A. CALL TO ORDER

1. Roll Call
2. Approval of Minutes from September 18th, 2019
3. Approval of Mid-Month COAs Granted by Staff

B. MID-MONTH APPROVALS

1. Applicant: Liberty Roofing Company Inc
   a. Property Address: 200 Marine Street
   b. Date of Approval: 09/05/2019

2. Applicant: Poeima LLC
   a. Property Address: 1166 Elmira Street
   b. Date of Approval: 09/18/2019
   c. Project: Repair and replace deteriorated wood including siding and balustrade to match existing in dimension, profile and material. Reroof with 5V crimp metal; and, repaint exterior neutral color scheme.

3. Applicant: Poeima LLC
   a. Property Address: 1168 Elmira Street
   b. Date of Approval: 09/18/2019
   c. Project: Repair and replace deteriorated wood including siding and balustrade to match existing in dimension, profile and material. Reroof with 5V crimp metal; and, repaint exterior neutral color scheme.

4. Applicant: Matthew Freeman
   a. Property Address: 118 Bush Avenue
   b. Date of Approval: 09/19/2019
   c. Project: Replace rotten wood and repaint similar color on house and garage to match existing in dimension, profile and material.

5. Applicant: Darrel J. Williams Associates
   a. Property Address: 1507 Government Street
   b. Date of Approval: 09/19/2019
   c. Project: Repair east elevation to match that of west elevation, with understanding the owner will reconstruct port cochere at later date or before selling property.

6. Applicant: Darrel J. Williams Associates
   a. Property Address: 51 S Julia Street
   b. Date of Approval: 09/19/2019
   c. Project: Construct small rear addition on second floor at southeast corner of residence not seen from public view. Roof with be architectural shingles, siding will be board and batten siding painted neutral to blend in with brick. Reuse six-over-six window on east elevation.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2019-40-CA: 20 S. Monterey Street
   a. Applicant: Mr. Douglas B. Kearley of DBK Inc. on behalf of Mr. and Mrs. Garin and Debbie Danner
   b. Project: Rear Porch Addition – Conduct in-kind repairs to existing porch deck and construct roof over existing porch deck.
2. 2019-41-CA: 26 N. Royal Street
   a. Applicant: Ms. Alice Warren of JESCO, Inc. on behalf of Retirement Systems of Alabama
   b. Project: Alteration of Fenestration: Remove existing wooden windows on second story and replace with custom aluminum clad windows.

D. OTHER BUSINESS
   1. Consolidated Review Committee (CRC)
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

STAFF REPORT

2019-40-CA: 20 S. Monterey Street
Applicant: Mr. Douglas B. Kearley of DBK Inc. on behalf of Mr. and Mrs. Garin and Debbie Danner
Received: 9/16/2019
Meeting: 10/2/2019

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Rear Porch Addition – Conduct in-kind repairs to existing porch deck and construct roof over existing porch deck

BUILDING HISTORY

This residence was constructed circa 1945 in a blend of the cottage revival and minimal traditional styles.

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 appeared before the Architectural Review Board according to the MHDC vertical files. A COA was issued on March 17, 2011 for the repainting and reroofing. The proposed scope of work includes repair of an existing deck and construction of a new roof over existing deck.

B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:

1. “Where repair is impossible, replace details and ornamentation accurately.”
2. “The roof of a new addition should be compatible with the existing historic building. The roof of a new addition should also promote the addition as subordinate in comparison to the historic building.”
3. “Design a roof of an addition to be compatible with the existing historic building.”
4. “Design a roof shape, pitch, material and level of complexity to be similar to those of the existing historic building.”
5. “Incorporate overhanging exposed rafters, soffits, cornices, fascias, frieze boards, moldings or other elements into an addition that are generally similar to those of the historic building.”
6. “Use a roofing material for an addition that matches or is compatible with the original historic building and the district.”
7. “Design roofs such that the addition remains subordinate to the existing historic buildings in the district.”
8. “Design a rear porch so that its height and slopes are compatible with the original historic structure.”
9. “Design the scale, proportion and character of a porch addition element, including columns, corner brackets, railings and pickets, to be compatible with the existing historic residential structure.”

10. “Match the foundation height of a porch addition to that of the existing historic structure.”

11. “Design a porch addition roofline to be compatible with the existing historic structure. However, a porch addition roofline need not match exactly that of the existing historic building. For example, a porch addition may have a shed roof.”

12. “Use materials for a porch addition that are appropriate to the building.”

13. “Do not use a contemporary deck railing for a porch addition placed at a location visible from the public street.”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted site plan):
   1. Work will be executed on the southeast corner of the building.
   2. Repair existing porch decking to match.
   3. Construct new roof over existing porch deck connecting it to existing house.
      a. A gable roof will extend from the existing house with a “cricket” roof connecting the new gable roof over the deck to an existing gable roof.
      b. Roof will be sheathed in shingles to match house.
      c. A vaulted ceiling with exposed trusts will be employed.
      d. Wooden columnar supports will support roof.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The application for review involves the following: repair and replacement of deteriorated elements on an existing porch deck, and new construction of a roof for aforementioned porch deck.

With regard to the in-kind repair and replacement of the existing features, the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state that historic stylistic and architectural details should be preserved, but note that when repair is impossible, replacements should match the existing (See B 1). The porch deck is not historic in nature, however all wood repair work would match the existing in profile, dimension, and material.

With regard to the alteration of an existing back porch, the Design Review Guidelines state that preserving a front porch is a high priority. The Guidelines go on to say that the preservation of rear or side porches is encouraged (See B-3.). The rear porch is not historic in nature. A new roof will extend over the existing porch deck and connect to the rear elevation of the house. Wooden columnar posts will support a shingled roof (See B-7) and a drop finial will mimic a front elevation porch element (see B-9).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-9), Staff does not believe this application will impair either the architectural or the historical character of the building or the district. Staff recommends approval of this application.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
STAFF REPORT

2019-41-CA: 26 N. Royal Street
Applicant: Ms. Alice Warren of JESCO, Inc. on behalf of Retirement Systems of Alabama
Received: 8/15/2019
Meeting: 9/18/2019

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street Commercial
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: T-6
Project: Alteration of Fenestration: Remove existing wooden windows on second story
and replace with custom aluminum clad windows.

BUILDING HISTORY

The existing Battle House Hotel was constructed in 1908 on the same site as the first Battle House Hotel
that burned in 1905. The original building was four-story brick building with two-story cast iron gallery
and constructed in 1852 with renovations at the turn of the century. After the fire, the owners contracted
Frank M. Andrews of New York City to design a new steel and concrete structure. The hotel has had
famous visitors and seen many owners and renovations throughout the years. The Retirement Systems of
Alabama began rehabilitation of the existing structure in 2003 after being out of use since 1974. The
Battle House Hotel is also a part of the Historic Hotels of America program administered by the
National Trust for Historic Preservation.

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 in 2013 according to the
MHDC vertical files. At that time wooden windows above the third story were replaced with
aluminum clad windows to match in dimension and profile. The proposed scope of work
includes removing existing wooden windows on the second story of a multi-story building
and replacing with custom aluminum clad windows to match in dimension, profile and
color.

B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
   1. “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.”
   2. “Significant features and stylistic elements should not be removed to the extent
      possible.”
3. “If disassembly is necessary for repair or restoration, use methods that minimize damage to original materials and facilitate reassembly.”
4. “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.”
5. The following is the preferred sequence of improvements: “preserve, repair, reconstruct, replace or compatible alteration.”
6. “For most historic resources, the front façade is the most important to preserve intact.
7. “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. Replace existing wooden windows on second story with aluminum clad windows.
   a. Aluminum clad windows will match the existing windows in dimension, profile, and exterior color.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the alteration of fenestration for building located at 26 N. Royal Street. The owner would like to replace wooden windows on the second floor with 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 are similar to the original (see B-9). 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).

The RSA Battle House is a commercial building downtown that was previously 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 Battle House 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 believes 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.