ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
October 2nd, 2019 – 3:00 P.M.
Multi-Purpose Room, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Steve Stone called the meeting to order at 3:03 p.m. Paige Largue, Historic Development Staff, called the roll as follows:
   Members Absent: Abby Davis, Andre Rathle, Joseph Rodrigues, Jim Wagoner, Nick Holmes and David Barr.
   Staff Members Present: Bridget Daniel, Paige Largue, John Sledge, Marion McElroy and Flo Kessler.

2. Mr. Stone noted the minutes of the September 18th meeting will be reviewed at the October 16th meeting.

3. Ms. Largue explained a Commissioner of the MHDC had expressed concern staff was approving items not in their purview, specifically citing No. 6 of the Mid-Months as an example. She further explained the rear addition was small and located on the interior corner and within the resolution. No Board Members expressed concern or commented. Mr. Brown moved to approve the Mid-Months as written. The motion was seconded by Ms. Van Antwerp and the Mid-Months were approved unanimously.

MID-MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED.

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

3. 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.

4. 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.

5. 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.

6. 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.
7. **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.

**B. 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.  
   **APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

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

**D. OTHER BUSINESS**

1. Consolidated Review Committee (CRC)  
   Ms. Largue stated she had shared a link to the Downtown Development Form Based Code used by the CRC and noted while they are similar to requirements of the districts, there are some differences. Ms. Largue also explained the CRC reviews applications in the downtown loop and then ARB reviews the applications for work. Mr. Stone request staff give bullet points of the differences.  
2. Next meeting October 16th, 2019.  
3. Design Review Committee will be held October 3rd at 4:15. Ms. Largue noted the Board should only make comments that relate to the Guidelines and that any comments on aesthetics should be relayed as a suggestion after the Board has discussed the application or voted so that there is no confusion of the Board potentially being arbitrary.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

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 rafter, 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 trusses 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.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Douglas B. Kearley of DBK, Inc., architect, on behalf of Mr. and Mrs. Danner, owners, was present to discuss the application.
BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Stone welcomed the applicant and asked if he had any clarifications, comments or questions.
Mr. Kearley stated staff had addressed the application in full.

Mr. Kearley confirmed for Mr. Roberts the exposed truss system would be painted.
No further discussion from the Board ensued at that time.

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 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 property or neighborhood and a Certificate of Appropriateness be granted.

The motion received a second by Mr. Brown and was approved unanimously.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

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 is 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.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Trey Hart and Ms. Alice Warren of JESCO, Inc, and Mr. Zach Davis of Deas Millwork, representatives, were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Stone welcomed the applicant and asked if he had any clarifications, comments or questions. Mr. Trey Hart stated staff had addressed the application well. He explained the windows were deteriorated to the point of being a safety hazard and that they had examined each window carefully to see if it could be repaired. He stated the aluminum clad would be similar to what was approved in 2013 and meet wind loads.

Mr. Roberts asked the representatives where the locations of the single paned windows were being installed. The representatives explained the architect’s drawings were older and incorrect. Mr. Roberts stated the pane configuration should be replicated in dimension and profile. Mr. Hart explained the windows will match existing in configuration and dimension.

Mr. Stone noted the previous windows were approved above the third floor and the application proposed includes replacing both second and first story windows. He expressed concern for replacing windows on a lower floor.

Mr. Roberts stated the window designs on the drawing do not reflect the existing window designs and that the proposed windows should match the existing in dimension, profile, and configuration. He expressed that repairing the windows would not be a long term solution and aluminum clad would withstand the elements better. He stated he believed the first floor windows should be wood. He mentioned the Park Service has allowed for the replacement of wood windows for tax credit projects.

Ms. Harden stated there is new wood developed in the last few years that has better longevity. She explained the idea is to keep floors close to the public on street facing sides to relay the structure is historic.

Ms. Largue clarified while the Park Service has allowed for custom materials to replace wood windows it has been in certain and specific scenarios normally involving large amounts of window replacements for multi-level buildings. She also explained the Park Service is very strict and specific on what they allow. Ms. Largue continued by explaining the Board has approved upper level replacements before with custom products to match, but not the first floor. She warned against setting precedent and encouraged the Board to review the Guidelines in place.

Mr. Davis explained the history of the rehabilitation of the building, noting wood windows replaced original windows in 2005 and by 2013 the third floor and above were replaced with aluminum clad. Ms. Harden stated historic windows when repaired generally have a longer lifespan than new wood windows. Mr. Davis stated replacing the first floor windows with wood to match would be acceptable and noted the 2nd floor windows would match the existing exactly in all aspects except for material.

Mr. Stone and Ms. Largue discussed how to amend the application.
Mr. Hart confirmed for Ms. Harden all windows had been examined to see if they could be repaired and clarified the jams would also be replaced down to the masonry. Mr. Hart stated the current jams allows water to penetrate the building. Ms. Harden asked if the windows would be double paned. Mr. Hart replied the windows would be double paned and simulated divided lite. Ms. Harden noted there were no sections of the windows included in the drawing. Mr. Roberts noted aluminum clad replacements were allowed on the upper story of the Van Antwerp building. Mr. Stone noted he did not think the ballroom windows were considered second story.

No further discussion from the Board ensued at that time.

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 amended to include the windows on the first floor will be wood to match exactly, while the second story will be aluminum clad, double paned, simulated divided lite to match existing in dimension, profile, configuration.

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 property or neighborhood and a Certificate of Appropriateness be granted.

The motion received a second by Mr. Brown and was approved with two, Mr. Stone and Ms. Harden, in opposition.