107 Saint Francis Street
- b. Date of Approval: 8/13/14
- c. Project: Install a blade sign. The sign will be suspended beneath the soffit extending in front of one the building's ground floor units. The total square footage of the single-faced aluminum sign will be less than ten feet. The sign design will be comprised of the name of the occupying tenant.

**8. Applicant: Brooke O'Donnell**

- a. Property Address: 1707 Hunter Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 8/14/14
- c. Project: Paint the house per the submitted BLP color scheme: body, St. Anthony Street Gray; Trim, Detonti Square White; and steps & porch floor, Chatham Street Blue.

**9. Applicant: Glenda Snodgrass**

- a. Property Address: 1408 Eslava Street
- b. Date of Approval: 8/15/14
- c. Project: Construct single car wooden carport of a modified version of the MHDC stock design. The plan will measure 16 x 28' and the detailing will reflect that of the main residence. As coordinated with staff and Urban Development, the building will be located 6' from the property line. Construct a 16' x 16' patio off the rear elevation.

**10. Applicant: Whithering Ten Construction**

- a. Property Address: 301 Conti Street
- b. Date of Approval: 8/19/14
- c. Project: Repair concrete/stucco band.

**11. Applicant: Wrico Signs/Allen Industries for Dairy Queen**

- a. Property Address: 1354 Government Street
- b. Date of Approval: 8/19/14
- c. Project: Revised Approval for a midmonth dated 6 June 2014. Install for a period of one month polycarbonate faced signs. After a period of one month from the day of this issue, the aforementioned signs will be removed and the approved signage (aluminum face with vinyl lettering) will be installed. Said signage will consist of a monument sign and two walls signs per submitted designs. The total square signs will measure 25 square feet each. The signs will feature the name of the dining venue. The single-faced 5' tall rock wall sign will feature a aluminum emblem advertising the commercial franchise. Install three aluminum directional signs.

**12. Applicant: Susanna Beique with Paint the Town**

- a. Property Address: 412 Dauphin Street
- b. Date of Approval: 8/19/14
- c. Project: Install a hanging blade sign per submitted photograph. The painted wooden sign will be hung to height commiserate with code-related height requirements. The double-faced sign will measure less than 10 square feet in dimension. Apply interior (non directional window graphics) to the inner panes of the street-facing windows (again per submitted designs).

**13. Applicant: Cummings Architecture**

- a. Property Address: 18 South Royal Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 8/19/14
  - c. Project: Paint the building per the submitted Benjamin Moore color scheme: cast iron pilasters, “Bonsai Tint”; windows, Courtyard; recessed metal details, “Coral Island”; raised metal devices and flashing, “Sticks and Stones”; and raised lettering, “Fired Brick”.
- 14. Applicant: Charles Landry**
- a. Property Address: 1259 Texas Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 8/21/14
  - c. Project: Repaint the house per the submitted BLP color scheme: the body, Joachim Street Biege; the trim, DeTonti Square Off White; the foundation, Summerville Red; and the steps & porch, Savannah Street Dark Brown.
- 15. Applicant: Scogin Construction**
- a. Property Address: 250 Roper Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 8/22/14
  - c. Project: Replace roof on house, carport and porches to match the existing with 50 year architectural shingle, gray to match the existing. Front porch will be metal to match the existing, silver in color.
- 16. Applicant: Carla Sharrow**
- a. Property Address: 1005 Augusta Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 8/25/14
  - c. Project: Repair transom to match the original beveled glass.
- 17. Applicant: Coumanis Allen**
- a. Property Address: 118 Houston Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 8/26/14
  - c. Project: Paint the house per the submitted Sherwin Williams color scheme: body, a gray hue; trim, white; and detailing, white. Repair deteriorated woodwork (when and where necessary) to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material.
- 18. Applicant: Brian Boutin**
- a. Property Address: 7 South Monterey Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 8/27/14
  - c. Project: Repair existing fabric awning over front entrance; paint front stairs; paint back stairs; reroof carport either with asphalt shingle, charcoal gray, or v-crimp metal roof; repair existing fence; remove remnants of chain link fence.
- 19. Applicant: 1<sup>st</sup> Choice Construction**
- a. Property Address: 17 McPhillips
  - b. Date of Approval: 8/26/14
  - c. Project: Tear off existing one story porch roof, remove flat roof underneath this, and reroof with a slightly higher pitch to shed water (profile will not change), cover with 30 year shingles charcoal gray.
- 20. Applicant: B. W. Construction Company**
- a. Property Address: 209 South Cedar Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 8/28/14
  - c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material. Repaint the building per the existing color scheme. Replicate an earlier porch picket treatment.
- 21. Applicant: Lucy Barr for Erin Wheeler**
- a. Property Address: 257 Charles Street
  - b. Date of Approval: 9/2/14
  - c. Project: Construct a carport measuring 26’ x 29’. The carport will feature an enclosed area with hardiboard siding and one-over-one window. The carport’s supports will

take the form of square section wooden posts. The carport will be sheathed by standing seam metal roofing panels.

**22. Applicant: Samuel Lee Randolph**

- a. Property Address: 356 Breamwood
- b. Date of Approval: 8/29/14
- c. Project: Erect 6' Dog-Eared Privacy Fence in Rear of Property.

**23. Applicant: Taylor Atchison with Atchison Home**

- a. Property Address: 255 Rapier Avenue
- b. Date of Approval: 9/2/14
- c. Project: Paint the hosue a shade of white and reroof the roof with architectural shingles (grey in color).

**24. Applicant: Bobby Gipson**

- a. Property Address: 165 Houston Street
- b. Date of Approval: 9/2/14
- c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork (when and where necessary) to match the existing. Repaint the house per the submitted BLP color scheme The Body will be Government Street Green and the trim will be off white. Reroof the house with asphalt shingles.

**25. Applicant: Robert Dueitt**

- a. Property Address: 63 South Monterey Street
- b. Date of Approval: 9/3/14
- c. Project: Remove a window unit. Repair the window.

**26. Applicant: John Thomas with TCM Remodlers**

- a. Property Address: 161 South Warren Street
- b. Date of Approval: 9/3/14
- c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork to match the existing as per profile, dimension, and material. Repaint the house.

**27. Applicant: City of Mobile**

- a. Property Address: 1451 Government Street
- b. Date of Approval: 9/9/14
- c. Project: Repair sections of roof and fascia to match the existing.

**28. Applicant: City of Mobile**

- a. Property Address: 205 State Street
- b. Date of Approval: 9/9/14
- c. Project: Repair roof and porch ceiling to match the existing; repair fascia to match the existing; repoint mortar as needed matching the existing in color and strike; repaint doors, windows and trim white; extend porch railing by removing the current top rail and inserting decorative section to match the existing and reinstalling top rail; repair rear porch decking to match the existing, repainting the entire porch.

**D. APPLICATIONS**

**1. 2014-40-CA: 9 North Monterey Street**

- a. Applicant: Courtney Brett with Casburn Brett for Mary Quin
- b. Project: Ancillary Construction – Construct an ancillary building.  
**APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

**2. 2014-41-CA: 1006 Church Street**

- a. Applicant: Edward and Abby Bowron
- b. Project: Reroofing – Reroof a house with metal roofing shingles.  
**APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

**3. 2014-42-CA: 358 Marine Street**

- a. Applicant: Lucy Barr for Mr. & Mrs. Charles Landry
- b. Project: Rehabilitation – Make alterations to previously altered front porch, remove a later addition, and construct an addition of the site of the aforementioned addition.

**APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

**4. 2014-43-CA: 200 South Ann Street**

- a. Applicant: Harold Craig  
Project: Addition – Construct a small side/rear addition.

**APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

**5. 2014-35-CA: 15 McPhillips Street**

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

**DENIED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

**D. OTHER BUSINESS**

1. Window Guideline

The Board reviewed a proposed window guideline.

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

**2014-40-CA: 9 North Monterey Street**  
**Applicant: Courtney Brett with Casburn Brett Architecture for Mary Quin**  
**Received: 8/18/14**  
**Meeting: 9/3/14**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Ancillary Construction – Construct an ancillary building.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This classically detailed American Foursquare dwelling dates from 1909. It is one of the oldest residences in the Hall Tract, the property from which the two northernmost blocks of Monterey Street were created.

**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 13, 2007. At that time, the Board approved work on the house’s front porch. With this application, the present owner proposes the construction of an ancillary building.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. “An accessory structure is any construction other than the main building on the property. It includes but is not limited to garages, carports, pergolas, decks, pool covers, sheds and the like. The appropriateness of accessory structures shall be measured by the guidelines applicable to new construction. The structure should complement the design and scale of the main building.”
- C. **Scope of Work (per submitted plans):**
  - 1. Construct an ancillary building.
    - a. The building will measure approximately 12’ 3” in width and 20’ 3” in depth.
    - b. The overall height will be 23’ 5”.
    - c. The building will rest atop a stucco-faced continuous foundation like that of the main house.
    - d. Portions of an existing wooden deck will be removed, replaced, and extended. An expanded deck will extend around the east and north sides of the building. Boxed, recessed, and suspended lattice panels will extend between the deck’s pilings. The deck will feature picketed railings.

- e. Hardiboard siding will face the building's walls.
- f. The building will feature wooden doors, windows, and shutters.
- g. Asphalt shingles matching the color of those employed on the principle dwelling will sheath the house's gabled roof.
- h. The East Elevation will feature a four-paneled wooden door and a shuttered window.
- i. The North Elevation will feature a pair of glazed and paneled French door. Transom windows will surmount the doors. Both the doors and transoms will be centered within an expanse of the wall that merges into a hipped wall dormer.
- j. A pergola featuring cloud lift bracketed ends will be located off the West Elevation.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application calls for the construction of an ancillary building. Located behind the main residence, the proposed building will not be visible from the public view. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that ancillary construction should complement the design and scale of the main building (See B-1.). The building's foundation height and ceiling levels are informed by those established by the principle residence. Materials and finishes are keeping with the design of the main house.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1), 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**

Carl Burdick 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. Burdick if he had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make.

Mr. Burdick responded by saying that Mr. Blackwell had addressed the application in full. He added that he believed that the design was reflective of traditional outbuildings and complementary to the main dwelling.

Mr. Roberts complimented Mr. Burdick on the quality of the submission.

No further Board discussion ensued.

Mr. Oswalt asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. Upon hearing no response, 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: 9/17/15**



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

**2014-41-CA: 1006 Church Street**  
**Applicant: Edward and Abby Bowron**  
**Received: 8/27/14**  
**Meeting: 9/17/14**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Reroofing – Reroof a house with metal roofing shingles.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This building was one of two substantial masonry dependencies constructed to the side/rear of a lost Government Street residence. The complex was built for the Gage family. It was later acquired and long remained in the hands of a branch of the Ketchum family. Both the main house and dependencies have been attributed to New York architect Calvert Vaux. The subject building (a former carriage house and stable) dates from the 1860s. The Italianate building’s original smooth-faced (possibly penciled scored walls) were later refaced with peddledash stucco treatment. The remodeling likely coincided with the construction of two Spanish Colonial Revival dwellings along the western portion of the original lot along Chatham Street (both dwellings survive). The two Chatham Street houses were designed by George B. Rogers. The subject building was later adaptively reused by the Government Street Church of Christ. It has been restored and rehabilitated as a single family residence.

**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 February 18, 2009. At that time, the Board approved plans calling for alterations to side and rear elevations. The application up for review calls for the removal of asphalt shingles and the installation of metal roofing shingles.
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. “A roof is one of the most dominant features of a building. Original or historic roof forms, as well as the original pitch of the roof should be maintained. Materials should be appropriate to the form and pitch and color.”
- C. Scope of Work:
  - 1. Remove the asphalt roofing shingles sheathing the house’s roof.
  - 2. Reroof the house with metal roofing shingles (coming in sheet form).

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application calls for the installation of metal roofing panels. Metal roofs are reviewed on a case by case basis. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that original or historic roof forms, as well as the original pitch of the roof should be maintained. Materials should be appropriate to the form and pitch and color (See B-1.). This building's varied roof forms and pitches will remain unchanged. Only the material sheathing would be altered from asphalt shingles to metal roofing panels. Metal roofing is a traditional roofing material that gained in popular during the latter half of the 19<sup>th</sup> Century. Standing seam panels and individual metal shingles were the most common types of metal roofing treatments employed on more high style ancillary buildings such as the subject building. The proposed panels, ones which feature a shingled treatment, represent a compromise between the effectiveness of panel construction/installation and the aesthetic/historical employment of individual shingles. The compartmentalized appearance of the shingles will allow for pattern without sacrificing water shedding and repair capability. The color is historically appropriate to the building's date of construction and materials phase of manufacture.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

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

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Edward Bowron was present to discuss the application.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION**

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

Mr. Bowron said that he and his wife had given much thought as to the period appropriateness and general effectiveness of several roofing alternatives. He explained that they believed the proposed roofing would be an improvement to and in keeping with the historic character of the property.

Ms. Harden asked if the reroofing was all that which was being proposed. Mr. Bowron answered yes.

No further Board discussion ensued.

Mr. Oswalt asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. Upon hearing no response, 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: 9/17/15**

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

**2014-42-CA:** 358 Marine Street  
**Applicant:** Lucy Barr for Mr. and Mrs. Charles Landry  
**Received:** 9/2/14  
**Meeting:** 9/20/14

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden  
Classification: Non-Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Rehabilitation – Make alterations to previously altered front porch, remove a later addition, and construct an addition on site of the aforementioned addition.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This house dates from the last quarter of the 19<sup>th</sup> Century. A single-story side hall in type, the building's exterior was (according to MHDC Staff files) faced with brick in the 1960s.

**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 owners/applicants propose a more historically sensitive intervention to a previously altered porch, the removal of a later rear addition, and the reconstruct of an addition on the site of the aforementioned addition.
- B. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation and the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. “The porch is an important regional characteristic of Mobile architecture. Particular attention should be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions and decorative details.”
  - 2. Porch “materials should blend with the style of the building.”
  - 3. “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy the historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.”
  - 4. “A roof is one of the most dominant features of a building. Original or historic roof forms, as well as the original pitch of the roof should be maintained. Materials should be appropriate to the form and pitch and color.”
  - 5. “Period color schemes are encouraged.”

- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans):
1. Alter a previously altered porch.
    - a. Remove later cast iron porch supports.
    - b. Install square section wooden posts.
    - c. Picketed railings will extend between the porch posts.
    - d. Remove late brick steps.
    - e. Install new brick steps.
    - f. Picketed wooden railings will be located atop the steps.
  2. Convert a later South (side) Elevation door into a window bay. The six-over-six window will match those found elsewhere on the house. The brickwork will be parched to match the existing.
  3. Demolish a later rear addition.
  4. Construct a rear addition on the location of the aforementioned addition.
    - a. The addition will measure 16' 6" by 22' 2" in plan.
    - b. The addition will be faced with a brick veneer matching that enclosing the main house.
    - c. The brick soldier course will match the existing.
    - d. The house's existing gable roof will extend over the new addition.
    - e. The roofing shingles will match those employed on the main house.
    - f. The addition will feature six-over-six wooden windows. The brick rowlocks will match those found on the body of the house.
    - g. The North (side) Elevation will feature a six-over-six wooden window.
    - h. The West (rear) Elevation will feature a six paneled wooden door and a six-over-six window.
    - i. A stoop supported by brick foundation piers and featuring wooden decking and single flight of wooden steps will access the aforementioned door.
    - j. A bracketed shed overhang will extend over the single bay stoop.
    - k. The South Elevation will feature a six-over-six window.
    - l. A crawl space access point will punctuate the continuous foundation. A vertical board covering will extend over said opening.
  5. Paint the house and the addition grey with white trim.

## STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the rehabilitation of a single-family residence. The house, a single-story wooden side hall, underwent significant alterations in either the 1950s or 1960s. Changes included the facing of the house with brick and the removal of the front porch's original substructure, supports, railings, and details. Later additions extend from the rear of the original house. The application up for review can be divided into five parts: alterations to previously modified front porch; the demolition of a later rear addition; the construction a new rear addition atop the location of the earlier addition; and the conversion of a later door into a window bay.

With regard to the alterations to the non-original porch treatment, the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts state that particular attention should be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions and decorative details (See B-1). The traditional three bay configuration retained by the late cast iron supports would be maintained, albeit with material and period appropriate columns and railings. Square section wooden posts and picketed railings would recapture lost historical integrity and reintegrate the façade other historical elements of the surrounding streetscapes.

This house features a later shed roof addition. Shed roofs remain a common roofing construction for rear additions to gabled and hipped roof buildings. The later addition is of an inferior construction quality than that of the main house. Additionally, the shed roof is of particularly low pitch. The work proposed for the

rear portion of the building calls for the demolition of the later rear addition and the construction of a new addition atop the location of the subject area. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation state that additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy the historic materials that characterize the property (See B-3.). The existing addition is not only of no historical or architectural significance, but also minimally impacts the streetscape. In accord with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, the new addition compatible with massing, size, scale, and architectural features of body of the house (See B-3). A slight break in seam of the brickwork would afford a visual demarcation between the older and later fabric allowing the addition to "read" as a later phase in the house's evolution.

The house's South (side) Elevation features a later door. The size of the door, the plan of the house, and the construction of the door indicate the door was originally a window bay. A window of the same type (sash) and configuration (six-over-six) as the house's original windows would replace the door. Surrounding brickwork would be parched to match the existing.

While Staff notes that painting brick results in additional maintenance requirements and alters the appearance of a building, the subject house's brick walls are not original to its period of construction or significance. The Design Review Guideline's for Mobile's Historic Districts encourage the selection of period color schemes (See B-5.). The neutral colors proposed for the body of the house & the addition would serve to take to negate the impact of the later brick wall surfaces and further reintegrate the building with frame and painted buildings that typify the streetscape.

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-5), Staff does not believe this application will impair the architectural or the historical character of the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of this application.

#### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Lucy Barr and Charles Landry were present to discuss the application.

#### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

Prior to the Board discussion and incorporated into the presentation, Mr. Blackwell informed the Board that the applicants had revised the application on account of a small increase in the size of the addition. He added that the application as revised would not impair the architectural or historical character of the historic district.

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. Mr. Oswalt welcomed the applicant and his representative. He asked if Ms. Barr and Mr. Landry if they had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make.

Ms. Barr clarified Mr. Blackwell's opening remarks. She stated that while the proposed addition would increase in size, it would only occupy the footprint of the existing rear addition.

Mr. Roberts asked Staff for clarification as to a possible lack of differentiation between the existing building and the new work. Mr. Blackwell said that a seam could be discerned in the brickwork. Ms. Barr stated that an emphatic break seemed unnecessary on account of the status of the building, existing conditions, and proposed improvements. She explained that a readable identifiable break was not intended.

Mr. Roberts said that he only wanted the Board to be consistent. Mr. Blackwell noted that the previous alterations to the building and the status of the building. He stated that differentiation takes many forms.

Mr. Harden voiced concern that in approving the application the Board would be approving additional nonconforming work.

No further Board discussion ensued.

Mr. Oswalt asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. Upon hearing no response, 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 amended to reflect the enlargement of the addition.

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: 9/17/15**

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

**2014-43-CA: 200 South Ann Street**  
**Applicant: Harold Craig**  
**Received: 9/3/14**  
**Meeting: 9/17/14**

**INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION**

Historic District: Leinkauf  
Classification: Contributing  
Zoning: R-1  
Project: Addition – Construct a side/rear addition.

**BUILDING HISTORY**

This house combines characteristics of an Arts & Crafts informed “bungalow” and an early 20<sup>th</sup>-Century Picturesque dwelling.

**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 May 19, 2002. At that time, the Board approved the construction a shed roofed addition off the rear elevation. With this application, the new owner/applicant proposes the construction of a small side/rear addition
- B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
  - 1. “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy the historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.”
- C. Scope of Work (per submitted plans) :
  - 1. Construct a side/rear addition
    - a. The will enclose and extend from a single bay side/rear porch.
    - b. The addition will rest atop a continuous brick foundation that will be interwoven to match that found on the body of the house.
    - c. A hardiboard skirting board matching the dimensions and profile of that found on the body of the house will be employed.
    - d. The addition will feature hariboard siding matching that employed on the body of the house as per profile and dimension.
    - e. The addition six-over-six wooden windows, window casings, and louvered shutters will match those found on the body of the house.
    - f. The addition’s North (Selma Street facing) Elevation will measure 14’ 3” in length.



- g. Standing seam metal roofing panels matching those employed on the rear porch will sheath the addition's shed roof.
- h. The North Elevation will feature two six-over-six wooden windows.
- i. The West (Rear) Elevation will feature a single six-over-six wooden window.
- j. The South (inner lot facing) Elevation will feature a glazed and paneled wooden door.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS**

This application involves the construction of a small side/rear addition. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation state that new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment (See B-1.). The house possesses a complex configuration of roof forms. A collection of gable, hip, and shed roofs surmount the building and conditioned the proposed designs. Located at the northwest corner of the house, the area encompassed by the proposed addition is composed of a partially infilled porch and a portion of a rear deck. The roof forms and pitches are more varied at that subject area than other location on the house. The continuation of the main house's floor level and the negotiation of varying roof pitches afford compatibility of massing and scale. The addition would feature a foundation treatment, siding profiles, and windows matching those found on the main house. The transition from the shed roof off the hipped roof skirting two prominent gables would allow addition to read as a later alteration to historic fabric.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1), 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**

Marilyn Craig 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 Ms. Craig if she had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make.

Ms. Craig first thanked Mr. Blackwell. She went on explain the motivations behind the proposed addition.

Discussion ensued as the differentiation between the historic and proposed fabric. It was suggested at the applicant employ a corner board at the line demarcating the existing fabric (enclosed space/wall) and the proposed construction. Following up on observations made by Ms. Coumanis, Mr. Blackwell noted that the use of a vertical element on the outside and structural components within the wall would obscure juncture between the sections of siding and strengthen the joining of the same.

Ms. Craig stated that she was amendable to the solution.

No further Board discussion ensued.

Mr. Oswalt asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. Upon hearing no response, 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 amended to reflect the use of a corner board-like vertical element at the juncture of the existing fabric and proposed new construction.

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: 9/17/15**

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

**2014-35-CA:** 15 McPhillips Avenue  
**Applicant:** Sue Wagner  
**Received:** 8/14/14  
**Meeting:** 9/17/14

**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 surfaces, parapet walls, and low pitched roof, this duplex 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 last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on July 23, 2014. At that time and at the application, the Board tabled for the second time an application calling for the removal and replacement of later windows on account of lack of information and further clarification. The application was tabled for reason of the same concerns on June 18, 2014. Following up on the Board’s concerns, the applicant submits a revised submission with imagery, drawings, and sample section in effort to be better articulate the propose scope the work.
- 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 type, size and dividing light 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. “The size and placement of new windows for additions and alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building.”
  - 3. Under unacceptable materials, vinyl is listed.
- C. Scope of Work (Per Submitted drawings, renderings, and sample section):
  - 1. Remove later metal and vinyl windows from the house’s South (side) Elevation and install vinyl windows as per the following sequence:
    - A. Remove a tripartite (Chicago style) metal picture window

- B. Install a new tripartite window that will take the form of picture window with flanking sliding windows in the location of the aforementioned window. See submitted imagery and drawings.
- C. Remove a metal window.
- D. Install a one-over-one vinyl sash window in the location of the aforementioned window. See submitted imagery and drawings.
- E. Remove a pair of jalousie (partial length) windows.
- F. Install a pair of sliding vinyl windows in the location of aforementioned windows. See submitted imagery and drawings.

## **STAFF ANALYSIS/REQUESTS**

This application involves the removal of later windows and the installation of vinyl windows. The application last appeared before the Board on July 23, 2014. The Board tabled the application for clarification and lack of information.

The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state that the type, size and dividing light of windows and their location and configuration (rhythm) on the building help establish the historic character of a building and when original windows are not intact alterations should be compatible with the general character of the building (See B-1.).

The subject windows – one picture, one single, and a pair of raised windows – occupy original fenestrated bays, but are not the original fenestrated units. Only the duplex dwelling’s façade possesses its original windows. The facades’s original windows are wood in composition and casement in type. The side and rear elevation windows have long been removed. Minimally visible at an oblique, the subject windows are located within the middle portion of the South (side) Elevation and do not directly engage the street. The proposed windows are vinyl in composition and varied in construction. Vinyl windows have been approved on two test case approvals, one for new construction and a second for replacement of lost windows. The latter approval, which was issued for 58 Bradford Avenue, involved the installation of vinyl sash windows on house lacking all of its original windows. Based on the size of the openings and the design of the house, the windows would have originally been sash windows. Aluminum clad wooden windows have been approved on several projects involving the installation of new windows on buildings which no longer possessed original windows.

All of the proposed windows would be recessed into the reveals as opposed to be installed in flush manner. The three part picture or Chicago window would retain its tripartite composite. Instead of flanking metal casement windows, the outer windows would be sliding in construction. As indicated by renderings provided the applicant, the single paned vertical outer windows would slide into the center picture window when opened. The single aluminum window would be replaced with one-over-one sash window. No muntins would be employed. The pair of kitchen type windows (jalousies at present) would be replaced with sliding windows. The design would consist of two glazed panels.

## **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

While the applicant has provided imagery, sample sections, and dimensions of the proposed windows, The Design Review Guidelines do not authorize vinyl windows. Based on B (3), Staff believes this application would impair the architectural and historical character of the building.

## **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Sue Wagner 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 Ms. Wagner if she had any clarifications to address, questions to ask, or comments to make.

Ms. Wagner stated that vinyl windows had been proposed from the first application forward. She explained that she and her husband had acquired the property as a rental investment in the mid 1970s and that she now lived in the building. Ms. Wagoner spoke of her efforts to maintain and improve the property. She stated the location of the windows on the side elevation would not impact the passerby and mentioned the variety of windows already informing that side of the house and the house in general. Ms. Wagner said that the building is what it is, but it is first and foremost her home. Addressing the existing windows and their openings, she said that the windows not only vary in type and material, but also size. The replacement process she stated would not be a standard one. Ms. Wagner asked for direction from the Board.

Ms. Harden stated that Board had approved aluminum clad windows.

Ms. Wagner informed the Board that the house was still settling and that she was hesitant to invest in such expensive product on account of the settling.

Mr. Roberts said that settling issues would impact any installation/construction.

Mr. Roberts asked why the windows did not feature a pattern. Mr. Blackwell stated that he encouraged the applicant not use a muntins because applied muntins are not listed as an approved material by the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts.

Ms. Wagner stated that only one neighbor would be impacted by the subject work.

Mr. Allen and Ms. Harden said that replacements should match the originals.

Considerable discussion ensued as what type of windows would have originally occupied the subject bays. The sequence of windows as existing and as proposed was reviewed several times. It was noted that one set of windows proposed for replacement was not included in the presentation.

Mr. Holmes stated that sliding windows were not in existence at the time of the building's construction.

Ms. Wagner told the Board that she had to stay within a budget for reason of appraised and rent values. She said that while she loves her home, it does not possess a high appraised value.

Mr. Holmes addressed Ms. Wagner. He explained that the Board was trying to work with her to develop a compromise.

Ms. Wagner stated that she believed the proposal up for review represented an improvement.

Mr. Holmes agreed that it was improvement in terms of efficiency (weather tight), but not material and design, which is what the Review Board regulates.

Both Mr. Holmes and Ms. Harden observed the same hodgepodge assemblage of windows informing the side elevation would be perpetuated by the proposal up for review.

Ms. Harden noted that while the existing windows were not original, their replacements would have to have be in compliance with the Guidelines and respect the building.

Ms. Wagner replied that she believed in regulations in concept and to most degrees.

Ms. Hasser recommended to Ms. Wagner that she work with her window contractor. She said that since they would in all likelihood want to gain a foothold in the historic districts it was in their best interest to work with her.

Mr. Holmes and Ms. Harden discussed the examination of the houses of the same period and style for design precedence.

Ms. Wagner explained that her window contractors only work in vinyl windows.

Mr. Roberts pointed out that the window contractors obviously knew that the windows were unacceptable when they engaged in the contract if all they could execute were vinyl windows.

Ms. Wagner mentioned and held before the Board her window contract. The contract noted that historical approval would be required.

Ms. Coumanis recommended that Ms. Wagner contact an attorney. She noted that the window contractor had a previous history with the Board

Mr. Oswalt addressed his fellow Board members. He stated that two courses of action presented themselves. He stated that the Board could rule on or table the application.

Ms. Wagner addressed the Board. She informed that she was under monetary constraints.

Ms. Coumanis addressed a representative from Window World, the firm that Ms. Wagner had contracted to execute her windows. She asked that since they knew the process and had taken payment could they not work with the applicant.

The representative answered no. He said that the windows had already been constructed.

Ms. Wagner stated that her check had already been cashed. She said that it was cashed shortly after the application's second appearance before the Board.

No further Board discussion ensued.

Mr. Oswalt asked if there was anyone from the audience who wished to speak either for or against the application. Upon hearing no response, 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 impair the historic integrity of the district or the building and that a Certificate of Appropriateness not be issued.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

**Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 9/17/15**