A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Steve Stone, called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. Christine Dawson, Historic Development staff, called the roll as follows.
   **Members Present:** Abby Davis, Kim Harden, Craig Roberts, Steve Stone, Gypsie Van Antwerp, and David Barr (alternate)
   **Members Absent:** Catarina Echols, Andre Rathle, Joseph Rodrigues, and Jim Wagoner
   **Staff Members Present:** Bridget Daniel and Christine Dawson

2. Ms. Van Antwerp moved to approve the Minutes of the July 1, 2020 meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Roberts and approved unanimously.

3. **Adoption of the Agenda**
   Mr. Roberts moved that the Architectural Review Board find that all agenda items listed for the July 15, 2020 Architectural Review Board meeting be adopted as necessary for the performance of the ARB’s essential minimum functions. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hardin and approved unanimously.

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

B. MID-MONTH APPROVALS

1. **Applicant: Terrell Mannion**
   a. Property Address: 11 N. Dearborn Street
   b. Date of Approval: 06/29/2020
   c. Project: Reroof.

2. **Applicant: All Weather Roofing & Construction LLC**
   a. Property Address: 105 S. Ann Street
   b. Date of Approval: 07/01/2020

3. **Applicant: MA & D REMODELING LLC**
   a. Property Address: 1707 Government Street
   b. Date of Approval: 07/01/2020
   c. Project: Remove termite damage and replace with new (interior), stain glass window frame and casing- detach and reset. All replacement materials to match in material, dimension, and profile.

4. **Applicant: 5 Star Roofing & Restoration**
   a. Property Address: 357 Adler Avenue
   b. Date of Approval: 07/01/2020
   c. Project: 29 square shingles re-roof, charcoal gray.

5. **Applicant: James E. & Susan H. Crowson**
   a. Property Address: 1110 Savannah Street
   b. Date of Approval: 07/02/2020
   c. Project: Repaint house, body white; trim extra-white. Porch deck Bellingrath Green.

6. **Applicant: Franchise Management Services Inc.**
   a. Property Address: 315 N Joachim Street
   b. Date of Approval: 07/02/2020
   c. Project: Replace 38 squares of roofing using GAF Timberline HDZ charcoal shingles. Install new ridge vents, boots and drip edge. Replace up to 3 sheets of decking if needed.
7. Applicant:  City of Mobile Real Estate Management  
   a. Property Address:  104 S Lawrence Street  
   b. Date of Approval:  07/06/2020  
   c. Project:  20"x26" yard blade sign; metal; "Mobile County Legislative Delegation".

8. Applicant:  BBVA Compass Bank  
   a. Property Address:  101 Dauphin Street  
   b. Date of Approval:  07/07/2020  
   c. Project:  Remove and replace upper building sign on E elevation, approx. 23'x7', halo-lit, "BBVA".

9. Applicant:  BBVA Compass Bank  
   a. Property Address:  101 Dauphin Street  
   b. Date of Approval:  07/07/2020  
   c. Project:  Remove and replace non-illuminated window sign above E elevation entrance. "BBVA".

10. Applicant:  BBVA Compass Bank  
    a. Property Address:  101 Dauphin Street  
    b. Date of Approval:  07/07/2020  
    c. Project:  Remove and replace non-illuminated window sign over door on N elevation, "BBVA".

11. Applicant:  BBVA Compass Bank  
    a. Property Address:  101 Dauphin Street  
    b. Date of Approval:  07/07/2020  
    c. Project:  Remove and replace rooftop sign on N elevation; approximately 2'x7'; illuminated; "BBVA".

C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2020-34-CA:  260 S. Ann Street  
   a. Applicant:  Mr. Douglas Kearley, architect, on behalf of Jason and Carolyn Smith  
   b. Project:  Construct 14’x20’ porch extension at the rear to match existing porch; construct a deck; add a master suite with connecting hyphen  
   APPROVED – CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

2. 2020-35 -CA:  201 Rapier Avenue  
   a. Applicant:  Mr. Douglas Kearley, architect, on behalf of Ms. Mary Elizabeth Harper  
   b. Project:  Reconstruct partial-width two-story porch on façade  
   APPROVED – CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

D. OTHER BUSINESS  
The next ARB meeting is scheduled for August 5, 2020.

Public comment regarding items on this agenda will be accepted via e-mail (christine.dawson@cityofmobile.org) or USPS (Mobile Historic Development Commission, P.O. Box 1827, Mobile, AL 36633) until 5PM on Tuesday, July 14, 2020.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2020-34-CA: 260 S. Ann Street
Applicant: Mr. Douglas Kearley, architect, on behalf of Jason and Carolyn Smith
Received: 6/22/2020
Meeting: 7/15/2020

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Leinkauf
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Construct 14’x20’ porch extension at the rear to match existing porch; construct a deck; add a master suite with connecting hyphen

BUILDING HISTORY

The house on the property is a one-story frame house with Craftsman style elements, constructed c. 1913.

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

B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts (Guidelines), in pertinent part, state the following.
1. “Design a rear porch so that its height and slopes are compatible with the original historic structure.” (6.17)
2. “Design a new porch to be compatible with the existing historic building.
   • Design the scale, proportion, and character of a porch addition element, including columns, corner brackets, railings and pickets, to be compatible with the existing historic residential structure.
   • Match the foundation height of a porch addition to that of the existing historic structure.
   • Design a porch addition roofline to be compatible with the existing historic structure.
   • Use materials for a porch addition that are appropriate to the building.” (6.18)
3. “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.
4. Design an addition so that the overall characteristics of the site (site topography, character-defining site features, and significant district vistas and public views) are retained.
5. 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.
6. Design an addition to be compatible with the color, material, and character of the property,
neighborhood, and environment.

7. Design the building components (roof, foundation, doors, and windows) of the addition to be compatible with the historic architecture.

8. Maintain the relationship of solids to voids (windows and doors) in an exterior wall as is established by the historic building.

9. 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.” (6.0)

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

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

12. “Place an addition so that it is subordinate to the historic residential structure.
   - 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.
   - Where possible, match the foundation and floor heights 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.
   - Design the height of an addition to be proportionate with historic building, paying particular attention to the foundation and other horizontal elements.
   - Design the addition to express floor heights on the exterior of the addition in a fashion that reflects floor height of the original historic building.” (6.11)

15. “Clearly differentiate the exterior walls of an addition from the original historic structure.
   - Use a physical break or setback from the original exterior wall to visually separate the old from new.” (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.
   - Use a material with a similar appearance in profile, texture, and composition to those on the original building.
   - Choose a color and finish that matches or blends with those of the historic building.” (6.13)

17. “Design a roof of an addition to be compatible with the existing historic building.
   - Design a roof shape, pitch, material, and level of complexity to be similar to those of the existing historic building.
   - 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.
   - Use a roofing material for an addition that matches or is compatible with the original
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.
  • Use a door material that is compatible with those of the historic building and the district.
  • Use a material with a dimensionality (thickness) and appearance similar to doors on the original historic building.
  • 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)

C. Scope of Work

1. Enlarge the existing rear porch by extending it to the north and east, wrapping around the existing northwest corner of the house.
   a. The porch would measure 20’-0”x14’-0”, or 280 square feet.
   b. The materials and detailing of the proposed porch addition would match those of the existing rear porch, including plain wood supports infilled with insect screening.
   c. The proposed porch addition would rest on brick piers infilled with framed wood lattice.
   d. The hipped roof of the proposed extension would be clad in metal roofing to match the existing house.
   e. The porch would be accessed from the interior of the house via the proposed hyphen and from the exterior via the proposed rear deck.

2. Construct a master suite to the north of the existing house, connected via a hyphen.
   a. The hyphen and master suite would be placed on a brick pier foundation with framed wood lattice infill. The addition would be clad in wood siding to match the existing house. The hyphen would be topped with a pitched roof. The roof of the master suite would be gabled on the east elevation and hipped on the west; the metal roofing would match the existing house. The architectural details of the addition, including the knee brackets under the east-facing gable end, trim, and eaves, would match the details of the existing house.
   b. The connecting hyphen would extend from the west side of the former chimney location on the north side of the house by removing a window in that location and replacing it with a cased opening. The footprint of the hyphen proper would be 37’-0”x4’-6”, or approximately 166.5 square feet.
   c. Three rooms would advance east toward South Ann Street from the hyphen – a storage room, a bathroom, and a laundry room. The footprint of these three rooms collectively would be 23’-4”x5’-8”, or approximately 131.88 square feet. The south end of these rooms would be separated from the existing north elevation of the house by approximately 14’.
   d. Fenestration on the east side of the hyphen would consist of three evenly spaced nine-over-one clad windows. Fenestration on the west side of the hyphen would consist of one nine-over-one clad window toward the north end and one 3’-0”x7’-0” clad door with a three—light transom above. The door would have a night-light window over a single panel.
   e. The master suite would be located at the north end of the hyphen, and its overall measurements would be 20’-0”x33’-0”. The footprint of the master suite would be just over 430 square feet.
   f. The fenestration on the east side of the master suite addition would consist of three nine-over-one clad windows in a bay. Fenestration on the north elevation would consist of two nine-over-one clad windows, and the west elevation would have one nine-over-one clad window.

3. Construct a wood deck off the proposed porch extension.
   a. The deck would measure 20’-0”x14’-0”, or 280 square feet.
   b. The deck would be accessed from the back yard via an extension of the existing concrete sidewalk from the driveway and four pressure treated wood steps.
STAFF ANALYSIS

The subject property, 260 S. Ann Street, is a contributing property within the Leinkauf Historic District. The application involves the extension of the rear porch to the north, the construction of a master suite connected to the existing house via a hyphen, and the construction of a deck in the nook created by the proposed porch extension and hyphen.

The Guidelines state that a new rear porch should be designed “so that its height and slopes are compatible with the original historic structure.” (B.1) The proposed porch addition would have a clearly subordinate roof to both the existing rear porch, which has a higher hipped roof, and the higher roof of the existing house. The Guidelines further instruct that new porches should be compatible with the existing historic buildings to which they are attached by designing “the scale, proportion, and character of a porch addition element, including columns, corner brackets, railings and pickets, to be compatible with the existing historic residential structure”; matching the foundation height of a porch addition to that of the existing historic structure, and using materials for the porch addition that are appropriate to the building. (B.2) The proposed porch extension is designed with posts, railings, screening, and other materials to match the existing rear porch. The foundation height would match the existing porch. Although the footprint of the porch addition may seem slightly large in comparison to the size of the existing porch, the addition roughly mimics the wrapping of the exiting front (east) porch around the north side of the house and is, therefore, compatible with the existing house and in conformance with the Guidelines.

The proposed hyphen and master bedroom suite addition to the north elevation of the house would be accessed from the existing house by removing a window on the north elevation and creating a cased opening to the west of a former chimney. In constructing an addition, the Guidelines call for the least possible loss of historic fabric (B.3) and for additions to be as reversible as possible (B.5). The proposed conversion of a window to a doorway complies with these directives, as an opening in the exterior wall of the existing house will be expanded but not newly created, and a very small area of the existing exterior of the house would become interior. Therefore, the loss of historic fabric would be minimal, and if the hyphen is removed in the future, restoration of the window and the wall below it would be feasible.

The roof, walls, and foundation of the proposed hyphen/master bedroom suite addition would match those of the existing house, in conformance with the Guidelines. (B.6, 7, 10) However, the walls of the addition also would be differentiated from the existing house through the use of recessed wall planes. The east plane of the hyphen/master bedroom suite addition would be located well behind the plane of the existing house façade, and the west elevation of the hyphen would be located approximately 20 feet behind the rear (west) elevation of the house. Although the west elevation of the master suite would be located approximately in the same plane as the rear elevation of the existing house, the two walls would be separated by almost 40 feet (the length of the hyphen, plus a small step back), and it would be obvious to the observer that the master bedroom suite is an addition. (B.9, 10, 11, 15, 16) Furthermore, the addition would be placed to the side of and behind the front wall plane of the existing historic house, in a subordinate location (B.12).

The Guidelines direct that additions should be designed to “maintain the relationship of solids to voids (windows and doors) in an exterior wall as is established by the historic building” (B.8) The regular fenestration pattern in the proposed addition recalls the regular pattern on the existing house and is, therefore, compatible.

The hyphen/master bedroom suite addition would be comprised of approximately 740 square feet of indoor area, or approximately 38% of the 1,945 square feet of the existing house. The addition would significantly alter the massing of the property. The Guidelines state that additions should be designed “to be compatible in massing and scale with the original historic structure.” (B.13) The massing of the existing house is box-like and is compatible with other properties on the street. The massing of the proposed addition clearly would differentiate it from the existing historic structure, but it also would introduce a more contemporary
linear element. The vacant lot to the north of the existing house is very visible, and the proposed massing of the hyphen/master bedroom suite would be visually very different from the existing house and its neighbors. Therefore, while the scale of the addition is not out of keeping with the subject property or the neighborhood, the massing of the proposed addition does not appear to be compatible with the more box-like form of the historic house.

The roof of the proposed rear porch addition would conform with the Guidelines, as its pitch would subtly continue the pitch of the existing hipped roof over the existing rear porch. The proposed roof shapes of the hyphen/master bedroom suite addition, gabled and hipped, are roof types that are present in the existing house. They also are significantly lower than the roof of the existing house. Therefore, the proposed roofs comply with the Guidelines’ instructions that new roofs be compatible with and subordinate to the existing roof. (B.17, 18)

The proposed pane-and-panel door leading from the proposed hyphen to the proposed deck would be compatible with the existing building, as prescribed by the Guidelines. (B.19) The nine-light window in the top of the door would recall the nine-over-one windows seen in the historic house and the pane-and-panel front entry door.

The Guidelines do not address decks. However, in 2012, the ARB delegated to Staff the approval of decks constructed “in rear yards provided the deck is not visible from the public right-of-way.” The proposed deck would not be visible from the public right-of-way, as it would be obscured by the proposed rear porch extension and the existing garage.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on Section B above, Staff believes the proposed rear porch extension and deck would not impair the architectural or historic character of the subject property or the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of those portions of the application. However, Staff is concerned that the linear nature of the 37-foot long hyphen may impair the architectural and/or historic character of the existing house and surrounding neighborhood and, therefore, recommends that the hyphen be shortened.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

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

FINDING OF FACT

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

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Roberts moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, the proposed rear porch extension, deck, and hyphen/master bedroom suite addition would not impair the architectural or historic character of the building or the surrounding district and a Certificate of Appropriateness be granted.

Ms. Hardin seconded the motion, and it was approved with one opposed, Steve Stone.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2020-35-CA: 201 Rapier Ave.
Applicant: Mr. Douglas Kearley, architect, on behalf of Ms. Mary Elizabeth Harper
Received: 6/16/2019
Meeting: 7/15/2020

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Reconstruct partial-width two story porch on facade

BUILDING HISTORY

The two-story, wood-framed Queen Anne style house was constructed in 1899. The house matches in design four other Charles Hearin houses constructed nearby (205 and 207 Rapier Avenue and 1154 and 1156 Palmetto Street). The two-story porches survived on three of those four houses, and the porch on 205 Rapier Avenue was restored in 1993. It appears the two-story porch was removed from the subject house’s façade at some point in the 20th century, as a porch is indicated on the 1905 Sanborn map.

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 appeared previously before the Board on one occasion. In February 1994, the ARB approved an application to construct a one-story rear (east elevation) porch.

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

   1. “If replacement is required, design [the porch] to reflect the time period of the historic structure.
      • Replace a historic porch element to match the original.
      • Use replacement materials and elements that are appropriate to the style, texture, finish, composition, and proportion of the historic structure.
      • Where an original porch is missing entirely, base a replacement porch on physical or photographic evidence. If no evidence exists, draw from similar structures in the neighborhood.
      • When reconstructing a porch, pay particular attention to matching the handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions, and decorative details.
      • Do not use cast iron columns or railing where no evidence exists that these elements were used historically.
• Do not use a brick base for a wood column (exception is Craftsman style).
• Do not use a railing that is too elaborate for the building (of a different style).
• Do not relocate an original front stairway or steps.” (6.6)

C. Scope of Work:
1. Reconstruct the two-story wood porch on the west elevation (façade) based on surviving examples on nearby Charles Hearin houses.
   a. The porch would be partial width, spanning from the northwest corner of the house to the south end of the central window of the bay on the façade. The porch would rest on a brick pier foundation, infilled with framed wood lattice, and be topped with a shed roof clad in shingles to match the existing house.
   b. The existing concrete porch floor, brick foundation and steps, iron porch support, brick steps, and brick planter would be removed.
   c. The porch would be accessed by a set of four wood steps leading from the existing front walkway. The steps would be flanked by wood handrails consisting of 2”-square balusters and 6”-square newel posts.
   d. The floor level of the porch would match the existing interior first floor level, expressed by a matching skirt-board.
   e. The lower level of the porch would have two columns visible on the north elevation, three columns visible on the west elevation (façade), and one column visible on the south elevation. The columns would be composed of 3” square upper portions with base and cap resting on 9”-square paneled wood bases. The porch would be enclosed by wood handrailng and 2”-square balusters.
   f. The upper level porch would have two columns visible on the north elevation, four columns visible on the west elevation (façade), and one column visible on the south elevation. The columns above the handrail would be 6”-square turned with caps and bases and would rest on plain square bases. The upper porch would be enclosed by a handrail with 2”-square turned wood balusters.
   g. The triangular area on north and south ends of the porch between the roof and the cornice would be infilled with wood beadboard.

2. The decorative spindle at the south end of the bay would be restored to match the one at 205 Rapier Avenue.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The subject property, 201 Rapier Avenue, is a contributing structure within the Oakleigh Historic District. The application under review involves the construction of a two-story porch on the façade (west elevation), which would likely be a restoration of a historic element of the property.

The proposed two-level, partial-width front porch would reflect the time period of the historic structure. (B.1). The precise design of the original front porch is not known; however, the proposed design draws from other houses in near proximity that also were constructed by Charles Hearin around the turn of the twentieth century, in conformance with the directives in the Guidelines to “draw from similar structures in the neighborhood” when the original design is unknown. The proposed materials and elements “are appropriate to the style, texture, finish, composition, and proportion of the historic structure”, as they match the existing house and blend with its style. Finally, the steps leading to the porch would be located where they have been historically, in line with the front door. Given the proposed design and materials for the proposed front porch, it is in conformance with the Design Review Guidelines.
STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on Section B above, Staff believes that the proposed two-story front porch would not impair the architectural or historic character of the subject property or the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

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

FINDING OF FACT

Ms. Davis 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. Hardin and approved unanimously.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Roberts moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, the proposed rear porch extension and deck would not impair the architectural or historic character of the building or the surrounding district and a Certificate of Appropriateness be granted.

Ms. Davis seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.