ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
June 5th 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 3:00 p.m. Paige Largue, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
   
   Members Present: Steve Stone, Catarina Echols, Abby Davis, David Barr and Craig Roberts.
   
   
   Staff Members Present: John Sledge, Bridget Daniel, Paige Largue, Marion McElroy.

2. Mr. Barr moved to approve the minutes. Mrs. Echols seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

3. Mr. Roberts moved to approve the May 1st, 2019 Mid-Months as written. Mr. Barr seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

B. MID-MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED.

1. Applicant: Brian Dykes
   a. Property Address: 66 S. Ann Street
   b. Date of Approval: 4/25/2019
   c. Project: Repair/replace rotten siding to match original in material, profile and dimension; repaint to match existing; replace non-historic decking with more appropriate tongue and groove wood decking, paint deck to match existing; pave existing graveled parking area at rear; remove noncompliant fence on property, erect six foot wooden privacy fence around perimeter, with metal gate at Brown Street parking entrance.

2. Applicant: Via Community Center
   a. Property Address: 1717 Dauphin Street
   b. Date of Approval: 4/26/2019
   c. Project: Attach one (1) wall plaque at rear of building, and install one (1) monument sign.

3. Applicant: Diane Nametz
   a. Property Address: 4 Straight Street
   b. Date of Approval: 4/26/2019
   c. Project: Jack and level house. Replace siding as necessary, and paint to match. Restore 3/1 windows to fit original opening, any new windows to be of same material, dimension and profile as original. Replace rear door with wooden french doors. Replace front door with solid wood door. Paint wrought iron railings on porch. Reroof with architectural asphalt shingles.

4. Applicant: Jerry Graham Roofing
   a. Property Address: 1360 Dauphin Street
   b. Date of Approval: 4/29/2019
   c. Project: Reroof with architectural shingle sin charcoal gray.

5. Applicant: Louis Herman
   a. Property Address: 1111 Savannah Street
   b. Date of Approval: 4/30/2019
   c. Project: Repair rotten soffit, fascia, and rearrange loose roofing tiles to secure.
6. **Applicant:** New Hand Signs on behalf of Noble South  
   a. Property Address: 203 Dauphin Street  
   b. Date of Approval: 4/30/2019  
   c. Project: Install 3'x2' painted wood and metal hanging blade sign.

7. **Applicant:** Michael Burkhhead on behalf of KGPCo  
   a. Property Address: 1509 Government Street  
   b. Date of Approval: 4/30/2019  
   c. Project: Replace existing flag pole and cables. Cables will not be seen.

8. **Applicant:** Historic Mobile  
   a. Property Address: 300 Oakleigh Place  
   b. Date of Approval: 5/1/2019  
   c. Project: Repair wooden panels under two windows on east facade, and two windows on south facade; repair rot at base of four columns on east facade; paint trim white. All materials to match original in profile and dimension.

9. **Applicant:** David and Autumn Turner  
   a. Property Address: 19 N. Ann Street  
   b. Date of Approval: 5/1/2019  
   c. Project: Reroof charcoal black.

10. **Applicant:** Cross Property Resource, LLC  
    a. Property Address: 311 Charles Street  
    b. Date of Approval: 5/1/2019  
    c. Project: Replace decking as necessary, reroof slate gray.

11. **Applicant:** John Turner  
    a. Property Address: 1624 Spring Hill Avenue  
    b. Date of Approval: 5/1/2019  
    c. Project: Install 8 foot fence and 4 foot fence on the west and south property lines to match existing fence on the north property line. Property abuts commercial property. Landscape front of house.

12. **Applicant:** New Hand Signs  
    a. Property Address: 5 N. Jackson Street  
    b. Date of Approval: 5/1/2019  
    c. Project: Install one hanging blade sign constructed of painted wood for a total of 11 square feet each side.

13. **Applicant:** John Turner Jr.  
    a. Property Address: 302 S. Ann Street 1-4  
    b. Date of Approval: 5/1/2019  
    c. Project: Install 8 foot fence and 4 foot fence on the west and south property lines to match existing fence on the north property line. Landscape front of house. This is a multi-family property with four units.

14. **Applicant:** Jason Cosper  
    a. Property Address: 251 Tuttle Avenue  
    b. Date of Approval: 5/2/2019  
    c. Project: Erect six foot privacy fence.

15. **Applicant:** Bailey Dumont  
    a. Property Address: 162 Roberts Street  
    b. Date of Approval: 5/2/2019  
    c. Project: This COA replaces that dated 11/17/10. Replace the white steel casement windows with white aluminum sash windows as per the submitted plans approved by the ARB.
16. **Applicant:** Robyn Browne  
   a. Property Address: 9 N. Reed Avenue  
   b. Date of Approval: 5/3/2019  
   c. Project: Reroof with architectural shingles in charcoal.

17. **Applicant:** O’Gwynn, LLC  
   a. Property Address: 204 Conti Street  
   b. Date of Approval: 5/3/2019  
   c. Project: Repair and Replace rotten wood to match existing. Repaint entire exterior to match existing with a slightly darker.

18. **Applicant:** Karen Kissinger  
   a. Property Address: 257 West Street  
   b. Date of Approval: 5/3/2019  
   c. Project: Reroof with architectural shingles in weathered shadow.

19. **Applicant:** Thomas and Ann Strange  
   a. Property Address: 264 McDonald Avenue  
   b. Date of Approval: 5/6/2019  
   c. Project: Construct wooden picket fence 4’ behind front plane of house surrounding backyard.

20. **Applicant:** Jessica Olen  
    a. Property Address: 304 Breamwood Avenue  
    b. Date of Approval: 5/6/2019  

21. **Applicant:** Will Speed  
    a. Property Address: 1127 Caroline Avenue  
    b. Date of Approval: 5/6/2019  
    c. Project: Reroof to match existing.

22. **Applicant:** Laurence Associates  
    a. Property Address: 918 Government Street  
    b. Date of Approval: 5/7/2019  
    c. Project: Reroof flat surface with elastomeric coating.

23. **Applicant:** Ed Bowron  
    a. Property Address: 1006 Church Street  
    b. Date of Approval: 5/7/2019  
    c. Project: Install fabric awnings west and south entrances on frame.

24. **Applicant:** Historic Dauphin Thirty+Three, LLP  
    a. Property Address: 5 Dauphin Street  
    b. Date of Approval: 5/7/2019  
    c. Project: Repaint in the following color scheme: Edgecomb Gray, Decorator White and Boothbay Cay (gray).

25. **Applicant:** Patricia Davis  
    a. Property Address: 7 Macy Place  
    b. Date of Approval: 5/7/2019  
    c. Project: Roll over previous approval of May 3, 2018 to build new shed.

26. **Applicant:** Peggy Gudmonson Trust  
    a. Property Address: 14 S. Catherine Street  
    b. Date of Approval: 5/8/2019  
    c. Project: Construct one story wooden ancillary building. Building will be 14'0" in width and 28'0" in depth; clad in wood lapsiding; rafter tails exposed; and louvered vent in gables. East elevation will feature glazed and paneled garage door. North elevation will feature six-over-one clad window, and metal glazed and panel door.
27. Applicant:  Triple Holdings  
   a. Property Address:  110 S. Broad Street  
   b. Date of Approval:  5/7/2019  
   c. Project:  Reroof with black asphalt shingles.  

28. Applicant:  John Sherwin  
   a. Property Address:  5/8/2019  
   b. Date of Approval:  104 Espejo Street  
   c. Project:  Remove rear bathroom and reconstruct per submitted plans. Addition is small  
      located out of public view.  

29. Applicant:  Daniel Henderson  
   a. Property Address:  1017 Old Shell Road  
   b. Date of Approval:  5/8/2019  
   c. Project:  Repaint in the following color scheme: PPU14-20 Starless night (navy;  
      ceiling-birdsong blue; trim-white; and stained wood door.  

30. Applicant:  Hunter Adams  
   a. Property Address:  210 George Street  
   b. Date of Approval:  5/8/2019  
   c. Project:  Remove lapsiding from southeast addition and install louvered panels.  
      Complete work on West (rear) Elevation. Install fixed louvered panels with two over two  
      wooden or aluminum clad windows above at southern portion. In two central bays install  
      two-over-two windows. The northern most portion of the northern bay will be a wood or  
      metal glazed door. On second story repair lapsiding and install diamond window on the  
      southern portion. On northern portion expand recessed balcony; Install two-over two  
      windows to door that will access balcony. Install canvas awning over balcony.  

31. Applicant:  David Will  
   a. Property Address:  320 N. Jackson Street  
   b. Date of Approval:  5/11/2019  
   c. Project:  Repair and replace deteriorated wood to match existing in profile and material.  
      Repaint to match existing.  

32. Applicant:  James Michael  
   a. Property Address:  1453 Dauphin Street  
   b. Date of Approval:  5/9/2019  
   c. Project:  Reconstruct fence to match dimension, material and profile. Enclose backyard.  
      Rebuild 10'x20' per-fab shed. Shed will have wood siding and asphalt shingles and repainted  
      to match main house. Rebuild and repaint lattice.  

33. Applicant:  Christopher Scott  
   a. Property Address:  160 S. Dearborn Street  
   b. Date of Approval:  5/13/2019  
   c. Project:  Screen back porch, screen will be placed between existing rails.  

34. Applicant:  John Smith  
   a. Property Address:  202 Roper Street  
   b. Date of Approval:  5/13/2019  
   c. Project:  Remove exterior boards to make interior repair and replace to match.  

35. Applicant:  Tim Sole  
   a. Property Address:  1215 Selma Street  
   b. Date of Approval:  5/13/2019  
   c. Project:  Rebuild back porch per plans, redo bathrooms, kitchen, relocate two  
      second story windows east elevation per plan.
36. **Applicant:** Mary Barrett  
   a. **Property Address:** 1802 New Hamilton Street  
   b. **Date of Approval:** 5/14/2019  
   c. **Project:** Repaint house, level one end porch, redeck porch, redeck rear porch, add railings with 4 inch on center balusters.

37. **Applicant:** John McClelland  
   a. **Property Address:** 109 Lanier Avenue  
   b. **Date of Approval:** 5/14/2019  
   c. **Project:** Remove deteriorated steel windows, replace with new steel to match original in dimension and profile.

38. **Applicant:** Jerry Arnold  
   a. **Property Address:** 558 Conti Street  
   b. **Date of Approval:** 5/15/2019  
   c. **Project:** Redeck front porch to match existing in dimension, profile, and material.

39. **Applicant:** Harold Dodge  
   a. **Property Address:** 305 S. Ann Street  
   b. **Date of Approval:** 5/15/2019  
   c. **Project:** Repair, replace rotten wood to match existing. Repaint house.

40. **Applicant:** Juanita Smith  
   a. **Property Address:** 211 Tuttle Avenue  
   b. **Date of Approval:** 5/16/2019  
   c. **Project:** Reroof.

41. **Applicant:** Paul Hanceri  
   a. **Property Address:** 1703 Hunter Avenue  
   b. **Date of Approval:** 5/16/2019  
   c. **Project:** Reroof.

42. **Applicant:** Betty Leslie  
   a. **Property Address:** 1579 West Avenue  
   b. **Date of Approval:** 5/21/2019  
   c. **Project:** Reroof with gray shingles.

43. **Applicant:** Todd Hicks  
   a. **Property Address:** 10 N. Dearborn Street  
   b. **Date of Approval:** 5/17/2019  
   c. **Project:** Redeck porch tongue and groove, replace non-historic square balusters with turned balusters to match drop frieze and original baluster patter, replace non-historic corner column with accurate matching column to original. Replace steps.

44. **Applicant:** Jay and Jodie Smith  
   a. **Property Address:** 75 S. Ann Street  
   b. **Date of Approval:** 5/17/2019  
   c. **Project:** Repaint to match existing. Trim to be painted Bellingrath Green.

45. **Applicant:** Ellen Tyner  
   a. **Property Address:** 1677 Government Street  
   b. **Date of Approval:** 5/21/2019  
   c. **Project:** Reroof porches.

46. **Applicant:** Palmer Hamilton  
   a. **Property Address:** 1157 Palmetto Street  
   b. **Date of Approval:** 5/21/2019  
   c. **Project:** Reroof.

47. **Applicant:** Joan Hargett  
   a. **Property Address:** 53 S. Monterey Street  
   b. **Date of Approval:** 5/21/2019  
   c. **Project:** Reroof.
48. Applicant: John McClelland
   a. Property Address: 109 Lanier Avenue
   b. Date of Approval: 5/21/2019
   c. Project: Reroof to match.

49. Applicant: Margie Crawford
   a. Property Address: 104 N. Julia Street
   b. Date of Approval: 5/21/2019
   c. Project: Reroof to match.

50. Applicant: Arwen Rice
    a. Property Address: 58 LeMoyne Place
    b. Date of Approval: 5/21/2019
    c. Project: Repair and replace wood siding to match existing. Repaint.

51. Applicant: EA and Virginia Naman
    a. Property Address: 119 Dauphin Street
    b. Date of Approval: 5/22/2019
    c. Project: Paint exterior façade bahama blue.

C. APPLICATIONS
1. 2019-20-CA: 934 Conti Street
   a. Applicant: Mr. Douglas Kearley of DBK, Inc. on behalf of Mr. Stephen May.
   b. Project: Relocation Related: Relocate an existing house located out of district on Springhill Avenue to Conti Street.
   APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

2. 2019-21-CA: 102 Ryan Avenue
   a. Applicant: Mr. Benjamin P. Cummings of Cummings Architecture on behalf of Mr. David Cooper
   b. Project: Addition Related: Construct one story addition on south side of single family residence.
   APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

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

2019-20-CA: 934 Conti Street
Applicant: Mr. Douglas B. Kearley of DBK, Inc. on behalf of Mr. Stephen May
Received: 4/26/2019
Meeting: 6/5/2019

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing (Vacant Lot)
Zoning: R-1
Project: Relocation Related: Relocate an existing house located out of district on Springhill Avenue to Conti Street.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to the 1904 Sanborn Map overlay, a double residence was formerly on this site.

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 before the Architectural Review Board on April 17th, 2019 according to the MHDC vertical files. At that time, conceptual approval for the relocation of the house was approved. The proposed scope of work includes relocating the house and constructing a rear addition.
B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
   1. “Consider whether or not a structure will be relocated within the same district and in a similar context.”
   2. “Relocation may be more appropriate when the receiving site is in the district. Relocated buildings shall be placed in situations that do not impair the architecture of the historical character of the surround.”
   3. “When relocating a building, maintain its general placement and orientation on the new site so as to maintain the architectural and the historical character of the streetscape and district.”
   4. “Preserve the original roof form of a historic residential structure.”
   5. “Repair a porch in a way that maintains the original character.”
   6. “Do not relocate an original front stairway or steps.”
   7. “Repair and, when necessary, replace piers, foundations and foundation infill to reflect historic character.”
   8. Acceptable materials for foundation replacement materials include: “…stucco piers or infill; brick piers or infill; stuccoed concrete block; wood lattice or vertical picket infill.”
9. “Repair deteriorated building materials by patching, piecing-in, consolidating or otherwise reinforcing the material.”
10. “Use new roof materials to convey a scale and texture similar to those used historically.”
11. “If installing a new metal roof, apply and detail it in a manner that is compatible with the historic character of the roof, period and style.”
12. “Use standing seam metal, metal shingles or five v-crimp.”
13. “Original doors and openings, including their dimensions, should be retained along with any moldings, transoms or sidelights.”
14. Acceptable door materials include: “Wood panel; wood panel with glass lights; leaded glass with lead came; metal with a painted finish; other materials original to the building.”
15. “Preserve storefronts, cornices, turned columns, brackets, exposed rafter tails, jigsaw ornaments and other key architectural features that are in good condition.”
16. “When replacing historic details, match the original in profile, dimension, and material.”
17. “Design an addition so there is the least possible loss of historic fabric and so the character-defining features of the historic building are not destroyed, damaged or obscured.”
18. “Design an addition so that the overall characteristics of the site (site topography, character-defining site features, trees, and significant district vistas and public views) are retained.”
19. “Wherever possible, construct an addition in such a manner that, if the addition were to be removed, the essential form and integrity of the historic structure would be unimpaired.”
20. “Design an addition to be compatible with the color, material and character of the property, neighborhood and environment.”
21. “Design the building components (roof, foundation, doors and windows) of the addition to be compatible with the historic architecture.”
22. “Maintain the relationship of solids to voids (windows and doors) in an exterior wall as is established by the historic building.”
23. “Differentiate an addition from a historic structure using changes in material, color and/or wall plane. Alternative materials, such as cement fiberboard, are allowed when the addition is properly differentiated from the original structure.”
24. “If the style of an addition is different than the original, use a style that is compatible with the historic context.”
25. “Place and design an addition to the rear or side of the historic building wherever possible.”
26. “Design the massing of an addition to appear subordinate to the historic building.”
27. “Where feasible, use a lower-scale connecting element to join an addition to a historic structure.”
28. “Where possible, match the foundation and floor heights of an addition to those of the historic building.”
29. “Design the height of an addition to be proportionate with the historic building, paying particular attention to the foundation and other horizontal elements.”
30. “Design the addition to express floor heights on the exterior of the addition in a fashion that reflects floor heights of the original historic building.”
31. “Use a physical break or setback from the original exterior wall to visually separate the old from new.”
32. “Use an alteration in the roofline to create a visual break between the original and new, but ensure that the pitches generally match.”
33. “Utilize an alternative material for siding as necessary, such as cement-based fiberboard, provided that it matches the siding of the historic building in profile, character and finish.”
34. “Use a material with proven durability.
35. “Use a material with a similar appearance in profile, texture and composition to those on the original building.”
36. “Choose a color and finish that matches or blends with those of the historic building.”
37. “Do not use a material with a composition that will impair the structural integrity and visual character of the building.”
38. “Do not use a faux stucco application.”
39. “Design a roof shape, pitch, material and level of complexity to be similar to those of the existing historic building.”
40. “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.”
41. “Use a roofing material for an addition that matches or is compatible with the original historic building and the district.”
42. “If a historic door is removed to accommodate the addition, consider reusing it on the addition.”
43. “Design a door and doorway to be compatible with the historic building.”
44. “Use a door material that is compatible with those of the historic building and the district.”
45. “Use a material with a dimensionality (thickness) and appearance similar to doors on the original historic building.”
46. “Design the scale of a doorway on an addition to be in keeping with the overall mass, scale and design of the addition as a whole.”
47. “Match the foundation of an addition to that of the original.”
48. “Use a material that is similar to that of the historic foundation.”
49. “Match foundation height to that of the original historic building.”
50. “Use pier foundations if feasible and if consistent with the original building.”
51. “Do not use raw concrete block or wood posts on a foundation.”
52. “Match a detail on an addition to match the original historic structure in profile, dimension and material.”
53. “Use ornamentation on an addition that is less elaborate than that on the original structure.”
54. “Use a material for details on an addition that match those of the original in quality and feel.”
55. “Match the proportions of details on an addition to match the proportions used on the original historic structure.”
56. “Maintain alignment of front setbacks.”
57. “Maintain the rhythm of buildings and side yards.”
58. “Design the massing of new construction to appear similar to that of historic buildings in the district.”
59. “Design the scale of new construction to appear similar to that of historic buildings in the district.”
60. “Design piers, a foundation, and foundation infill to be compatible with those of nearby historic properties.
61. “Size foundations and floor heights to appear similar to those of nearby historic buildings.”
62. “Use building height in front that is compatible with adjacent contributing properties.”
63. “Design building elements on exterior buildings walls to be compatible with those on nearby historic buildings. These elements often include but are not limited to: balconies, chimneys, and dormers.”
64. “Use exterior building materials and finishes that complement the character of the surrounding district.”
65. “Locate and size a window to create a solid-to-void ratio similar to the ratios seen on nearby historic windows.”
66. “Use traditional window casement and trim similar to those seen in nearby historic buildings.”
76. “Place and size a special feature, including a transom, sidelight or decorative framing element, to complement those seen in nearby historic buildings.”

77. “Match the scale of a porch to the main building and reflect the scale of porches of nearby historic buildings.”

78. “When using artificial materials, use a blind or shutter unit that has a thickness, Weight and design similar to wood.”

79. “Design a roof on new construction to be compatible with those on adjacent Historic buildings.”

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

1. Deconstruct and dismantle residence at 1107 Spring Hill Avenue outside a historic district.
   a. Property would be carefully moved and relocated to Old Dauphin Way historic district.
   b. Reassemble residence on an inner lot bound by Common Street, Conti Street, and Broad Street.

2. Reconstruct a residence.
   a. Residence will be orientated to Conti Street situated on an inner lot.
   b. Residence will be setback 25’0” from the front sidewalk.
   c. The residence is one story.
   d. The residence is a three bay, sidehall shotgun with an addition.

3. Construct a rear addition.
   a. The addition will take an existing, later addition wing from the house at its Spring Hill location, and relocate it to the rear of the house.
   b. The addition (relocated wing) will have a door with awning installed above on the North elevation.
   c. Door will be salvaged and composed of paneled wood and glass.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The application calls for the relocation of an existing residence into a historic district. A residence located at 1107 Springhill Avenue is threatened by demolition. The existing location is just outside of purview of the Architectural Review Board. The applicant would like to relocate the residence to an inner lot in a mostly residential area of the Old Dauphin Way historic district. When looking at the relocation of properties, one considers several items.

With regard to placement, two components are taken into account – setback from the street and between buildings. The Design Review Guidelines for New Residential Construction in Mobile’s Historic Districts state that new buildings should be responsive to and maintain alignment of traditional façade lines (See B 56.), as well as the rhythm of side & rear setbacks (See B-57). The property would be reconstructed on an inner lot in the vicinity of contributing residential buildings. The proposed placement will negotiate the existing historic buildings located to the east of the site (see survey).

While the building is being relocated, reviewing guidelines for new construction is crucial to ensuring the appropriateness of a residence to the neighborhood. The Design Review Guidelines state that mass - the relationship of the parts of the larger whole comprising a building - for new construction should be in keeping with arrangement and proportion of surrounding historic residences (B-58). The proposed house is a comprised of a porch-fronted, three bay sidehall with offset wing in an eclectic style. An existing wing will be removed and relocated on the rear of the house, distinguished by corner boards. The building with its traditional massing and scale is suited to the architectural and historical traditions of the neighborhood (See B-59).
With regard to building components, the Design Review Guidelines call for responsiveness to traditional design traditions. The building is historic and features a side gabled front porch with offset wing. The composition and materials (wood siding, wood windows, standing seam metal roof), and rhythm of solid to void patterns is compatible with immediate and larger residential architectural vocabulary of the district (See B-73 and B-74). Deteriorated elements will be repaired when possible and replaced when necessary to match existing in dimension, profile and material (See B-16). The roof form will be maintained and a new metal standing seam roof will surmount the relocated building. Metal roofs are often appropriate for antebellum and Victorian cottages (See B-11). The brick pier with lattice infill foundation is reflective of traditional foundation elevations (See B-60) and dwellings on properties abutting the subject address.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-3) Staff does not believe this application would impair either architectural or the historical character of the building or the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of the application in full.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Stone welcomed Mr. Kearley, the owner’s representative and asked if he had any comments, questions or clarifications. Mr. Kearley stated Ms. Largue had addressed the application in full.

Mr. Roberts inquired as to what type of metal roof. Mr. Kearley responded 5V Crimp. Mr. Roberts then asked if the applicant had a landscape plan. Mr. Kearley asked Mr. Roberts what of landscaping he was referring to in his question. Ms. Largue explained that the Board is more concerned with hardscaping, and that staff can approve several landscape related alterations if it meets the guidelines. Mr. Roberts replied the Board was concerned with hardscaping.

Mr. Stone inquired as to an existing rear hall on the currently out of district residence that is labeled “former porch” on the existing plans. Mr. Kearley explained the former porch was already enclosed to make a hallway.

No further discussion from the Board ensued.

Mr. Stone opened the application to public comment. With no one to speak in favor of or opposition to, 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 reflect the findings of the Design Review Committee.

The motion received a second by Mrs. Davis and was unanimously approved.

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the facts as approved by the Board, that the application does not impair the historic district and that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued.

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

**CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS EXPIRATION DATE: June 6th, 2020**
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2019-21-CA: 102 Ryan Avenue
Applicant: Mr. Benjamin P. Cummings of Cummings Architecture on behalf of Mr. David Cooper
Received: 4/30/2019
Meeting: 6/5/2019

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Ashland Place
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Addition Related: Construct one story addition on south side of single family residence.

BUILDING HISTORY

This Colonial Revival house dates from 1925. The two-story residence features pronounced eaves and an elegant entry.

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. The proposed scope of work includes a rear addition.
B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
   1. “Design an addition so there is the least possible loss of historic fabric and so the character-defining features of the historic building are not destroyed, damaged or obscured.”
   2. “Design an addition so that the overall characteristics of the site (site topography, character-defining site features, trees, and significant district vistas and public views) are retained.”
   3. “Wherever possible, construct an addition in such a manner that, if the addition were to be removed, the essential form and integrity of the historic structure would be unimpaired.”
   4. “Design an addition to be compatible with the color, material and character of the property, neighborhood and environment.”
   5. “Design the building components (roof, foundation, doors and windows) of the addition to be compatible with the historic architecture.”
   6. “Maintain the relationship of solids to voids (windows and doors) in an exterior wall as is established by the historic building.”
7. “Differentiate an addition from a historic structure using changes in material, color and/or wall plane. Alternative materials, such as cement fiberboard, are allowed when the addition is properly differentiated from the original structure.”
8. “If the style of an addition is different than the original, use a style that is compatible with the historic context.”
9. “Place and design an addition to the rear or side of the historic building wherever possible.”
10. “Design the massing of an addition to appear subordinate to the historic building.”
11. “Where feasible, use a lower-scale connecting element to join an addition to a historic structure.”
12. “Where possible, match the foundation and floor heights of an addition to those of the historic building.”
13. “Design the height of an addition to be proportionate with the historic building, paying particular attention to the foundation and other horizontal elements.”
14. “Design the addition to express floor heights on the exterior of the addition in a fashion that reflects floor heights of the original historic building.”
15. “Use a physical break or setback from the original exterior wall to visually separate the old from new.”
16. “Use an alteration in the roofline to create a visual break between the original and new, but ensure that the pitches generally match.”
17. “Utilize an alternative material for siding as necessary, such as cement-based fiber board, provided that it matches the siding of the historic building in profile, character and finish.”
18. “Use a material with proven durability.
19. “Use a material with a similar appearance in profile, texture and composition to those on the original building.”
20. “Choose a color and finish that matches or blends with those of the historic building.”
21. “Do not use a material with a composition that will impair the structural integrity and visual character of the building.”
22. “Do not use a faux stucco application.”
23. “Design a roof shape, pitch, material and level of complexity to be similar to those of the existing historic building.”
24. “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.”
25. “Use a roofing material for an addition that matches or is compatible with the original historic building and the district.”
26. “If a historic door is removed to accommodate the addition, consider reusing it on the addition.”
27. “Design a door and doorway to be compatible with the historic building.”
28. “Use a door material that is compatible with those of the historic building and the district.”
29. “Use a material with a dimensionality (thickness) and appearance similar to doors on the original historic building.”
30. “Design the scale of a doorway on an addition to be in keeping with the overall mass, scale and design of the addition as a whole.”
31. “Match the foundation of an addition to that of the original.”
32. “Use a material that is similar to that of the historic foundation.”
33. “Match foundation height to that of the original historic building.”
34. “Use pier foundations if feasible and if consistent with the original building.”
35. “Do not use raw concrete block or wood posts on a foundation.”
36. “Match a detail on an addition to match the original historic structure in profile, dimension and material.”
37. “Use ornamentation on an addition that is less elaborate than that on the original structure.”
38. “Use a material for details on an addition that match those of the original in quality and feel.”
39. “Match the proportions of details on an addition to match the proportions used on the original historic structure.”
40. “Maintain alignment of front setbacks.”
41. “Maintain the rhythm of buildings and side yards.”
42. “Design the massing of new construction to appear similar to that of historic buildings in the district.”
43. “Design the scale of new construction to appear similar to that of historic buildings in the district.”
44. “Design piers, a foundation, and foundation infill to be compatible with those of nearby historic properties.
45. “Size foundations and floor heights to appear similar to those of nearby historic buildings.”
46. “Use building height in front that is compatible with adjacent contributing properties.”
47. “Design building elements on exterior buildings walls to be compatible with those on nearby historic buildings. These elements often include but are not limited to: balconies, chimneys, and dormers.”
48. “Use exterior building materials and finishes that complement the character of the surrounding district.”
49. “Locate and size a window to create a solid-to-void ratio similar to the ratios seen on nearby historic windows.”
50. “Use traditional window casement and trim similar to those seen in nearby historic buildings.”
51. “Place and size a special feature, including a transom, sidelight or decorative framing element, to complement those seen in nearby historic buildings.
52. “Match the scale of a porch to the main building and reflect the scale of porches of nearby historic buildings.”
53. ”When using artificial materials, use a blind or shutter unit that has a thickness, weight and design similar to wood.”
54. “Design a roof on new construction to be compatible with those on adjacent historic buildings.”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted site plan):
1. Prepare site for addition.
   a. A portion of the existing patio, sidewalk and stairs leading to the rear patio will be removed.
   b. Wooden casement windows on the first story of the south elevation will be removed and repurposed on the addition.
   c. A set multi-paned wooden window flanking the chimney will be removed.
2. Construct a one story addition.
   a. The addition will extend from/off of the South elevation of the house.
   b. The addition will take the form of an enclosed space.
   c. The addition will be 24’0” in depth and 44’0” in width.
   d. The addition’s foundation treatment will match the brick found on the body of the house.
   e. The addition’s walls will be clad in wood siding.
   f. A flat roof membrane roof will surmount the addition.
   g. Wooden arbor with brackets will be constructed below the cornice.
      i. West (facade) Elevation
The addition will be slightly recessed from the original portion of the house.
Two sets of paired casement windows will punctuate the elevation.
Aforementioned windows are repurposed from the south elevation first floor

South (side) Elevation
Five equidistant, six-over-six wooden windows will punctuate the elevation.
Wooden shutters will be installed to match the existing.
Wooden arbor with brackets will be constructed individually over each window.
A new set of stairs will be constructed to access the porch.

East (rear) Elevation
A six-over-six wooden window will be installed on the northern portion of the elevation.

STAFF ANALYSIS

Several factors are taken into consideration when designing an addition on a contributing building. These include: setback, scale, massing, materials and compatibility. Regarding setback, a large addition will be located on the side of the property (See B-9). The scale and massing of the side addition blends in with surrounding residences (See B-10). The one story addition is slightly recessed from front façade plane of the existing portion of the house (See B-15). The wooden siding and wooden windows are all approved materials for new construction (See B-11).

Regarding compatibility, the one story addition draws inspiration from the existing house. In particular, the existing residence has design elements such as large overhanging eaves with brackets. The new addition adheres to the guidelines by “incorporating elements…that are generally similar to those of the historic building” (See B-24). The wooden arbor/ shed roof element that will be constructed over the windows of the addition incorporate brackets similar to those brackets seen on located on the historic house under the eaves. Repurposed windows, nine-over-nine wooden windows, and a six-over-six window will be located on the new addition. Nine-over-nine windows are currently located on the South elevation, making the new windows compatible with the existing house (See B-6). The parapet roof further differentiates the old from the new (See B-5).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-3) Staff does not believe this application would impair either architectural or the historical character of the building or the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Stone welcomed Mr. Cummings, the owner’s representative, and asked if he had any questions, comments or clarifications. Mr. Cummings replied Ms. Largue had explained the application in full.

Mr. Stone asked Mr. Cummings if the roof for the addition was a three-sided parapet. Mr. Cummings responded the roof will see a single slope and not visible form Old Shell Road. Mr. Roberts commented the perspective shows a slope, but that it will be lower pitch in reality. Mr. Cummings stated the new addition’s roof was a response to the other additions and rooflines on the existing house. He noted one area is shingled and then goes flat. He further explained the roof chosen seemed to be the cleanest way to attach the addition.
Mr. Stone noted no other pergolas or shutters were on the exiting house. Mr. Cummings replied the addition was to be less formal than the existing house.

Mrs. Davis commented the existing windows on the second floor were in condition and that is why the roof is proposed to be sloped. Mrs. Davis asked Mr. Cummings what is the color of the roof. Mr. Cummings responded it will be white. Mrs. Davis noted that is not a stark contrast to the house color.

Mr. Roberts stated a concern that had come up in year’s past over additions. He explained over time several additions can affect the original house and stated a discussion had taken place previously that additions were allowed to be only 25% of the existing house.

No further discussion from the Board ensued.

Mr. Stone opened the application to public comment. With no one to speak in favor of or opposition to, 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 reflect the findings of the Design Review Committee.

The motion received a second by Mrs. Davis 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 house or the district and a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued.

The motion received a second by Mr. Barr and was approved with one in opposition, Mr. Stone.

**CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS EXPIRATION DATE: June 6th, 2020**