A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Steve Stone, called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. Christine Dawson, Historic Development Staff, called the roll as follows.

   **Members Present:** David Barr, Kim Harden, Andre Rathle, Craig Roberts, Steve Stone, and Jim Wagoner

   **Members Absent:** Abby Davis, Catarina Echols, Joseph Rodrigues, and Gypsie Van Antwerp

   **Staff Members Present:** Bridget Daniel and Christine Dawson

2. Mr. Roberts moved to approve the minutes from the April 15, 2020 meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wagoner and approved unanimously.

3. **Adoption of the Agenda**

   Mr. Wagoner moved that the Architectural Review Board find that all agenda items listed for the May 6, 2020 Architectural Review Board meeting be adopted as necessary for the performance of the ARB’s essential minimum functions. The motion was seconded by Mr. Roberts and approved unanimously.

4. Mr. Roberts moved to approve the Mid-Month COAs Granted by Staff. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wagoner and was approved unanimously.

B. MID-MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED

1. Applicant: **Dennis Langan**
   a. Property Address: 1412 Brown Street
   b. Date of Approval: 4/9/2020
   c. Project: Install 8' wood fence to replace chain-link fence at east and north property lines and enclosing courtyard on south side. Replace existing chain-link fence at west rear property line with 4' aluminum picket fence.

2. Applicant: **Turner-Wilson Fence Company**
   a. Property Address: 1122 Palmetto Street
   b. Date of Approval: 04/13/2020
   c. Project: Install 8' treated pine privacy fence across the back of property (north property line).

3. Applicant: **Turner-Wilson Fence Company**
   a. Property Address: 1124 Palmetto Street
   b. Date of Approval: 04/13/2020
   c. Project: Take down & replace 8' treated pine privacy fence on west, east, and north property lines.

4. Applicant: **Ed Bowron**
   a. Property Address: 1006 Church Street
   b. Date of Approval: 04/15/2020
   c. Project: Re-gravel driveway; repair concrete curbing and sidewalk.

5. Applicant: **Rellim Contracting LLC**
   a. Property Address: 211 Levert Avenue
   b. Date of Approval: 04/17/2020
   c. Project: Termite damage repairs. Window on stairs to be removed while repairs are performed on internal studs, then replaced.

6. Applicant: **Daniel Henderson**
   b. Property Address: 1017 Old Shell Road
   c. Date of Approval: 04/17/2020
   d. Project: Put in concrete apron, driveway.
7. **Applicant:** Allyn Irby  
   a. Property Address: 62 Houston Street  
   b. Date of Approval: 04/20/2020  
   c. Project: Repair rotten foundation sills, lapsiding to match original in material, proportion and design.

8. **Applicant:** All Weather Roofing & Construction LLC  
   a. Property Address: 1704 New Hamilton Street  
   b. Date of Approval: 04/20/2020  
   c. Project: Re-roof with CertainTeed architectural shingles in Landmark Pewter.

9. **Applicant:** Bessie Williams  
   a. Property Address: 364 Tuttle Avenue  
   b. Date of Approval: 04/23/2020  
   c. Project: Demolish rear addition per City order.

10. **Applicant:** Rata Investments LLC  
    a. Property Address: 755 Monroe Street  
    b. Date of Approval: 04/23/2020  
    c. Project: Erect one monument sign measuring 4'-6"x5'-6". Wood sign with painted lettering reading "Ice Box". Ground mounted flood lighting.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. **2020-25-CA:** 1 N. Royal Street  
   a. Applicant: Mr. Mark Fillers on behalf of Renasant Bank  
   b. Project: Modify pass-through window on east elevation to function as a casement window/door from the second floor to the gallery  
   **APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

2. **2020-26-CA:** 221 S. Dearborn Street  
   a. Applicant: Mr. Don Williams on behalf of Mr. Tony Jones  
   b. Project: New Construction: Garage/Guest House and extension of existing stuccoed wall along Canal Street service road (COA originally issued October 2009)  
   **APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

3. **2020-27-CA:** 1709 Hunter Avenue  
   a. Applicant: Mr. Josh Perry on behalf of Mr. Frank Vincent  
   b. Project: Reroof existing clay tile roof with composition shingle roof of similar Color  
   **WITHDRAWN. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

4. **2020-28-CA:** 52 S. Catherine Street  
   a. Applicant: Mr. Douglas Kearley, Architect, on behalf of Gene and Dian Beitel  
   b. Project: New Construction: Garage/Workshop  
   **APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

D. OTHER BUSINESS

The next ARB meeting is scheduled for May 20, 2020.

Public comment regarding items on this agenda will be accepted via e-mail (christine.dawson@cityofmobile.org) or USPS (Mobile Historic Development Commission, P.O. Box 1827, Mobile, AL 36633) until 5PM on Tuesday, May 5, 2020.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2020-25-CA: 1 N. Royal Street
Applicant: Mark Fillers of Renasant Bank on behalf of One North Royal, LLC
Received: 4/2/2020
Meeting: 5/6/2020

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street Commercial
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: T5.2
Project: Modify pass-through window on east elevation balcony to function as a casement window/door

BUILDING HISTORY

The Burke Building was constructed in 1880 as a three-story brick commercial building of Italianate design with an elaborate, two-story, cast iron gallery. The building was significantly altered in 1938, including the removal of the third floor (possibly due to damage sustained in a hurricane), the cast iron gallery, and the first-floor storefronts. The exterior was stuccoed, and the second story was scored to emulate stone. Alterations made in the 1980s resulted in the building’s general current appearance, including the addition of a two-story, cast iron gallery.

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 (ARB) in November 2019, when approval was granted for new paint; the installation of an ATM and canopy; installation of a dropbox; replacement of a window with a door, and the installation signage. Approval in concept was granted to the conversion of an existing window to a door. Full approval of the window-to-door conversion was granted in January 2020. In February of 2019, the ARB granted approval for the removal of the westernmost window on the south elevation and installation of a door.

B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts (Guidelines), in pertinent part, state the following.
   1. “Distinctive stylistic features or examples of skilled craftsmanship which characterize a building, structure or site should be treated with sensitivity with particular emphasis on preservation of the features.” (5.0)
   2. “Maintain significant historic façades in their original form.
      • Maintain historic façade elements.
• Pay special attention to maintaining the historic appearance of building walls of corner buildings.” (5.3)

3. “Preserve the functional historic and decorative features of a historic window.
• 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.
• Preserve historic window features, including the frame, sash, muntins, mullions, glazing, sills, heads, jambs, moldings, operation, and groupings of windows.” (5.20)

C. Scope of Work:
   1. Modify the existing double-hung window at the center of the east second floor elevation to function as a casement window/door.
      a. The work would involve the same procedure as used for the window likewise converted on the south elevation, wherein the two sashes were joined into one piece.
      b. Period-appropriate, heavy-duty hinges would be employed to facilitate the swinging motion of the window/door.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The subject property, 1 N. Royal, is located within the Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District. The application involves alteration of fenestration. The application has been approved by the Consolidated Review Committee (CRC) which reviews work in the Downtown Development District (DDD). The application also has been given approval by the Mobile Historic Development Commission, which holds a façade easement on the property. Their letter of approval is forthcoming.

With the loss of the third floor and alteration of the storefront openings on the first floor, the second story fenestration retains the only original windows, window arrangement, and window trim (hoods). The Guidelines state, “Distinctive stylistic features or examples of skilled craftsmanship which characterize a building, structure or site should be treated with sensitivity with particular emphasis on preservation of the features.” (5.0) The Guidelines further direct that significant façade elements and the appearance of corner buildings should be maintained (5.3). Regarding windows in particular, their functional and decorative features should be preserved, as well as their frames, sashes, muntins, mullions, glazing, sills, heads, jambs, moldings, and operation. (5.20)

The proposed window-to-door conversion would preserve the existing, distinctive arched window, which is part of the character-defining fenestration of the subject building; the frame, sashes, muntins, glazing, sill, head, and jambs will be maintained, in accordance with the Guidelines. Because the lower sash of the window is almost as tall as a person, the window previously has been used to access the gallery surrounding the building. The conversion of the window to open as a casement rather than as a sash would alter the specific way the window opens, but it would maintain the existing functions of the window, i.e., allowing light into the building, allowing fresh air into the building, and allowing egress from the building proper to the gallery. Therefore, the functional features of the window also would be preserved, in accordance with the Guidelines.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on Section B above, Staff believes the conversion of the existing double-hung window to a casement window/door would not impair the architectural or historical character of the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of the application.
PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Fillers and Ms. Heather Beach, the applicant’s representatives, were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with public testimony.

The Board had no questions. Mr. Stone stated that he was in favor of the proposal because the window on the Dauphin Street side turned out so well.

No comments were received from the public prior to the meeting. Mr. Stone closed the period of public comment.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Roberts moved that, based on the evidence presented in the application, the Board finds the facts in the Staff’s report, as written.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Wagoner and approved unanimously.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Roberts moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, the proposed conversion of the subject window to a door would not impair the architectural character of the building or the surrounding district and a Certificate of Appropriateness be granted.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Harden and was approved unanimously.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2020-26-CA: 221 S. Dearborn Street
Applicant: Mr. Don Williams on behalf of Mr. Tony Jones
Received: 4/6/2020
Meeting: 5/6/2020

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Construct a garage/guest house at the southeast corner of the property and extend existing stuccoed wall 22’ along Canal Street service road (COA originally issued October 2009)

BUILDING HISTORY

The house on the property was constructed in 1998.

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 (ARB) in October 2009, when approval was granted for the same application. Due to litigation between the City of Mobile and the property owner, construction of the garage/guest house could not commence during the three-year period during which Certificates of Appropriateness may be re-issued by Staff. Prior to 2009, the ARB approved construction of the 8’ stuccoed wall that encloses all but the southern perimeter of the lot.

B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts (Guidelines), in pertinent part, state the following.

1. “Design an accessory structure to be subordinate in scale to that of the primary structure.
   - If a proposed accessory structure is larger than the size of typical historic accessory structures in the district, break up the mass of the larger structure into smaller modules to reflect traditional accessory structures.” (9.1)

2. “Locate a new accessory structure in line with other visible accessory structures in the district…traditionally located at the rear of the lot.”
   - ”Materials that are compatible with the historic district in scale and character are acceptable.” These often include wood frame, masonry, and cement-based fiber siding.
   - “Materials that are not compatible with the historic district in scale and character are unacceptable.” The materials often include metal, plastic, and fiberglass. (9.2)

3. “Design a wall to be compatible with the architectural style of the house and existing walls in the district.
   - When building a solid wall, use a finish and material that is similar in texture, mass, and
durability to historic walls in the neighborhood.”

- Materials that have a similar character, durability, and finish to those of walls in the district are acceptable. Those often include brick, stone, and stucco over masonry.
- Materials that do not have a similar character, durability, and finish to those of historic walls in the district are unacceptable and include unstuccoed concrete block. (10.3)

4. “Design a fence [wall] located behind the front building plane to not exceed 72” in height. If the subject property abuts a multi-family residential or commercial property, a fence [wall] of up to 96” will be considered.” (10.2)

C. Scope of Work (per submitted application and plans)

1. Construct a one and one-half story garage/guest house to be accessed from the Canal Street service road.
   a. The garage would consist of a 25’-10” square western block and a 13’x20’-5” eastern block. The western block would be one and one-half stories under a side-gabled roof with raked parapet and would measure approximately 27’ tall. The eastern block would be set back approximately 3’-7” from the southern wall plane (façade) of the western block and consist of one story under a shed roof obscured by a parapet wall on the south elevation; the eastern block would measure approximately 15’ in height.
   b. The brick wall veneer and roofing of the garage would match the existing house.
   c. The South elevation (façade) would appear as follows.
      1) The first floor would be composed of three single vehicle garage doors, two in the western block and one in the eastern block. The overhead garage doors would have vertical, applied, tongue-and-groove facing, and would be located beneath a soldier row brick header.
      2) A single gabled wall dormer would be centered over each of the garage doors in the western block. The windows would be wood two-over-two sashes to match the house.
   d. The East elevation would appear as follows.
      1) A wood, 6-light door with soldier brick header would be located at the south end of the elevation.
      2) The shed-roofed parking area would be open on the east side, making visible two wood, six-light doors beneath soldier brick headers. A brick column would be located at the center of the open parking area to support the roof.
      3) A 20”x36” louvered wood vent would be located near the apex of the parapet wall.
   e. The North (rear) elevation would appear as follows.
      1) A single vehicle overhead garage door with vertical, applied, tongue-and-groove facing would be located at the east end of the elevation. The area between the shed roof and the brick wall surrounding the garage door would be open.
      2) The wall of the western block would be blank except for a single wood, six-light door beneath a soldier brick header at the west end of the elevation.
      3) Four skylights would be located in the northern slope of the roof.
   f. The West elevation of the garage would appear as follows.
      1) A wood, two-panel, louvered door would be located at the center of the first floor.
      2) A blind window in basketweave pattern beneath a brick soldier header would be located immediately above the door.
      3) A louvered vent matching the one in the east elevation would be located near the apex of the parapet wall.

2. Pave a driveway/motorcourt to give access from the Canal Street service road to the garage.
3. Extend the existing 8’ stucco-faced concrete block wall 22’ along the Canal Street service road to enclose the backyard.
   a. A single iron gate would be located in the angle between the southwest corner of the proposed garage and the extended wall.
STAFF ANALYSIS

The subject property, 221 S. Dearborn Street, is located within the Church Street East Historic District. The application involves the construction of a new garage/guest house and the extension of an existing stucco-faced concrete block wall. This application was approved by the ARB in 2009; however, because construction did not commence within three years of the COA’s issuance, the application must be reviewed again.

The Guidelines state that accessory structures should be subordinate in appearance to the primary structure on a property. The footprint of the house is approximately 56’-4”x32’-10”, and the house is approximately 35’ tall. In comparison, the footprint of the proposed garage/guest house would be approximately 39’x30’-6”, and it would stand approximately 27’ at its highest point. Therefore, the proposed garage/guest house would be smaller than the primary structure, though perhaps not as subordinately sized as garages and carriage houses traditionally found in Church Street East. The proposed garage would be significantly larger than the size of typical historic accessory structures in the district; however, the design follows the directive of the Guidelines to “break up the mass of the larger structure into smaller modules to reflect traditional accessory structures.” The three stalls for parking are broken up with one stall located in a recessed, one-story, shed-roofed block to the east of the one and one-half story two-car parking block. (B.1)

The proposed garage/guest house would be located at the rear of the subject lot, in accordance with the Guidelines, and the exterior materials would match those of the existing house and would be compatible with those existing in the district. (B.2)

The proposed 8’ (96”) tall wall extension is not in conformance with the Guidelines, which state that fences [walls] should not exceed 72” in height unless the property abuts a multi-family or commercial property. (B.4) The wall extension would abut the Canal Street service road. Although single family residences are located across Canal Street from the subject property, the intervening roadway consists of seven lanes on Canal Street (three lanes each direction, plus turn lane) and two lanes on the Canal Street service road. This virtual highway is not in keeping with the residential character of the district.

During the hearing at which this application was initially entertained (October 2009), the applicant agreed to face the proposed wall extension with smooth stucco and crown the wall with a cap, as indicated in the Scope of Work for the COA issued in 2005 for the construction of the wall. The COA notes that 16” square columns of the wall are to be topped with a pre-cast pyramidal cap, and the walls will have a 3” flap cap with lip.

The submitted design for the gate at the junction of the wall extension and the southwest corner of the proposed garage is relatively simple (thin iron bars with knotted trim) and would be in keeping with the surrounding district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on Section B above, Staff believes the construction of the proposed garage/guest house and extension of the existing wall would not impair the architectural or historical character of the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with public testimony.
Ms. Harden inquired whether the current proposal included the treatments for the stucco-clad wall that had been agreed upon previously by the ARB and the applicant. Mr. Williams stated that it does.

No comments were received from the public prior to the meeting. Mr. Stone closed the period of public comment.

**FINDING OF FACT**

Mr. Roberts moved that, based on the evidence presented in the application, the Board finds the facts in the Staff’s report, as written.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Harden and approved unanimously.

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Mr. Roberts moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, the proposed garage/guest house and wall extension with gate would not impair the architectural character the surrounding district and a Certificate of Appropriateness be granted.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Harden and was approved unanimously.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2020-27-CA: 1709 Hunter Avenue
Applicant: Mr. Josh Perry on behalf of Mr. Frank Vincent
Received: 4/6/2020
Meeting: 5/6/2020

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Re-roof existing clay tile roof with composition shingle roofing of a similar color

BUILDING HISTORY

The small Tudor style house was constructed c. 1930. The side-gabled, tile-roofed, brick-veneered structure has two smaller, front-facing gables, one containing a round-headed door and the other containing a round-headed casement window.

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 not previously appeared before the Architectural Review Board (ARB).

B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts (Guidelines), in pertinent part, state the following.
   1. “Historic materials are significant and shall not be removed.
   2. 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.” (5.0)
   3. “Repair and maintain original roof materials rather than replace them, whenever possible.
      • Patch and replace damaged areas of an existing roof.” (5.12)
   4. “Use new roof materials that convey a scale and texture similar to those used traditionally.
      • Use materials that are consistent with the architectural style of the structure.
      • Use materials with a similar texture, pattern, and finish to the original.”
   5. Regarding tile roofs, the Guidelines specifically state the following.
      • “Use an original replacement material if possible.
      • Use cement tiles when replacing clay tiles on larger buildings if clay is not available.
         If repairing specialty roof materials such as glazed clay tile or barrel tile, use a matching replacement material.” (5.12)
C. Scope of Work
   1. Remove existing clay tile roofing.
   2. Reroof with composition shingles of a similar color.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The subject property, 1709 Hunter Avenue, is a contributing property within the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The application involves replacement of a character-defining roofing material with a non-historic material.

The general guidance of the Guidelines is that significant historic materials should not be removed, but if replacement is necessary, the replacement material should match the original being replaced. (B.1, B.2) More specifically, the Guidelines direct that new roofing material should “convey a scale and texture similar to those used traditionally… Use materials with a similar texture, pattern, and finish to the original.” (B.4) Regarding historic tile roofs, the Guidelines very clearly state that an original replacement material should be used if possible. (B.5)

The proposed composition shingle replacement roofing material is not in conformance with the Guidelines. The existing tile roofing is a significant historic material which, per the Guidelines, should be repaired rather than replaced if possible. The applicant has not offered any evidence that damaged or deteriorated portions of the roof cannot be repaired or replaced in-kind. The proposed material is not similar to the original tile roofing material in texture, pattern, and finish. (B.4) The replacement of the existing, character-defining clay tile roofing with composition shingles would permanently alter the historic appearance of this property.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on Section B above, Staff believes the replacement of the existing tile roofing with composition shingles would impair the architectural or historical character of the subject property and the surrounding district. Staff recommends denial of the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Josh Perry, the applicant’s representative, was present to discuss the application. Mr. Perry stated that 25% of the tiles are broken or missing. In addition, the decking underneath is rotted, and the interior of the house is experiencing leaks. Replacement of the roofing with tiles would be quite expensive.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with public testimony.

Mr. Stone asked the applicant if the proposed composition shingle would look like an asphalt shingle, versus one that would more closely resemble the existing tile. Mr. Perry stated that the proposed roofing is a designer architectural shingle with a thicker appearance (CertainTeed Landmark Pro).

Mr. Roberts sympathized with the applicant regarding the expense of tile roofing versus shingle roofing. He noted that shingles are available on the market that appear more like tiles than most architectural shingles. For instance, there is galvanized metal roofing manufactured in the shape of tiles such as those on the subject roof. A surface is sprayed on to them that mimics the look of tiles. These roofs also are not inexpensive but they are not as expensive as tiles. Mr. Roberts suggested that the applicant get quotes for tiles and for the galvanized metal type roofing just mentioned. This would prevent denial today and permit the consideration of another option.

Mr. Stone noted that the ARB cannot take financial hardship into consideration. However, the ARB previously has allowed replacement of roofs with non-original materials.
Ms. Harden stated that there are companies that could provide replacement tiles for the 25% that are damaged or missing, and replacement of the entire roof is not necessary.

Mr. Perry stated that even replacing only the 25% that are missing or broken would be prohibitively expensive due to installation costs. Further, he was not certain he could obtain matching tiles. He had been in touch with a company in Chicago.

Mr. Roberts recommended to the applicant that he withdraw the application today and return with some additional information for the ARB to consider.

The applicant agreed to withdraw the application and return with additional information.

No comments were received from the public prior to the meeting. Mr. Stone closed the period of public comment.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2020-28-CA:  52 S. Catherine Street
Applicant:  Mr. Douglas Kearley, Architect, on behalf of Gene and Dian Beitel
Received:  4/17/2020
Meeting:  5/6/2020

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District:  Old Dauphin Way
Classification:  Conditionally Contributing
Zoning:  R-1
Project:  New Construction: Garage/Workshop

BUILDING HISTORY

The house on the property is a front-gabled Craftsman style bungalow constructed c. 1925. The smaller offset gable at the south end of the façade originally sheltered a porch, which was closed at some point in its history. Recent rehabilitation of the house has restored the open porch.

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 appeared previously before the Architectural Review Board (ARB) in 2017. At that time, a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) was granted for work including a rear addition containing a master bedroom and a porch.

B.  The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts (Guidelines), in pertinent part, state the following.
   1. “Design an accessory structure to be subordinate in scale to that of the primary structure.
      • If a proposed accessory structure is larger than the size of typical historic accessory structures in the district, break up the mass of the larger structure into smaller modules to reflect traditional accessory structures.” (9.1)
   2. “Locate a new accessory structure in line with other visible accessory structures in the district…traditionally located at the rear of the lot.”
      • ”Materials that are compatible with the historic district in scale and character are acceptable.” These often include wood frame, masonry, and cement-based fiber siding.
      • “Materials that are not compatible with the historic district in scale and character are unacceptable.” The materials often include metal, plastic, and fiberglass. (9.2)

C.  Scope of Work
   1. Construct new garage/workshop at the southwest corner of the property.
      a. The footprint of the structure would measure 34’-0”x22’-0” and would stand approximately 24’-4” high at one and one-half stories. The building would be clad in 5” smooth-faced Hardie board siding.
b. The long sides of the building would face east and west.
c. The structure would have a side-gabled roof with a combination shed and gabled dormer on the east elevation. The roof would be clad in fiberglass asphalt shingles.
d. The East elevation (façade) of the building would appear as follows.
   1) A 16’x8’ sectional garage door (2 cars wide) with an incorporated multi-light transom would be located at the south end, allowing access from the existing driveway. The garage door and a pair of two-by-two clad wood awning windows toward the north end of the ground level would be sheltered by a 4’ deep canopy roof with exposed rafters supported by knee brackets.
   2) The upper half story would be lit by a pair of two-by-two clad wood awning windows on either side of the central gable. A set of three two-over-two windows would be located in the gable.
   3) Rafter tails would be visible beneath the eaves of the main side-gabled roof and the shed dormer.
e. The North elevation would appear as follows.
   1) A single two-panel hollow metal door beneath a two-light transom would be located at the east end of the elevation. The door would be sheltered by a 2’-0”x2’-10” wood awning supported by wood knee brackets.
   2) A single two-over-two window would be located near the apex of the gable.
f. The West elevation (rear) would be devoid of fenestration. Rafter tails would be visible under the eave.
g. A single two-over-two window would be located near the apex of the gable on the south elevation.

2. A new driveway with turnaround area would be poured at the entrance to the garage/workshop building.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The subject property, 52 S. Catherine Street, is located within the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The application involves the construction of a new garage/workshop to be located at the southwest corner of the property.

The Guidelines state that accessory structures should be subordinate in appearance to the primary structure on a property. The footprint of the existing house is approximately 46’ x 62’, and the house is approximately 21’ tall. In comparison, the proposed garage/workshop footprint would be approximately 34’ x 22”, and it would stand approximately 24’ at its highest point. Therefore, the proposed garage/workshop would have a smaller footprint than the primary structure, but it would be as tall as or slightly taller than the existing house. The proposed garage/workshop would not be significantly larger than the size of typical historic accessory structures in the district, thereby being in conformance with the Guidelines. (B.1)

The proposed garage/guest house would be located at the rear of the subject lot, in accordance with the Guidelines, and the exterior materials would be compatible with those of the existing house and the surrounding district. (B.2)

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on Section B above, Staff believes the construction of the proposed garage/workshop would not impair the architectural or historical character of the subject property and the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of the application.
PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Kearley, the applicant’s architect, was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with public testimony.

The Board had no questions or comments.

No comments were received from the public prior to the meeting. Mr. Stone closed the period of public comment.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Roberts moved that, based on the evidence presented in the application, the Board finds the facts in the Staff’s report, as written.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Wagoner and approved unanimously.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Roberts moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, the proposed garage/workshop would not impair the architectural character of the surrounding district and a Certificate of Appropriateness be granted.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Wagoner and was approved unanimously.