A. CALL TO ORDER
1. The Chair, Steve Stone, called the meeting to order subsequently after the regularly scheduled meeting. Paige Largue, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
   Members Absent: Abby Davis, Andre Rathle, Nick Holmes, and David Barr.
   Staff Members Present: John Sledge, Bridget Daniel, Paige Largue, Flo Kessler and Marion McElroy.

B. APPLICATIONS
1. 2019-25-CA: 169 Dauphin Street
   Applicant: Davis McPhillips of Dale Incorporated on behalf of Landmark Square, LLC
   Project: Fenestration Related: Replace existing wooden windows to custom aluminum clad windows.

C. OTHER BUSINESS
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2019-25-CA: 169 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Davis McPhillips of Dale Incorporated on behalf of Landmark Square, LLC
Received: 6/24/19
Meeting: 6/26/19

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: T5.2
Project: Fenestration Related: Replace existing wooden windows to custom aluminum clad windows.

BUILDING HISTORY

The Guesnard/ Spira and Pincus Buildings was listed as a contributing building in 1979 on the National Register of Historic Places. 169 Dauphin Street was constructed circa 1879 and 171 Dauphin Street was constructed circa 1899. Originally the buildings existed separately. The buildings have been attributed to Rudolph Benz, although in the 1912 Trade Annual of the Mobile Press Register, Hutchisson and Denham listed the building at 169 Dauphin Street as one of their designs. A historic rehabilitation tax credit project was executed in 1988.

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 in 2003 according to the MHDC vertical files. At that time a request to rehabilitate the building was granted. The proposed scope of work includes altering fenestration from wood to aluminum clad.
B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
   1. Chapter 4, Overarching Preservation Principles: “Upgrade existing materials using recognized preservation methods whenever possible.”
   2. “If replacement of a historic element is required, replace the historic element in kind, or with a product that is similar in visual character and durability to the original.”
   3. “Significant features and stylistic elements should not be removed to the extent possible.”
   4. “If disassembly is necessary for repair or restoration, use methods that minimize damage to original materials and facilitate reassembly.”
   5. “If replacement of a historic element is required, replace the historic element in kind, or with a product that is similar in visual character and durability to the original.”
   6. The following is the preferred sequence of improvements: “preserve, repair, reconstruct, replace or compatible alteration.”
7. “For most historic resources, the front façade is the most important to preserve intact. Alterations are rarely appropriate. Many side walls are also important to preserve where they are highly visible from public streets. By contrast, portions of a side wall that are not as visible may be less sensitive to change.”

8. “Removing original material diminishes the integrity of a historic property by reducing the percentage of building fabric that remains from the period of historic significance. Retaining the original material is always preferred. If this is not feasible, alternative materials may be considered. When used, an alternative material should convey the character, including detail and finish, of the original to the greatest extent feasible.”

9. Chapter 5, Design Guidelines Applicable to All Historic Properties: “Deteriorated architectural features shall be repaired rather than replaced, wherever possible. In the event replacement is necessary, the new material should match the material being replaced in physical character and durability. Composition, design, color, texture, and other visual qualities should appear similar to the original material. Repair or replacement of missing architectural features should be based on accurate duplications of features, substantiated by historic, physical or pictorial evidence.”

10. “The type, size, framing, and dividing lights of windows, as well as their location and configuration (rhythm), help establish the historic character of a building. Original window components should be retained to the extent possible. The character-defining features of a window should be preserved. Historic windows can be repaired through re-glazing and patching and splicing wood elements such as muntins, frame sill and casing. Repair and weatherization is generally more energy efficient and less expensive than replacement. Windows should be in character with the historic building.”

11. “For most contributing properties in historic districts, the windows that are on the front elevation and those on the sidewalls that are visible from the street will be the most important to preserve. Windows in other locations that have distinctive designs and that represent fine craftsmanship may also be important to preserve.”

12. “Where historic (wooden or metal) windows are intact and in repairable condition, retain and repair them to match the existing as per location, light configuration, detail and material.”

13. “Preserve historic window features, including the frame, sash, muntins, mullions, glazing, sills, heads, jambs, moldings, operation, and groupings of windows.”

14. “Repair, rather than replace, frames and sashes, wherever possible.”

15. “When historic windows are not in a repairable condition, match the replacement window design to the original.”

16. “In instances where there is a request to replace a building’s windows, the new windows shall match the existing as per location, framing, and light configuration.”

17. “A new window shall be installed in such a manner as to fit within the original window opening and match in depth and filling of the reveal. A reveal is the part of the side of a window opening that is between the outer surface of the wall and the window.”

18. “A doubled-paned or clad wood window may be considered as a replacement alternative only if the replacement matches the configuration, dimensions, and profiles of original windows.”

19. “For increased efficiency, storm windows can be installed. A storm window shall fit within the window reveal and avoid damaging window casings. Operable storm windows are encouraged.”


21. Chapter 7, Commercial Guidelines: “The placement, orientation and size of windows both on the ground floor and the upper floor significantly impact the appearance of the building and the streetscape. Windows in historic commercial buildings should be preserved.”

22. “Maintain the original space patterns and location of windows. Most display windows have a bulkhead below and a transom above.”

23. “Preserve the size and shape of an upper story window.”
24. “If required, replace original historic windows to be compatible with the windows on the original historic building.”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted site plan):

1. Remove existed wood windows and replace with aluminum clad windows.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the alteration of fenestration for buildings located at 169-171 Dauphin Street. The windows in poor condition became a life safety concern on Friday, June 21, 2019. The owner would like to replace wooden windows to aluminum clad windows that would match in dimension and profile.

This application calls for the alteration of fenestration. With regard to the windows, replacements will match the existing components as per location, light configuration, and detail (See B-9). In keeping with the Guidelines the proposed materials of aluminum clad in a matching light pattern is similar to the original (see B-9). Based on the MHDC vertical files work executed circa 1988 on the windows was limited to repair. The Design Review Guidelines state where historic windows are intact they should be repaired, rather than replaced (See B-14). Where windows are not in repairable condition replacements may be employed to match in dimension, profile, and material. However, aluminum clad or double paned wood can be considered if it appears similar to the original in texture, profile, dimension, finish and configuration (see B-18). Based on Certificate of Appropriateness issued, the number of historic windows intact are unknown.

The RSA Battlehouse is an example of a commercial building downtown that was granted approval for replacement of wooden windows to aluminum clad. In 2002, work was approved to rehabilitate the existing windows or match in dimension, profile and material. In 2013, approval was granted for the RSA Battlehouse to remove wooden windows located above the second floor and replace with aluminum clad windows. The clad windows maintained the light configuration, moldings and casings.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-21) and B (1-24), Staff does believe replacing all windows will impair either the architectural or the historical character of the properties or district. Staff recommends a two-fold approach. Staff recommends replacing the windows that are irreparable with either single or double paned wood or aluminum clad to match in dimension or profile. Staff recommends repairing windows that are still in fair condition.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Davis McPhillips, applicant’s representative, was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Stone welcomed the applicant’s representative and asked if he had any clarifications, comments or questions. Mr. McPhillips explained he was at the meeting on behalf of the owner, Mr. Richard Inge.

Mr. McPhillips confirmed that on the two story portion of the building, Guesnard Building, the second floor windows had a muntin only on the interior. Mr. Roberts stated muntins would be aesthetically
pleasing on the windows. Mr. McPhillips replied the windows could be one-over-one in configuration or with muntins.

Mr. Stone stated the Board does not normally consider the whole replacement on windows and he was concerned to replace all 57 windows with aluminum clad, when only one window is broken. Mr. Roberts questioned if the wooden windows in situ were the original windows. Ms. Harden requested historic photographs which staff then provided to the Board and representative. Mr. Stone commented if the windows were previously replaced they were done so to meet the Secretary of Interior’s Standards and tax credit requirements.

Mr. Roberts expressed the windows on the Guesnard building has been replaced if muntins were only on the interior. Mr. McPhillips stated several windows had been replaced. He stated his of water seeping in, energy inefficiency, and some window being replaced with insulated glass. Mr. Roberts stated newer wood windows to not hold up to the elements as well as older wood windows and that the aluminum clad windows should be considered. Ms. Harden explained the proposed specifications call for insulated glass, but the Board was not sure what windows were currently in place that already had insulated glass. Ms. Harden then requested more details, including a profile of the window to consider approval. She then noted the historic images of the Guesnard Building showed a two-over-two configuration.

Mr. Rodrigues asked the applicant to further explain the specifications of the proposed aluminum clad replacement windows. Mr. McPhillips explained the new clad windows would match the brick mold, casing, and the simulated divided lite would be similar to the existing windows.

Ms. Harden explained the Guidelines typically state an original wooden window be replaced to match in dimension, profile and material. She then requested the Guesnard Building photos be replaced to match the original configuration, dimension, and profile with a vertical muntin. Mr. McPhillips explained the simulated divided lite will mirror the true divided lite and the spacer in between the glass would be black. Mr. McPhillips then confirmed for Ms. Harden that the new windows would be double hung with a key to allow for it to open.

Ms. Harden expressed her concern there were no more details on the drawings. The Board then discussed the life safety matter and questioned if a decision should be made immediately. Mr. McPhillips explained the owners were in the process of getting quotes to replace the windows when a sash fell out of the Guesnard Building onto Dauphin Street. Mr. Roberts suggested placing scaffolding around the building or covering the windows that were in danger of falling, if any. Mr. Rodrigues asked if the windows had been inspected by the City. Ms. Largue stated she was not aware any inspections had taken place.

Mr. Stone suggested holding over the application with the applicant’s representative’s permission until July 17th and requested more information including a sample of the window. Ms. Harden requested a mock-up showing the muntin and window profile.

No further discussion from the Board ensued.

Mr. Stone opened the application to public comment. With no one to speak either for or against the application, Mr. Stone 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 by Mr. Rodrigues and was unanimously approved.
DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the facts as approved by the Board, the application be held over so the applicant can provide a mock-up with more detail, a sample, and assessment of the window deterioration. Mr. Roberts also noted the building windows should be secured where necessary to prevent any safety issues.

The motion received a second by Mr. Rodrigues and was approved unanimously.