ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
March 4th, 2020 – 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 3:05 p.m. Christine Dawson, Historic Development Staff, called the roll as follows:
   
   **Members Present:** Abby Davis, Kim Harden, Andre Rathle, Craig Roberts and Steve Stone
   
   **Members Absent:** David Barr, Robert Brown, Catarina Echols, Joseph Rodrigues, Gypsie Van Antwerp, and Jim Wagoner
   
   **Staff Members Present:** Bridget Daniel, Christine Dawson, John Sledge, and Marion McElroy

2. Craig Roberts moved to approve the minutes from the February 19th, 2020 meeting. The motion was seconded by Kim Harden and approved unanimously.

3. Craig Roberts moved to approve the Mid-Month COAs Granted by Staff. The motion was seconded by Abby Davis and approved unanimously.

B. MID-MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED

1. Applicant: Meredith O'Meara
   a. Property Address: 1157 Selma Street
   b. Date of Approval: 01/31/2020
   c. Project: Reroof.

2. Applicant: Walker Brothers
   a. Property Address: 470 Dauphin Street
   b. Date of Approval: 02/11/2020
   c. Project: Repair rotten wood and windows to match existing and repaint to match existing.

3. Applicant: Luke Spaulding
   a. Property Address: 1120 Palmetto Street
   b. Date of Approval: 02/11/2020
   c. Project: Repaint in kind.

4. Applicant: Alver A and Dixie M Carlson
   a. Property Address: 1653 Dauphin Street
   b. Date of Approval: 02/12/2020
   c. Project: Updates COA of 2/15/19. Repaint house in existing color scheme. Repair and replace deteriorated woodwork to match in dimensions, profile and material. Reroof rear porch to asphalt or architectural shingles in autumn.

5. Applicant: David Kearns
   a. Property Address: 1706 New Hamilton Street
   b. Date of Approval: 02/14/2020
   c. Project: Replace damaged decking and reroof with architectural shingles to match existing.

6. Applicant: Leonard Dunning
   a. Property Address: 358 West Street
   b. Date of Approval: 02/14/2020
   c. Project: Reroof in gray.

7. Applicant: Wesley McGugin
   a. Property Address: 124 Ryan Ave
   b. Date of Approval: 02/14/2020
   c. Project: Add 3 ½-foot picket fence along north and south rear property lines; add gate. Extend flagstone walkway between public sidewalk and curb.
8. Applicant: Julian Mathis  
a. Property Address: 1162 New St Francis Street  
b. Date of Approval: 02/14/2020  
c. Project: Replace rotten deck boards, balusters, and column bases, all to match original in material, profile and dimension. Repaint.

9. Applicant: Rebecca Ferguson  
a. Property Address: 6 S Hallett Street  
b. Date of Approval: 02/17/2020  
c. Project: Add three-foot wood picket fence down side property line between houses; paint.

10. Applicant: Hunter Omainsky  
a. Property Address: 1656 Dauphin Street  
b. Date of Approval: 02/18/2020  
c. Project: Repair leaking roof; remove original tile; repair deck and replace with original tile.

11. Applicant: Dagmary Vega  
a. Property Address: 114 Espejo Street  
b. Date of Approval: 02/19/2020  
c. Project: Repair and replace to match in-kind the front porch flooring in dimension, profile, and material; reroof with architectural shingles; repaint exterior with historic color.

12. Applicant: Antwan Hogue  
a. Property Address: 107 Gilbert Street  
b. Date of Approval: 02/19/2020  
c. Project: Repaint in historic color of Palmetto Street Bronze or Chatham Street Blue for body of house with trim white or off-white color and shutters brown in color.

13. Applicant: Patricia Hagood  
a. Property Address: 1405 Blacklawn Street  
b. Date of Approval: 02/21/2020  
c. Project: Reroof with asphalt shingles, dark brown.

14. Applicant: Jerry Graham Roofing  
a. Property Address: 24 Blacklawn  
b. Date of Approval: 02/26/2020  
c. Project: Reroof with black architectural shingles.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2020-10-CA: 100 S. Georgia Avenue  
a. Applicant: Mr. Don Bowden, Architect, on behalf of Chris Gilbert  
b. Project: Removal of chimney  
APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

2. 2020-11-CA: 102 S. Georgia Avenue  
a. Applicant: Mr. Douglas Kearley on behalf of Buddy and Linda Holland  
b. Project: Construct two additions to the house; demolish existing garage; construct new two-car garage  
APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

3. 2020-12-CA: 204 S. Dearborn Street  
a. Applicant: Mr. Ernest Philon  
b. Project: Install 12’x12’ prefabricated shed in rear yard  
APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.
4. **2020-13-CA: 1359 Dauphin Street**
   a. Applicant: Mr. Wayne Reyner on behalf of Chris and Lesley Rainosek
   b. Project: Paint brick exterior
   **APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

5. **2020-14-CA: 104 S. Ann Street**
   a. Applicant: DBL-P Properties, LLC
   b. Project: Demolish fire-damaged house; construct fencing around north, west, and south sides of property; place gravel on lot for parking
   **APPROVED AS AMENDED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

   a. Applicant: Ms. Gillian McGee on behalf of Mr. William Faircloth
   b. Project: Repair rotten siding, fascia, soffit, and trim; replace front and back doors; replace all windows; install new wood shutters on façade; replace front porch decking; rear addition and new rear porch; repaint exterior; new rear privacy fence; repair and paint brick piers; install new lattice panels.
   **APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

D. **OTHER BUSINESS**

The next ARB meeting is scheduled for March 18, 2020.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2020-10-CA: 100 S. Georgia Avenue
Applicant: Mr. Don Bowden, Architect, on behalf of Chris Gilbert
Received: 2/11/2020
Meeting: 3/4/2020

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Removal of chimney

BUILDING HISTORY

The two-story, frame American Foursquare house on the subject property was constructed c. 1905.

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. According to the MHDC vertical files, this property has not appeared previously before the Architectural Review Board (ARB).

B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts (Guidelines) state, in pertinent part:
   1. “Distinctive stylistic features or examples 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.”
   2. “Remove only those materials which are deteriorated and beyond reasonable repair. Do not remove original materials that are in good condition.” (5.4)
   3. “Preserve masonry features that define the overall historic character, such as walls, cornices, pediments, steps, and foundations.
   4. Take particular care with historic masonry.” (5.8)

C. Scope of Work:
   1. Remove the existing brick chimney toward the southwest corner of the house.
   2. Patch the resulting cavity with decking and shingles to match the existing.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The subject property, 100 South Georgia Avenue, is a contributing interior property within the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The application under review involves the removal of a chimney toward a rear corner of the house. The existing fireplaces, one on the first floor and one on the second floor, served
by the subject chimney are non-functioning and will be removed as part of a larger interior renovation project.

The *Design Review Guidelines* call for the preservation of distinctive stylistic features and examples of skilled craftsmanship. The chimney in question is an example of skilled craftsmanship (B.1), but it is not a character-defining feature of the house, as are the wide overhanging eaves, the exposed rafter tails, and the diamond pane windows (B.3). The *Guidelines* also state that only materials deteriorated beyond reasonable repair should be removed (B.2).

The chimney in question is not obvious from the public right-of-way and can only be viewed from a very specific angle near the street. Therefore, the removal of the chimney would not impair the historic or architectural character of the house. Furthermore, although the chimney above the roofline does not appear deteriorated, the fireplaces it serves are not functional and will be removed as part of interior renovations. Therefore, there will no longer be underlying structure to support the subject chimney, and it would be visually misleading to maintain a chimney with no associated fireplace(s). Because the chimney is visible from only a narrow angle near the street, its removal would not impair the historic or architectural character of the surrounding district.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-4) above, Staff believes the proposed removal of the subject chimney would not impair the architectural or historic character of the property or the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Mr. Bowden, the owner’s representative and project architect, was present to discuss the application.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

The Board had no questions or comments.

Mr. Stone opened the application to public comment. With no one speaking in favor of or in opposition to the application, 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. Davis and was approved unanimously.

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Mr. Roberts moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, the proposed removal of the subject chimney would not impair the integrity of the house or the surrounding district and a Certificate of Appropriateness be granted.

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

2020-11-CA: 102 S. Georgia Avenue
Applicant: Mr. Douglas Kearley, Architect, on behalf of Buddy and Linda Holland
Received: 2/12/2020
Meeting: 3/4/2020

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Construct two additions to the house; demolish existing garage; construct new garage

BUILDING HISTORY

The house on the subject property is a one-story, hip-roofed, frame Victorian Cottage type resting on a brick pier foundation. The house was constructed c. 1910. The partial-width front porch has an integral roof supported by turned posts with decorative brackets. The existing garage, constructed c. 1960, is a front-gabled, cinder block structure with a single car bay. It is located to the immediate south of the house.

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. Per the MHDC vertical files, this property appeared before the Old Dauphin Way Review Board (ODWRB) in 1981, when approval was granted to repaint the house white with green trim and black shutters. Foundation repairs including removing and replacing sills as necessary, repairing/ replacing brick piers, and leveling the house as necessary were approved by the ODWRB in 1997. Replacement of a door with a window on the south elevation, removal of a shed in the rear yard, and repainting the house in Oakleigh Garden Peach, DeTonti Square Off White, and Government Street Olive were approved by the ODWRB in January 1998. An application for the installation of an iron fence and gate along the north and south property lines was approved by the ODWRB in May 1998. A request made in March 2000 for the installation of a metal and glass prefabricated sunroom was denied by the ODWRB; however, a subsequent request to construct a sunroom of wood frame was approved in April 2000.

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

1. “Place an addition so that it is subordinate to the historic residential structure.
   a. Place and design an addition to the rear or side of the historic building wherever possible.” (6.9)
2. “Design an addition to be compatible in massing and scale with the original historic structure.
a. Design the massing of an addition to appear subordinate to the historic building.
b. Where possible, match the foundation and floor height of an addition to those of
the historic building.” (6.10)

3. “Design the exterior walls of an addition to be compatible in scale and rhythm with the original
historic structure.
   a. Design the height of an addition to be proportionate with the historic building,
paying particular attention to the foundation and other horizontal elements.
b. 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.” (6.11)

4. “Clearly differentiate the exterior walls of an addition from the original historic structure.
   a. Use a physical break or setback from the original exterior wall to visually separate the
      old from new.
b. Use an alteration in the roofline to create a visual break between the original and new,
   but ensure that the pitches generally match.” (6.12)

5. “Use exterior materials and finishes that are comparable to those of the original historic
   residential structure in profile, dimension, and composition. Modern building materials will be
   evaluated for appropriateness or compatibility with the original historic structure on an
   individual basis, with the objective of ensuring the materials are similar in their profile,
   dimension, and composition to those of the original historic structure.
   a. 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.
b. Use a material with proven durability.
c. Use a material with a similar appearance in profile, texture, and composition to those
   on the original building.
d. Choose a color and finish that matches or blends with those of the historic building.
e. Do not use a material with a composition that will impair the structural integrity and
   visual character of the building.” (6.13)

6. “Design a roof of an addition to be compatible with the existing historic building.
   a. Design a roof shape, pitch, material, and level of complexity to be similar to those of
      the existing historic building.
b. 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.
c. Use a roofing material for an addition that matches or is compatible with the …
   historic building and the district.” (6.14)

7. “Design roofs such that the addition remains subordinate to the existing historic buildings in
   the district.” (6.15)

8. “Design doors and doorways to an addition to be compatible with the existing historic building.
   a. If a historic door is removed to accommodate the addition, consider reusing it on the
      addition.
b. Design a door and doorway to be compatible with the historic building.
c. Use a door material that is compatible with those of the historic building and the
   district.
d. Use a material with a dimensionality (thickness) and appearance similar to doors on
   the … historic building.
e. 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.” (6.16)

9. “Design piers, foundations, and foundation infill on a new addition to be compatible with those
    on the historic building.
    a. Match the foundation of an addition to that of the original.
b. Use a material that is similar to that of the historic foundation.
c. Match foundation height to that of the historic building.
d. Use pier foundations if feasible and if consistent with the original building.
e. Do not use raw concrete block or wood posts on a foundation.” (6.19)

10. “Use details that are similar in character to those on the historic structure.
    a. Match a detail on an addition to the historic structure in profile, dimension, and material.
    b. Use ornamentation on an addition that is less elaborate than that on the original.
    c. Use materials for details on an addition that match those of the original in quality and feel.
    d. Match the proportions of details on an addition to match the proportions used on the historic structure.” (6.20)

11. “Design a window on an addition to be compatible with the historic building.
    a. Size, place, and space a window for an addition to be in character with the original historic building.” (6.21)

12. In regard to the demolition of structures within historic districts, “Consider the current significance of a structure…”
    • “Consider the condition of the structure in question. Demolition may be more appropriate when a building is deteriorated or in poor condition.”
    • “Consider whether the building is one of the last remaining positive examples of its kind in the neighborhood, county, or region.”
    • “Consider the impact that demolition will have on surrounding structures, including neighboring properties, properties on the same block or across the street, or properties throughout the individual historic district.”
    • “Consider the future utilization of the site.”
    • “If a development is proposed to replace a demolished historic structure, determine that the proposed replacement structure is consistent with the guidelines for new construction in historic districts…” (12.0)

13. “A new accessory structure should be compatible with those in the district.”
    a. “Design an accessory structure to be subordinate in scale to that of the primary structure.” (9.1)
    b. “Locate a new accessory structure in line with other visible accessory structures in the district…traditionally located at the rear of a lot.” (9.2)
    c. “Materials that are compatible with the historic district in scale and character are acceptable. These often include wood frame, masonry, cement-based fiber siding [and] installations (pre-made, store-bought sheds, provided they are minimally visible from public areas).” (9.2)
    d. “Materials that are not compatible with the historic district in scale and character are unacceptable. These often include metal (except for a greenhouse), plastic (except for a greenhouse), [and] fiberglass (except for a greenhouse).” (9.2)

C. Scope of Work (per submitted application and plans):
1. Extend rear wing 5’-0” to the west to create larger kitchen and small porch.
   a. One window on the west elevation would be removed to create an interior closet, and the opening would be covered with siding to match the existing.
   b. The addition would reuse existing materials (e.g., window and trim) where possible and would use new materials matching existing where necessary.
   c. The rear-gabled roof would be carried west to cover the addition and covered with shingles to match the existing.
d. The addition would be supported by brick piers with framed lattice to match the existing.
e. The north elevation of the addition would have no fenestration. The existing corner board would remain to denote the beginning of the addition. The steps accessing the rear porch would be visible from this elevation.
f. The west elevation would have a pair of two-over-two wood windows (windows relocated from the existing structure). The enlarged porch would have an integral roof supported by a single 8” square boxed column. The porch would be accessed by a set of six wood stairs with wood handrails and newel post.

2. Add a bath and closet on the south side of the house.
a. The addition would measure 19’-4” wide by 8’-4” deep.
b. A pair of windows, a door, and a brick landing and steps with wood railing would be removed from the south elevation west of an existing side-gabled bump-out on the south elevation.
c. The roof slope would be extended to the south to cover the addition.
d. Fenestration on the south elevation addition would consist of a single, wood, four-light diamond window.

3. Demolish existing garage and remove existing concrete paving.

4. Construct a new garage with rear storage area to the west of the existing garage (to be demolished).
a. The new garage would measure 24’ wide by 30’ deep.
b. The proposed garage would be a front-gabled frame structure sheathed in smooth James Hardie siding.
c. The roof would be covered with dimensional fiberglass asphalt shingles.
d. Fenestration on the east elevation would consist of two 8’x10’ paneled garage doors with lights at the top.
e. A functional, semi-circular Fypon vent would be located in the gable end.
f. Fenestration on the north elevation would be as follows, from east to west: two-over-two wood clad window; two-over two wood clad window, and paneled pedestrian door to the storage area. The door would be sheltered by an extension of the main roof.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The subject property is a contributing resource in the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. This application proposes two additions to the house, the demolition of the existing garage, and the construction of a new garage. The two proposed additions would be constructed on the rear (west) and side (south) elevations of the existing house. Further, the addition to the south elevation would be constructed toward the rear (west) of the house (B.1). The massing and scale of the two proposed additions would be subordinate to the existing structure. The additions would measure 110 square feet and 161.1 square feet, respectively, compared to the approximate 2,649 square feet of the existing house. The roofs of both additions would be extensions of the existing roofs, having equal or lower elevations (B.2, B.6, and B.7). The proposed exterior materials of the additions, including wood windows, matching wood siding, matching roofing, brick piers, and framed lattice, would be compatible with the existing house (B.5 and B.9), and the floor levels of the additions would match the exiting floor level (B.2). The new rear (west) exterior wall would complement the rhythm of the existing wall, with a similar fenestration pattern. The new south wall would have fewer openings than the existing wall; however, the elevation is secondary and not visible from the public right-of-way (B.3). Although the cladding of the additions would match the existing house, the additions would be differentiated from the historic house by maintaining corner boards where wall planes would be flat (B.4). The proposed doors, doorways, and windows of the additions are compatible in size, material, and detailing to the existing doors and windows (B.8 and B.11). Considering all applicable guidelines, the two proposed additions are in conformance.
Applications for Certificates of Appropriateness for the demolition of structures within historic districts must be considered in light of the significance of the structure in question; the condition of the structure; whether the structure is the last remaining positive example of its kind in the neighborhood, county, or region; the impact of demolition on surrounding structures, and the future utilization of the site. The existing garage is a non-contributing structure, having been constructed outside the district’s period of significance (1827-1941). Therefore, the garage is not significant. The garage appears to be in fair condition, but it is not a significant or unique example of a cinder block garage in the neighborhood, county, or region. The proposed demolition of the existing garage likely would have little to no impact upon other properties in the district. Its demolition would remove a structure that has stood next to the residence for approximately sixty (60) years; however, the garage is not a significant part of the setting of the house because it is only visually related through paint color, which is not a permanent element. The proposed future use of the site on which the garage stands would be concrete paving in front of the new garage.

The proposed garage would be placed farther to the rear of the lot than the existing garage, an appropriate location per the Guidelines. The garage would be approximately twice as large as the existing, with a footprint of 282 square feet. However, the square footage of the proposed garage would be approximately one-tenth of the house following the construction of the additions described above, and its roof height would be several feet lower than the height of the house roof. The proposed exterior materials are non-historic, but they are compatible per the Guidelines (B.13).

**CLARIFICATIONS**

1. What is the proposed material of the shutters on the garage? Would they be paneled or louvered? Would they be functional or decorative?
2. What is the proposed material of the new framed lattice?
3. What is the proposed material of the pedestrian door on the north elevation of the garage?

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B.1-B.13 above, Staff believes that the additions and new garage proposed in this application would not impair the historic or architectural character the property or the surrounding district. Pending satisfactory clarification of the questions above, Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Mr. Kearley, the owner’s representative and project architect, was present to discuss the application. Mr. Kearley stated that the shutters on the garage would be decorative, louvered wood to match the existing on the house. The garage door would be galvanized steel with four panels. The lattice infill would be pressure treated wood in a wood frame, 2” above grade to match the existing.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony. The Board had no questions or comments.

Mr. Stone opened the application to public comment. With no one speaking in favor of or in opposition to the application, 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 was approved unanimously.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Roberts moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, the two proposed additions to the house, the demolition of the existing garage, and the construction of a new garage would not impair the integrity of the house or the surrounding district and a Certificate of Appropriateness be granted.

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

2020-12-CA: 204 S. Dearborn Street
Applicant: Ernest Philon on behalf of Jake and Mable James
Received: 2/12/2020
Meeting: 3/4/2020

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: T-3
Project: Install 10’x12’ storage shed; widen gate opening to 12’ (double leaf)

BUILDING HISTORY

The Staffen House is a one and one-half story frame worker’s cottage constructed c. 1871. The steeply pitched, side-gabled roof shelters an integral, full-width front 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 before the Architectural Review Board (ARB) in April 2014. Approval was sought after-the-fact for the installation of ten vinyl windows with snap-in muntins. The application was not approved, and the ARB instead approved the installation of salvaged, wood, six-over-six windows.

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

1. “A new accessory structure should be compatible with those in the district.”
   a. “Design an accessory structure to be subordinate in scale to that of the primary structure.” (9.1)
   b. “Locate a new accessory structure in line with other visible accessory structures in the district...traditionally located at the rear of a lot.” (9.2)
   c. “Materials that are compatible with the historic district in scale and character are acceptable. These often include wood frame, masonry, cement-based fiber siding [and] installations (pre-made, store-bought sheds, provided they are minimally visible from public areas).” (9.2)
   d. “Materials that are not compatible with the historic district in scale and character are unacceptable. These often include metal (except for a greenhouse), plastic (except for a greenhouse), [and] fiberglass (except for a greenhouse).” (9.2)

2. “Design a fence to be compatible with the architectural style of the house and existing fences in the neighborhood.
   a. Install a simple wood or wire fence.
b. “Face the finished side of a fence toward the public right-of-way.
c. Based on the chosen fence material, use proportions, heights, elements, and levels of opacity similar to those of similar materials and styles seen in the historic district.
d. Design a fence located behind the front building plane to not exceed 72” in height.” (10.2)

C. Scope of Work (per submitted application and plans):
   1. Install prefabricated 10’x12’ shed at the northwest corner of the property.
      a. The shed would be one story in height.
      b. The side-gabled roof would be clad in gray shingles to match the house.
      c. The walls would be composed of wood, and the walls and contrasting trim would be painted to match the house.
      d. The single wood slab door would be located on the east elevation and would be painted to match the exterior walls.
      e. The louvered vents in the gable ends would be painted to match the trim.
      f. The shed would rest on a cinder block pier foundation.
   2. Remove existing 6’ wide fence gate and replace with two gates with a total width of 12’.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the installation of a prefabricated shed behind a contributing structure and the widening of a gate opening in the Church Street East Historic District. The Guidelines state that new accessory structures should be subordinate in scale to the primary structure on a property (B.1.a). At one story in height and with a fractional footprint, the shed would be clearly subordinate to the house, which is crowned by a steeply pitched, character-defining roof. The Guidelines further state that new accessory structures should be placed in line with other accessory structures in the neighborhood, typically at the rear of the lot (B.1.b). The proposed shed would be placed at a rear corner of the property, in accordance with the Guidelines. As to materials, the Guidelines state that compatible materials include wood frame and masonry (B.1.c). The proposed exterior material for the shed is wood with a shingled roof. Cinder block piers are proposed for the foundation. While cinder block is not considered a traditional material in this context, the shed would be obscured from public view by the existing 6’ privacy fence.

The application proposes widening the existing 6’ gate at the east elevation of the existing privacy fence to 12’. The Guidelines do not offer specific directives regarding gate openings. However, the proposed widening of the opening in the fence would be closed with a matching gate to the existing, resulting in a double-leaf opening.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2) above, Staff believes the proposed shed and gate widening would not impair the historic or architectural character of the property or the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Eric Nelson and Mr. Ernest Philon, the owner’s representatives, were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.
Mr. Stone asked if the fence would be rebuilt or just modified. Mr. Philon stated it would be modified.

Someone asked if the accessory building would be painted to match the house, and Mr. Nelson replied that it would.

Mr. Stone opened the application to public comment. With no one speaking in favor of or in opposition to the application, 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 was approved unanimously.

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Mr. Roberts moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, the proposed new accessory structure and widening of the existing fence opening along Dearborn Street would not impair the integrity of the house or the surrounding district and a Certificate of Appropriateness be granted.

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

2020-13-CA: 1359 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Wayne Reyner on behalf of Chris and Lesley Rainosek
Received: 2/13/2020
Meeting: 3/4/2020

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Paint brick exterior

BUILDING HISTORY

The two-story, brick-veneered Colonial Revival style house was constructed c. 1940. The first and second floors are elaborated by a two-belt contrasting string course, and brick quoining accentuates the corners. A brick chimney is located at the east end of the side-gabled roof, which is covered in composition shingles. The centrally placed, wood-paneled front door is sheltered by a copper-clad flared portico roof resting on wrought iron supports. The portico is reached by a set of five concrete steps. The central two-story mass is framed by one-story, side-gabled wings to each side. There have been no apparent additions; however, based on the different mortar and large size, the attic vent on the west elevation may have been changed.

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. According to the MHDC vertical files, this property appeared before the Architectural Review Board (ARB) in December 2019. The application requesting to enclose a side porch with matching brick to create a master bedroom closet, enclose a rear porch to create a utility room, and replace windows with wood types of the same pattern and profile was approved by the ARB.

B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts, in pertinent part, state the following:
   1. “Distinctive stylistic features and other examples of skilled craftsmanship should be preserved.”
   2. “Do not cover or obscure original building materials.”
   3. “Use of color and color schemes that reflect a building’s predominant historic period are encouraged. A painting project should reflect the historic character of the property and of the district.”
   4. “Do not paint over exposed brick.”
C. Scope of Work (per submitted application and plans):
   1. Paint the brick exterior of the house with Benjamin Moore Glacier White.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The subject property, 1359 Dauphin Street, is a contributing property within the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The application under review involves painting the unpainted brick exterior of the house in Glacier White.

The brick veneer exterior is composed of bricks in varying shades of red, brown, and black. The bricks are laid in a running bond with concave masonry joints. The bricks have never been painted (B.2). Because painting the brick exterior would obscure the designer’s intended visual effect, and the change is not reversible without causing damage to the outer shell of the bricks, the Design Review Guidelines do not permit painting unpainted brick (see B.4).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B.1-B.4 above, Staff believes the proposed exterior painting would impair the architectural or historical character of the existing house on the property and the surrounding district. Staff recommends denial of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Reyner, the owners’ representative, was present to discuss the application. Mr. Reyner stated that it was the owners’ intention to brighten up the aesthetics of the house.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Stone noted that the subject house is the only two-story brick residence in the area.

Ms. Harden asked if the bricks were laid in a pattern. Mr. Roberts thought they were common red brick.

Mr. Roberts inquired whether the proposed paint color was a very bright white as the name “Glacier White” suggests, or if it is a more yellowish white, as the reproduction printed for Board members appeared. Mr. Reyner stated it was more yellowish.

The Board discussed precedent for painting previously unpainted brick exteriors, as the Guidelines explicitly state that exposed brick should not be painted. Ms. Harden noted that painting brick leads to maintenance problems, as moisture forms within the house that normally would migrate out through bricks would become trapped by the paint, causing paint failure and bricks to pop out.

Mr. Stone opened the application to public comment. With no one speaking in favor of or in opposition to the application, 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 was approved unanimously.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Roberts moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, the proposed painting of the brick exterior in Glacier White would not impair the historic or architectural integrity of the house or the surrounding district and a Certificate of Appropriateness be granted.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Davis and was approved on a 4-1 vote. Ms. Harden was opposed.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2020-14-CA: 104 South Ann Street
Applicant: Pete Blohme
Received: 2/12/2020
Meeting: 3/4/2020

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing
Zoning: B-2
Project: Demolish fire-damaged house; install 6’ wood fence on north, west, and south property lines; lay gravel

BUILDING HISTORY

The National Register nomination for the Old Dauphin Way Historic District states that the one-story, frame, front-gabled house was constructed c. 1950. Until a two-story apartment building on the property was demolished in 2011, the house was part of a larger complex. The Staff Report for the demolition of the apartment building notes that the structure had been ancillary to a dwelling that was no longer extant at that time (2011). Contrary to the National Register nomination, the materials and features of the subject house appear to be those of one constructed c. 1910-1940. The bungalow type house was clad in wood clapboards, and it has many features of the Craftsman style of architecture (popular from 1905-1930 with slightly later examples in less metropolitan areas) including paired wood six-over-six windows, exposed rafter tails under the eaves, and a pane-and-panel door typical of the era. The shed-roofed front porch of the house was enclosed with modern materials at an unknown date prior to 1984.

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. According to the MHDC files, this property appeared previously appeared before the Architectural Review Board (ARB) in 2011, when the ARB approved a Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition of the two-story apartment building discussed above.

B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts (Guidelines) state, in pertinent part:
   1. “Consider the current significance of a structure…”
      a. “Consider the condition of the structure in question. Demolition may be more appropriate when a building is deteriorated or in poor condition.”
      b. “Consider whether the building is one of the last remaining positive examples of its kind in the neighborhood, county, or region.”
c. “Consider the impact that demolition will have on surrounding structures, including neighboring properties, properties on the same block or across the street, or properties throughout the individual historic district.”
d. “Consider the future utilization of the site.”
e. “If a development is proposed to replace a demolished historic structure, determine that the proposed replacement structure is consistent with the guidelines for new construction in historic districts…” (12.0)

C. Scope of Work (per submitted application):
1. Demolish existing, fire-damaged structure.
2. Install 6’ wood fencing on north, west, and south sides of the property.
3. Lay gravel on lot for use as parking.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application concerns the demolition of a derelict, fire-damaged residence in the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The house sustained significant damage in a fire in November 2019. The house is a non-contributing structure and is located toward the rear (west end) of the lot, where it is not especially obvious from Ann Street.

Applications for Certificates of Appropriateness for the demolition of structures within historic districts must considered in light of the significance of the structure in question; the condition of the structure; whether the structure is the last remaining positive example of its kind in the neighborhood, county, or region; the impact of demolition on surrounding structures, and the future utilization of the site.

The subject house is a non-contributing structure within the Old Dauphin Way Historic District, although its likely construction date falls within the district’s period of significance (1827-1941). Because the structure is considered non-contributing to the district, the building is not considered significant.

The building is in poor condition. In addition to significant fire damage, there is evidence of termite damage and rot. The property has not been occupied legally for at least ten years, and it has been used by vagrants and animals for shelter. The lack of regular maintenance and use by animals has had deleterious effects upon the structure.

The building in question is a Craftsman style bungalow, which was a very popular residential type and style at the beginning of the twentieth century. The building is not unusual, nor is it the last remaining of its type and style in the district, county, or region.

The demolition of this structure, which is situated almost 200 feet west of Ann Street, would have little to no impact on neighboring structures or the neighborhood, as it is not very obvious from the public right-of-way.

The proposed future use of the site is parking on gravel. This use is low-impact and reversible. Given the existing zoning, the site may be developed in the future for a commercial use, or the owner may seek a rezoning to develop housing on the property.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B.1 above, Staff believes the proposed demolition would not impair the historic character of the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.
PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Blohme, the property owner, was present to discuss the application. Mr. Blohme stated that he had purchased the property across the street from the subject property for use as offices for his business and a new barber shop. His immediate intent with the subject property is to use it as employee parking.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Stone stated that the ARB normally would review a site plan illustrating the proposed graveled area and fence locations. He stated the Board could approve the proposed demolition but not the proposed parking. Mr. Stone recommended that, in the absence of a parking plan, Mr. Blohme may wish to amend the application to include demolition and the planting of sod only.

Mr. Blohme agreed and amended his application to include only demolition of the existing house and the planting of sod.

Mr. Stone opened the application to public comment. With no one speaking in favor of or in opposition to the application, Mr. Stone closed the period of public comment.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Roberts moved that, based on the evidence presented in the application and the amendments made by the owner, the Board finds the facts, as amended.

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Roberts moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, the proposed demolition of the existing house and planting of sod on the property would not impair the historic or architectural integrity of the surrounding district and a Certificate of Appropriateness be granted.

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

2020-15-CA: 306 S. Broad Street
Applicant: Gillian McGee on behalf of William Faircloth
Received: 2/17/2020
Meeting: 3/4/2020

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Repair rotted wood siding, fascia, soffit, and trim; replace front and back doors; replace all windows; install wood shutters on façade; replace existing front porch decking; construct rear addition and back porch; repaint exterior; install 6’ privacy fence; repair and paint brick piers; install new lattice panels; and repave front walkway with Old Mobile brick.

BUILDING HISTORY

The one-story, frame cottage was constructed in 1898. The house has a high hipped roof with front-facing gable-roofed porch. The porch roof is supported by turned posts.

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. According to the MHDC files, this property has not appeared previously before the Architectural Review Board (ARB).

B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts (Guidelines) state, in pertinent part:
   1. “Preserve the key historic walls of a building.
      a. Maintain significant historic facades in their original form.
      b. Maintain historic façade elements.” (5.3)
   2. “Preserve original building materials.
      a. Repair deteriorated building materials by patching, piecing-in, consolidating, or otherwise reinforcing the materials.
      b. Remove only those materials which are deteriorated and beyond reasonable repair.
      c. Do not remove original materials that are in good condition.” (5.4)
   3. “Use original materials to replace damaged materials on primary surfaces where possible.
      a. Replace only the amount of materials required.
      b. Do not replace building materials on the primary façade, such as wood siding and masonry, with alternative or imitation materials unless it cannot be avoided.
      c. Wholesale replacement of exterior finishes is generally not allowed.” (5.6)
4. “When replacing materials on a non-primary façade or elevation, match the original material in composition, scale, and finish.
   a. Replace exterior finishes to match original in profile, dimensions, and materials.” (5.7)
5. “Preserve and repair original masonry materials.
   a. Preserve masonry features that define the overall historic character, such as walls, cornices, pediments, steps, and foundations.
   b. Unpainted 19th century imported Philadelphia brick and locally manufactured brick may not be painted. In cases where historic brick has been painted previously, the paint color should be a suitable color to match the age and architectural style of the structure.” (5.8)
6. “Repair or replace a damaged historic door to maintain its general historic appearance.
   a. Replacements should reflect the age and style of the building.
   b. Use materials that are comparable to that of the original.” (5.15)
7. “Preserve historic stylistic and architectural details and ornamentation.
   a. Preserve…cornices, turned columns, brackets, exposed rafter tails, jigsaw ornaments, and other key architectural features that are in good condition.
   b. Retain historic details and ornamentation intact.
   c. Retain and treat historic exterior stylistic features and examples of skilled craftsmanship with sensitivity.
   d. Repair historic details and ornamentation that are deteriorated.” (5.17)
8. “Where historic [wooden or metal] windows are intact and in repairable condition, retain and repair them to match the existing as per location, configuration, detail, and material.
   a. Preserve historic window features, including the frame, sash, muntins, Mullions, glazing, sills, heads, jambs, moldings, operation, and groupings of windows.
   b. Repair rather than replace frames and sashes, wherever possible.” (5.20)
9. “When historic windows are not in a repairable condition, match the replacement window design to the original.
   a. 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.
   b. Use any salvageable window components on a primary elevation.” (5.21)
10. “When a historic window is missing on a key, character-defining wall, use a historically accurate replacement.
   a. Historically accurate light patterns shall be employed.
   b. 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.
9. A double-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.” (5.22)
11. “Replace shutters where they previously existed when possible.
   a. Size new shutters to precisely fit the window opening.
   b. Use operable shutters where feasible.
   c. Where shutters are fixed, use shutters that are hung on the window in a fashion that appears similar to operable shutters.” (5.24)
12. “Place an addition so that it is subordinate to the historic residential structure.
   a. Place and design an addition to the rear or side of the historic building wherever possible.” (6.9)
13. “Design an addition to be compatible in massing and scale with the original historic structure.
   a. Design the massing of an addition to appear subordinate to the historic building.
   b. Where possible, match the foundation and floor height of an addition to those of the historic building.” (6.10)
14. “Design the exterior walls of an addition to be compatible in scale and rhythm with the
original historic structure.
   a. Design the height of an addition to be proportionate with the historic building,
      paying particular attention to the foundation and other horizontal elements.
   b. 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.” (6.11)
15. “Clearly differentiate the exterior walls of an addition from the original historic structure.
   a. Use a physical break or setback from the original exterior wall to visually separate the
      old from new.
   b. Use an alteration in the roofline to create a visual break between the original and new,
      but ensure that the pitches generally match.” (6.12)
16. “Use exterior materials and finishes that are comparable to those of the original historic
    residential structure in profile, dimension, and composition. Modern building materials will
    be evaluated for appropriateness or compatibility with the original historic structure on an
    individual basis, with the objective of ensuring the materials are similar in their profile,
    dimension, and composition to those of the original historic structure.
    a. 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.
    b. Use a material with proven durability.
    c. Use a material with a similar appearance in profile, texture, and composition to those
       on the original building.
    d. Choose a color and finish that matches or blends with those of the historic building.
    e. Do not use a material with a composition that will impair the structural integrity and
       visual character of the building.” (6.13)
17. “Design a roof of an addition to be compatible with the existing historic building.
   a. Design a roof shape, pitch, material, and level of complexity to be similar to those of
      the existing historic building.
   b. 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.
   c. Use a roofing material for an addition that matches or is compatible with the …
      historic building and the district.” (6.14)
18. “Design roofs such that the addition remains subordinate to the existing historic buildings in
    the district.” (6.15)
19. “Design doors and doorways to an addition to be compatible with the existing historic
    building.
    a. If a historic door is removed to accommodate the addition, consider reusing it on the
       addition.
    b. Design a door and doorway to be compatible with the historic building.
    c. Use a door material that is compatible with those of the historic building and the
       district.
    d. Use a material with a dimensionality (thickness) and appearance similar to doors on
       the … historic building.
    e. 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.” (6.16)
20. “Design piers, foundations, and foundation infill on a new addition to be compatible with
    those on the historic building.
    a. Match the foundation of an addition to that of the original.
    b. Use a material that is similar to that of the historic foundation.
    c. Match foundation height to that of the … historic building.
    d. Use pier foundations if feasible and if consistent with the original building.
e. Do not use raw concrete block or wood posts on a foundation.” (6.19)

21. “Use details that are similar in character to those on the historic structure.
   a. Match a detail on an addition to … the … historic structure in profile, dimension, and material.
   b. Use ornamentation on an addition that is less elaborate than that on the original.
   c. Use materials for details on an addition that match those of the original in quality and feel.
   d. Match the proportions of details on an addition to match the proportions used on the … historic structure.” (6.20)

22. “Design a window on an addition to be compatible with the … historic building.
   a. Size, place, and space a window for an addition to be in character with the original historic building.” (6.21)

23. “Design a fence to be compatible with the architectural style of the house and existing fences in the neighborhood.
   a. Install a simple wood or wire fence.
   b. Face the finished side of a fence toward the public right-of-way.
   c. Based on the chosen fence material, use proportions, heights, elements, and levels of opacity similar to those of similar materials and styles seen in the historic district.
   d. Design a fence located behind the front building plane to not exceed 72” in height.” (10.2)

   a. If a historic sidewalk is damaged, replace the damaged portion to match the original.” (10.4)

25. “The utilization of period color and paint schemes that reflect the historic character of the property is encouraged.” (5.9)

26. “Alterations that have no historic basis and which seek to create an earlier or later appearance are discouraged.” (5.0)

C. Scope of Work (per submitted application and plans):
   1. Repair rotten wood siding, fascia, soffit, and trim on all elevations.
   2. Repaint the body of the house (siding, windows, trim, stair risers, porch supports, brackets, and porch railing) in Benjamin Moore “Brilliant White.” Repaint the porch decking and stair treads in Benjamin Moore “Anchor Gray.” Repaint the shutters, exterior doors, brick piers, and lattice panels in BLP Paint “Bellingrath Green.”
   3. Repair and repoint brick piers as necessary; paint Bellingrath Green (all elevations).
   4. Install new framed wood lattice panels painted Bellingrath Green (all elevations)
   5. Rehabilitation work on the East elevation (façade) would consist of the following.
      a. Replace front door with paneled wood door. Replace existing transom with new wood transom with matching mullion spacing.
      b. Replace existing wood steps with new wood stairs and railing.
      c. Existing brick piers repaired and repointed as necessary and painted Bellingrath Green.
      d. Install new framed wood lattice panels painted Bellingrath Green.
      e. Repair turned wood posts and brackets.
      f. Install new wood six-over-six windows and wood louvered shutters.
      g. Install a new wood railing and balusters to enclose the front porch.
      h. Repair existing brick chimney.
      i. Remove a set of steps leading to a door set back from the front plane of the façade and the door. Install one-over-one wood window in place of the door.
      j. Remove all windows and replace with wood six-over-six (on outer ends) and six-over-nine windows.
   6. Rehabilitation work on the North elevation would consist of the following.
a. Remove one small aluminum one-over-one window in the original mass of the house, and cover the resulting opening with wood siding to match existing.

b. Remove one-over-one aluminum window in existing, historic rear addition (at west end of elevation) and cover the resulting opening in wood siding to match the existing.

c. Remove all remaining aluminum windows and replace with wood one-over-one types.

7. Rehabilitation work on the West elevation (rear) would consist of the following.
   a. Remove existing stairs and door (this area to be enclosed by proposed addition described in item 9 below).
   b. Remove existing, small one-over-one window at south end of the elevation, and cover the resulting opening with wood siding to match the existing.
   c. Install one (1) one-over-one wood window in the existing, historic, hip-roofed addition at the north end of the elevation.

8. Rehabilitation work on the South elevation would consist of the following.
   a. Remove one window in the rear addition at the west end of the elevation (this area to be enclosed by proposed rear addition, described in item 9 below).
   b. Replace existing windows with wood one-over-one types.

9. Construct rear (west elevation) addition and deck.
   a. The addition would be one story in height and measure 7’-3” deep by 24’ wide.
   b. The deck would measure 8’ deep by 16’ wide.
   c. The addition would have a shed roof covered with architectural shingles to match the existing roofing.
   d. The addition would be sheathed in wood siding and trim to match the existing.
   e. One (1) wood, one-over-one window would be located in the north end of the addition, and a new paneled wood door would give access to the deck from the addition.
   f. The deck would be enclosed with wood railing and balusters, and the deck would be accessed from the back yard via a set of wood steps.

10. Site improvements would consist of the following.
    a. Remove existing concrete front walkway and install a new walkway to the front porch, paved with Old Mobile bricks.
    b. Install a 6’ wood privacy beginning at the northeast corner of the existing rear addition and running to the north property line, turning west along the north property line and running west to the northwest corner of the property, then turning south to the southwest corner of the property, then running east to a point parallel with the eastern plane of the façade, and turning north to the southeast corner of the house.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application concerns the rehabilitation of and additions to a contributing residence in the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. When undertaking rehabilitation work on historic properties, the Guidelines emphasize preserving original building materials through repair and replacing materials only when they are too damaged or deteriorated to be reasonably repairable (B.2, B.5); using original materials to replace damaged materials on primary elevations (B.3); matching replacement materials to the original materials in composition, scale, and finish (B.4); preserving historic stylistic and architectural details and ornamentation (B.7); replacing missing historic windows on key walls with historically accurate replacements (B.8), and replacing missing shutters when possible (B.9).

The proposed rehabilitation would preserve the existing historic wood wall cladding as possible, the brick chimney, the brick piers, and wood elements such as the fascia, soffits, and trim. The application proposes repair for those wood and brick elements that require it. The proposed rehabilitation would preserve key architectural features such as the hipped roof, turned porch supports and decorative brackets, and the
The proposed rehabilitation also would replace all windows on the house. The Guidelines state that the wholesale replacement of exterior finishes is generally not allowed (B.3). However, the aluminum windows on the north, west, and south elevations clearly are not original to the structure, and the applicant proposes to replace all windows with wood types to match the existing styles and mullions. The Guidelines are not entirely clear when addressing the replacement of non-original or non-historic windows. They state that, “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.” (B.9) This guidance appears under a heading addressing original windows but refers to existing windows. The applicant’s request notes that the new windows would match the muntins and styles of the existing windows, which appears to conform to the Guidelines (B.10). In reference to the historic wood windows located on the façade, the Guidelines state that repairable windows should be retained and repaired (B.8). If the existing windows are irreparably damaged or decayed, the Guidelines require that the replacement window match the design of the original’s location, framing, and light configuration. (B.9) The Guidelines further direct that any salvageable window components should be used on a primary elevation. (B.10) The submitted application states only that the new windows would match the existing styles and mullions. It is not clear that the replacement windows would fit into the existing openings, whether the existing framing and sills would be retained, or if the existing windows could be repaired and retained.

The submitted application proposes replacing missing shutters where possible. However, there is no physical indication that shutters previously have existed where they are proposed on the façade. The Guidelines state that “Alterations that have no historic basis and which seek to create an earlier or later appearance are discouraged.” The applicant has presented evidence that shutters were placed on nearby residences of similar age and style, suggesting that the proposed shutters would not “seek to create an earlier or later appearance.” Therefore, the addition of louvered wood shutters to the façade would be in accordance with the Guidelines.

The Guidelines direct that a damaged historic door should be repaired or replaced “to maintain its general historic appearance. Replacements should reflect the age and style of the building.” The materials used should be comparable to those of the original (B.6). The application proposes to replace the front and back doors with “historically appropriate wood doors,” and the plans show paneled doors that appear appropriate. Therefore, the replacement of the existing doors would be in conformance with the Guidelines.

The application states that the front porch decking would be replaced with tongue-and-groove flooring, but the precise material is not provided. Because the decking is a horizontal element, is not visually apparent from the public right-of-way, and must be hardy enough to endure being repeatedly walked upon, it may not be especially important for the porch decking to be wood. Furthermore, the Guidelines direct that porches be repaired in a way that maintains their original character (6.5), and the replacement of the porch decking with tongue-and-groove would preserve the historic character of the porch.

The submitted plans show the replacement of an existing door in the existing, historic, hip-roofed addition on the east elevation with a window and the removal of the related steps. It is not known whether the door opening is original to the addition in which it exists. However, given the awkward placement of the door, it likely is not original to the historic addition. Converting the existing doorway to a window would, at minimum, preserve the existing fenestration pattern on the facade of the house and might return the opening to its original type (window). (B.14)
Two windows would be removed, and their openings closed with siding to match the existing. One window would be added to the west (rear) elevation of the existing, historic addition. Given the material (aluminum), configuration (one-over-one), and small size of the windows to be removed, they do not appear to be original to the house. Furthermore, the windows are located in areas that are not evident from the public right-of-way (the west [rear] end of the north elevation and the rear [west] elevation). Though the size, placement, and spacing of the windows in the proposed addition would be compatible with the existing house, the window to be added would not be visible from the public right-of-way, as it would be located on the rear elevation (B.22). Furthermore, the window to be added on the rear elevation would replace a window removed and boarded over at an unknown previous date, thus restoring the historic appearance of the northern bay of the west elevation. These changes would not have a significant impact upon the historic character of the property (B.14).

The house would be repainted in colors within the approved BLP palette and in the same family of colors. The color choices are in conformance with the Guidelines, which direct that period paint and color schemes be used (B.24).

The proposed addition and deck would be placed at the rear of the house, and the living area would have a shed roof of lower elevation than the existing main, hipped roof. The addition would have a footprint of 192 square feet, compared to the approximate 1,260 square feet of the existing house, and the floor level would match that of the existing house. As required by the Guidelines, the addition would be subordinate to (B.12) and its massing and scale would be compatible with the existing house (B.13, B.17, B.18).

The walls of the addition would be clad in wood siding to match the existing house, and the roof would be covered in architectural shingles to match the existing, thus being compatible as required by the Guidelines (B.14, B.16). At the same time, the addition would be stepped back from the original western and southern elevations of the original house, differentiating those walls from the historic block of the house. The shed roof of the addition would create an additional visual break between the original house and the addition (B.15).

As noted above, the proposed door on the west elevation of the addition would be a wood paneled type appropriate for the historic character of the house, as directed by the Guidelines (B.19). The foundation of the addition would be brick piers, and the piers would be infilled with framed wood lattice, all matching the existing house (see B.20). As noted above, the windows in the addition would be wood one-over-one sashes matching the other replacement windows on the house.

The application proposes the installation of a 6’ wood privacy fence to enclose the back yard. The fence is proposed to run south from the southeast corner of the house, in line with the easternmost plane of the house. The Guidelines allow for such fencing to be located behind the front wall plane (B.23). Therefore, the location of this portion of the proposed fence is not in conformance with the Guidelines.

**CLARIFICATIONS**

1. Will the clapboards removed from the rear elevation to construct the addition be reused elsewhere on the building?
2. Is there evidence of shutters existing previously on the façade?
3. Will the new shutters be operable?
4. Is evidence of irreparable damage to or decay of the existing windows, requiring replacement of the windows on the façade, available?
5. Where windows are to be replaced, will the existing/historic frames, sills, jambs, and opening sizes be preserved?
6. What material is proposed for the front porch decking?
RECOMMENDATION

Move the portion of the fence running south from the southeast corner of the house at least one foot behind (west of) the front (east) plane of the house.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B.1-B.25 above, Staff believes the proposed rehabilitation and rear addition would not impair the historic or architectural character of the subject property or the surrounding district. Upon satisfactory clarification of the questions and recommendation above, Staff recommends approval of the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Faircloth, the property owner, and Ms. McGee, the architect, were present to discuss the application. Ms. McGee stated that the porch decking would be replaced with cured wood. The fence would be pushed back to the rear corner of the house to comply with the Guidelines. She further stated that the existing windows on the façade are not salvageable; they would be replaced with windows to match what would have been installed originally, and the existing frames. Sills, jambs. And opening sizes would be preserved. Finally, any useable wood siding removed from the rear elevation to accommodate the addition would be reused.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Ms. Harden asked if the existing windows on the façade are original. Ms. McGee stated that they are not.

Mr. Stone opened the application to public comment. With no one speaking in favor of or in opposition to the application, Mr. Stone closed the period of public comment.

FINDING OF FACT

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

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Roberts moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, the proposed rehabilitation of the house would not impair the historic or architectural integrity of the subject house or the surrounding district and a Certificate of Appropriateness be granted.

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