ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
July 17th 2019 – 3:00 P.M.
Multi-Purpose Room, Mobile Government Plaza, 205 Government Street

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Steve Stone, called the meeting to order at 3:09 p.m. Paige Largue, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
   - **Members Present:** Steve Stone, Jim Wagoner, Joseph Rodrigues, Craig Roberts, Robert Brown and Nick Holmes.
   - **Members Absent:** Kim Harden, Catarina Echols, Abby Davis, Andre Rathle, and David Barr.
   - **Staff Members Present:** Bridget Daniel, Paige Largue, Flo Kessler, Shayla Beaco and Marion McElroy.

2. Mr. Roberts moved to approve the minutes of the June 26, 2019 meeting. The motion received a second and was approved unanimously.

3. Mr. Roberts moved to approve the Mid-Months as written. Mr. Brown seconded the motion. The Mid-months were approved unanimously.

B. MID-MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED.

1. **Applicant:** Betty Lagman
   - **Property Address:** 65 S. Montgomery Street
   - **Date of Approval:** 6/10/2019
   - **Project:** Reroof with architectural shingles in black.

2. **Applicant:** Bruce Pfeiffer
   - **Property Address:** 200 Marine Street
   - **Date of Approval:** 6/10/2019
   - **Project:** Repair or replace deteriorated wood to match in dimension, profile and material. Repaint to match.

3. **Applicant:** Demtrius James of Guncle’s, LLC
   - **Property Address:** 1252 Government Street
   - **Date of Approval:** 6/10/2019
   - **Project:** Exterior Repaint of building with Benjamin Moore Paint Colors of White, Dark Gray and Black.

4. **Applicant:** Ryan Lewis
   - **Property Address:** 161 Michigan Avenue
   - **Date of Approval:** 6/11/2019
   - **Project:** Replace balusters per existing; repair/replace rotten wood per existing; remove non-historic apartment stair at rear; repaint tin approved colors or in white. Reroof in architectural or asphalt shingles in neutral color. Repoint chimneys or rebuild to match in dimension, profile and material.

5. **Applicant:** Thomas and Susan Thomas
   - **Property Address:** 1744 Hunter Avenue
   - **Date of Approval:** 6/12/2019
   - **Project:** Repair and replace wooden windows to match in dimension, profile and configuration. Replace one pane picture windows on later addition with aluminum clad windows with multi-pane transom.
6. Applicant: Robert and Sharon Anderson
   a. Property Address: 166 Hannon Avenue
   b. Date of Approval: 6/12/2019
   c. Project: Install storm windows to fit openings. Screws and frame will be minimal in profile.

7. Applicant: Hebrides, LLC
   a. Property Address: 206 Government Street
   b. Date of Approval: 6/13/2019
   c. Project: Repaint facade, medium gray body, lighter gray trim, dark gray band across top. balcony dark green.

8. Applicant: Leslie Ridley on behalf of Child Day Care Association
   a. Property Address: 209 S Washington
   b. Date of Approval: 6/13/2019
   c. Project: Run 6 foot privacy fence along north fence, design to be short at column and up to six feet, making gentle curves.

9. Applicant: Point Cartwright Properties
   a. Property Address: 456 S. Broad Street
   b. Date of Approval: 6/13/2019
   c. Project: Repair/rotten wood as needed to match original in material, profile and dimension, repaint body slate, roof gable dark blue, door yellow, trim white, porch ceiling Haint Blue, patio basil.

10. Applicant: Megan Haller
    a. Property Address: 1320 Dauphin Street
    b. Date of Approval: 6/14/2019
    c. Project: Gravel driveway, build rear deck, replace privacy fence to match existing.

11. Applicant: John Wink
    a. Property Address: 501 Eslava Street
    b. Date of Approval: 6/14/2019
    c. Project: Reroof with architectural shingles - timberline, charcoal in color.

12. Applicant: Michael Spina
    a. Property Address: 1252 Government Street
    b. Date of Approval: 6/14/2019
    c. Project: Existing sign board mounted on building, new tenant to place business name within panel.

13. Applicant: Guy Marcum
    a. Property Address: 1309 Azalea Street
    b. Date of Approval: 6/17/2019
    c. Project: Tear out old concrete driveway, replace.

    a. Property Address: 1406 Dauphin Street
    b. Date of Approval: 6/18/2019
    c. Project: Reroof flat roof to match.

15. Applicant: Liberty Roofing on behalf of Emil Kraft
    a. Property Address: 1702 Hunter Avenue
    b. Date of Approval: 6/20/2019
    c. Project: Reroof with architectural shingles in pewter gray.

16. Applicant: LaClede Investors, LLC
    a. Property Address: 150 Government Street
    b. Date of Approval: 6/20/2019
    c. Project: Install hanging blade sign with business name, Pond.
17. **Applicant:** Marion Timmons on behalf of Stephen and Mary Harris  
a. Property Address: 311 S. Ann Street  
b. Date of Approval: 6/20/2019  
c. Project: Repair deteriorated wood to match in dimension, profile and material. Repaint to match or using historic color chart.

18. **Applicant:** New Hand Signs, LLC  
a. Property Address: 9 Dauphin Street  
b. Date of Approval: 6/20/2019  
c. Project: Install metal hanging blade that is 13\" x 36\"

19. **Applicant:** Mick Blankenship  
a. Property Address: 1725 Laurel Street  
b. Date of Approval: 6/21/2019  
c. Project: Reroof ancillary building with 5V Crimp or standing seam metal.

20. **Applicant:** Mario Saybe Construction  
a. Property Address: 458 Dexter Avenue  
b. Date of Approval: 6/21/2019  
c. Project: Reroof with architectural shingles in driftwood.

21. **Applicant:** David Miller  
a. Property Address: 1204 Old Shell Road  
b. Date of Approval: 6/25/2019  
c. Project: Reroof with architectural shingles in charcoal or black.

22. **Applicant:** David Miller  
a. Property Address: 1204 Old Shell Road  
b. Date of Approval: 6/25/2019  
c. Project: On ancillary building: paint exterior to match; repair and reroof with asphalt shingles to match; repair garage door and steps.

23. **Applicant:** Chad Wynne  
a. Property Address: 124 Houston Street  
b. Date of Approval: 6/25/2019  
c. Project: Install outlets that our out of public view. Install gutter over back door.

24. **Applicant:** Chris Teague  
a. Property Address: 400 Charles Street  
b. Date of Approval: 6/28/2019  
c. Project: Erect six foot privacy fence from front plane of house south to property line, run east to tie-in with existing fence.

25. **Applicant:** Ben Cummings of Cummings Architecture  
a. Property Address: 1413 Old Shell Road  
b. Date of Approval: 6/28/2019  
c. Project: Construct two ADA ramps necessary for code. ramps will be constructed of painted wood with framed lattice screening base. Applicant will return with more plans for permanent ramps.

26. **Applicant:** Grimm Horst  
a. Property Address: 366 Tuttle Avenue  
b. Date of Approval: 7/2/2019  
c. Project: Reroof with architectural shingles in charcoal or black.
C. APPLICATIONS

1. 2019-23-CA: 661 Dauphin Street (Held over from June 26th at the request of the applicant)
   a. Applicant: Mr. Jim Walker on behalf of Dauphin Management, LLC
      APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

2. 2019-24-CA: 602 Church Street (Held over from June 26th at the request of the applicant)
   a. Applicant: Mr. Jim Walker on behalf of James And Woodrow Walker
      APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

3. 2019-25-CA: 169 Dauphin Street (Held over)
   a. Applicant: Mr. Davis McPhillips of Dale Incorporated on behalf of Landmark Square, LLC
   b. Project: Fenestration Related: Replace existing wooden windows to custom aluminum clad windows.
      APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

   a. Applicant: Mr. Douglas B. Kearley of DBK, Inc. on behalf of Mr. DeMarkus Burroughs Boykin, Sr.
   Project: Rehabilitation, Addition and Fenestration Related: Repair/replace to match in kind; Relocate existing front door opening; construct rear addition and garage.
      APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

5. 2019-28-CA: 1310 Azalea Street
   a. Applicant: Mr. Clark Robenstine and Mr. Tony Matthews
   b. Project: Fenestration Related: Remove wood windows and replace with double paned wooden windows to match in dimension, profile and configuration.
      APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

6. 2019-29-CA: 113 Monroe Street
   a. Applicant: Mr. Larry Posner on behalf of Fort Conde Restoration Venture
   b. Project: Fenestration Related: Repair selected windows. Replace other windows on a non-contributing multi-use building from existing wood to double paned aluminum clad. Install doors in existing window openings.
      APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

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

2019-23-CA: 661 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Jim Walker on behalf of Dauphin Management, LLC
Received: 5/19/2019 (Held over per applicant’s request at June 26th meeting)
Meeting: 7/17/2019

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: T5.1
Project: Addition Related: Construct gallery on front façade.

BUILDING HISTORY

The 1878 Atlas does not show a building on this site. The 1885 Sanborn map shows a brick building with
umbrage. The 1904 Sanborn map shows the building in use as an auto repair business. Sometime sin the
mid-century the façade was heavily altered. In the late 1990’s and early 2000’s, the storefront was restored
to a historic appearance.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “the Board shall not approve any application
proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the change…will not materially impair the
architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or
the general visual character of the district.”

STAFF REPORT

A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board in July 2002 according to the
MHDC vertical files. At that time, a restoration of the storefront was approved. The proposed scope
of work includes constructing a gallery on the front façade.
B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
1. “Galleries in Mobile are defined as building elements that project from the façade to
provide an outdoor deck with railings for upper floors that has supports that extend to the
sidewalk.”
2. “Galleries serve as important outdoor amenities for upper floors and provide shade and
coverage for sidewalk areas.”
3. “These elements are common on many buildings and are key features for a historic
commercial building. Historic balconies and galleries should be preserved.”
4. “Where replacement of a balcony or gallery is required, replace it in a fashion that preserves
the key character-defining features of a historic building.”
5. “Replace a historic balcony or gallery where documentation exists of its previous
existence.”
6. “Design a replacement balcony or gallery to reflect the design of the original building. The
ARB will consider modern balconies.”
7. Regarding ornamentation and detail: “Where exact reconstruction is not possible, use a
simplified interpretation of the original design detail that maintains the scale and character
of original or similar detailing used on buildings of the same period.”
8. “Use a replacement material that is visually compatible with the original.”
C. Scope of Work (per submitted site plan):
   1. Construct a one-story gallery.
      a. Gallery will be constructed of metal.
      b. The gallery will measure 7’9” in depth and 12’5” inches in height.
      c. The gallery will have columns 3” in diameter will capital and base.
      d. Decorative iron ornamentation will be employed.
      e. A section of the gallery on the western portion will be recessed to accommodate a lamp post.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of a gallery on a contributing commercial building. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts defines a gallery as “are defined as building elements that project from the façade to provide an outdoor deck with railings for upper floors that has supports that extend to the sidewalk.” The proposed gallery does not have a railing above, however it is employs columnar supports.

A new gallery will be constructed. Mobile’s downtown is filled with galleries and balconies. The gallery will be constructed on a restored façade which possesses a storefront with transoms. Evidence seen on the 1885 Sanborn map shows a brick building with some form of umbrage over the sidewalk (See B-5). The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state to design a replacement balcony or gallery to reflect the original design of the building (See B-6). The gallery’s proposed ornamentation is appropriate for a building constructed before the 1861. The guidelines also state to design a gallery or balcony, “in a fashion that preserves the key character-defining features of a historic building” (See B-4). As designed, the transom windows are covered by ornamentation.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Consider removing the ornamentation from the proposed gallery.
2. Expose transom.
3. Consider an awning or abat vent.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-4) and B (1-7), as proposed, staff believes this application would impair either architectural or the historical character of the building or the surrounding district. Staff recommends the applicant return with a revised drawing addressing the transom windows and ornamentation.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Nick Holmes recused himself from the discussion.

Mr. Jim Walker, applicant, was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Stone welcomed the applicant and asked if he had any clarifications, comments or questions. Mr. Holmes, the applicant’s architect, explained the ornamentation of the iron gallery will not cover the historic transom. He stated the applicant would like to keep the ornamentation on the balcony since it does not harm the fabric of the building and can be removed. Mr. Holmes noted the gallery
roof is proposed to recess around a light post but after meeting with the Consolidated Review Committee the lamp post may be removed and the gallery roof straightened.

Mr. Walker stated the gallery was intended to increase the amount of seating accessed on the sidewalk.

No further discussion from the Board ensued at that time.

Mr. Stone opened the application to public comment. With no one to speak either for or against the application, Mr. Stone closed the period of public comment.

Mr. Roberts stated he did not have an issue with the ornamentation. Mr. Walker clarified the location of a cast iron column for Mr. Roberts.

Mr. Holmes provided Mr. Rodrigues clarification on the design of the gallery with the light post in situ. Mr. Holmes confirmed for Mr. Stone that there will be four supporting columns. Mr. Wagoner stated the Board could choose to amend the decision on the application to include both a straight roof on the gallery or one that recessed around a light pole.

**FINDING OF FACT**

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, as written.

The motion received a second and was unanimously approved.

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the facts as approved by the Board, a Certificate of Appropriateness be granted for the construction of a gallery with or without a recessed portion for a lamp post.

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

2019-24-CA:  602 Church Street
Applicant:  Jim Walker on behalf of James and Woodrow Walker
Received:  5/19/2019 (Held over per applicant’s request at June 26th meeting)
Meeting:  7/17/2019

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District:  Church Street East
Classification:  Contributing (Main Residence)
Zoning:  T-4
Project:  Ancillary Related: Construct ancillary building.

BUILDING HISTORY

The ancillary building will be constructed on the Fairley House property. The Fairley House, constructed in 1870, is a two-story building with brick façade and stucco side elevations constructed in the Federal style with cast iron gallery.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the change…will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the district.”

STAFF REPORT

A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board in 1994 according to the MHDC vertical files. At that time, an application to rebuild porches and conduct repair work was approved. The proposed scope of work includes constructing an ancillary building.

1. “In general, the addition of a new accessory structure to a historic property or within a historic district should refer to guidelines for new construction presented in Chapters 6 and 7.”
2. “A new accessory or ancillary structure should be compatible with those in the district.”
3. “Design an accessory or ancillary structure to be subordinate in scale to that of the primary structure.”
4. “Locate a new accessory or ancillary structure in line with other visible accessory structures in the district. These are traditionally located at the rear of the lot.”
5. “Materials that are the same as the original, or that appear similar in texture and finish to the original are acceptable. These often include: wood panel; wood panel with glass lights; leaded glass with lead cames; and metal with a painted finish.”
6. Regarding new construction, “New designs should relate to the fundamental characteristics of the historic houses on a block while also conveying the stylistic trends of today. It may do so by drawing upon the basic elements of a building that make up a part of the character of the property. Such features include the way in which a building is located on its site, the manner in which it relates to the street and its basic mass, form and materials. When these design variables are arranged in a new building to be similar to those seen traditionally, visual compatibility results.”
7. Regarding contemporary design, “The Architectural Review Board will pay particular attention to mass, scale, siting and overall design, but all elements will be considered. The design professional or owner must demonstrate that a contemporary structure will not materially impact the historic integrity of the surrounding district.”

8. Regarding compatibility, “successful compatible design will also consider the distinctive architectural character of the street, the neighborhood and the district.”

9. Regarding differentiation, “New construction should respect the historic character of the neighborhood through the considerations described above. Replication of a historic building is generally not appropriate, but will be considered.”

C. Scope of Work (per submitted site plan):
   1. Construct a new ancillary building (a carriage house) and relocate existing fence.
      a. The ancillary building will be setback 6’2” from the front façade line and 11’3” from the eastern lot line.
      b. The ancillary building (carriage house) will be rectangular in massing.
      c. The carriage house will be 12’2-1/2” x 30’2-1/2” in size and will be two-stories in height.
      d. The floor will be raised and skirted by skimmed CMU with faux vents interspersed.
      e. The walls will be clad with wooden lap-siding so as to match the siding found on the addition of the body of the main residence.
      f. Exterior will be painted to match the main dwelling.
      g. Windows will be multi-pane in configuration and composed of wood.
      h. Board and batten shutters will slide over doors and windows.
      i. Rafter tails will be exposed.
      j. A kneebrace will be employed under the eave of the West (side) Elevation.
      k. A complex gable roof (gable roof with shed roof addition) will surmount the carriage house.
      l. The roof will be sheathed in asphalt shingles matching those found on the body of the house.
   2. South (front) Elevation
      a. A six-paned window will be located centrally on the first floor.
      b. A set of sliding barn shutters will be installed over the window.
      c. A two-over-two window will be installed centrally in the gable.
   3. West (side) Elevation
      a. A central portion of the roof will be elevated.
      b. Rafter tails will be exposed.
      c. A set of three casement windows in a two-over-five configuration with two-over-two transom light above will be installed centrally on the elevation.
      d. Sliding shutters will be installed and able to close over the windows.
      e. A set wooden steps will access the West elevation.
   4. North (rear) Elevation
      A four-over-four window will be installed centrally in the gable.
   5. East (side) Elevation
      a. The East elevation will mimic the West elevation.
      b. A set of steps will access a wooden door on the northern portion of the elevation.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the construction of an ancillary building, a carriage house, in the Church Street East district. The Design Review Guidelines state that new ancillary construction should be compatible with those in the district (See B-3.). New ancillary construction involves review of the following considerations: placement, scale, massing, façade elements, and materials so as to obtain compatibility between the new and the existing.
As to placement, the proposed new construction, a carriage house, would occupy a rear portion of the lot and would be located directly behind the main house. Ancillary buildings were constructed behind the front plane of residential buildings in general and in the rear of the (See B-5). The proposed building is located behind the front plane of the house, but not towards the rear. The side (East) setback of the garage will be in line with the current dwelling, while the hyphen will be inset in nature. The side setback of is permissible by reason of the Downtown Development District Code. The aforementioned taken into account, the proposed building’s placement is not compatible with traditional ancillary construction.

With regard to scale and massing, the Design Review Guidelines state that new ancillary construction should be subordinate to the main building (See B 3-4.). The height of the building at 20’ 4-1/8” makes the proposed building subordinate to of the historic body of the house (See B-2.). The proposed two-story, the raised elevation (construction on skimmed CMU), and secondary use of the building cause for the design to be compatible with the context.

Façade elements are crucial to compatibility of compatible ancillary construction (See B-8). Exposed rafter tails will employed. Board and batten or “barn” door shutters are proposed. The existing main house has evidence of louvered shutters. With regard to materials to be employed on ancillary construction, the Design Review Guidelines allow for composite materials if said materials appear similar in texture and finish of the original (See B-6.). Wooden siding will be employed on the walls. Lapsiding is found on an addition of main residence. Roofing shingles will similarly match those surmounting the body of the house. The doors and windows will be constructed of wood.

RECOMMENDATIONS
1. Consider a simpler roof structure.
2. Consider removing sliding barn doors and shutters or using a louvered shutters.
3. Consider using a paneled door.
4. Consider boxing eaves on West and East elevation.
5. Relocate proposed site further into rear yard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-6), B (1-7, specifically siting) and B (1-8), as proposed, staff believes this application would impair either architectural or the historical character of the building or the surrounding district. Staff recommends the applicant return with revised site plan and elevation addressing location and façade elements.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Jim Walker, applicant, was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Stone welcomed the applicant and asked if he had any clarifications, comments or questions. Mr. Walker stating the ancillary building will be so that a friend who is need of medical care can be close by. He noted the loft would be for future use.

No further discussion from the Board ensued at that time.
Mr. Stone opened the application to public comment. With no one to speak either for or against the application, Mr. Stone closed the period of public comment.

Mr. Roberts inquired as to the architect of the project. Mr. Walker stated Ms. Courtney Barnett was the architect. Mr. Wagoner asked if the building could be recessed further to the rear corner of the property so that it would meet the Design Review Guidelines. Mr. Roberts stated it was an interesting design.

Mr. Rodrigues asked staff to address some of their recommendations. Ms. Largue attempted to address items expressed in the staff report included the improvement of the shutter design from a “barn” look to louvered or board and batten. Mr. Stone noted the color scheme would mimic that of the main house.

**FINDING OF FACT**

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, as written.

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

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the facts as approved by the Board, a Certificate of Appropriateness be granted for the construction of an ancillary pending the applicant provide a revised site plan which depicts the building’s change in location towards the rear corner of the lot.

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

2019-25-CA: 169 Dauphin Street
Applicant: Davis McPhillips of Dale Incorporated on behalf of Landmark Square, LLC
Received: 6/24/19, (Held over at June 26th meeting)
Meeting: 7/17/19

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: T5.2
Project: Fenestration Related: Related: Replace existing wooden windows to custom aluminum clad windows.

BUILDING HISTORY

The Guesnard/ Spira and Pincus Buildings was listed as a contributing building in 1979 on the National Register of Historic Places. 169 Dauphin Street was constructed circa 1879 and 171 Dauphin Street was constructed circa 1899. Originally the buildings existed separately. The buildings have been attributed to Rudolph Benz, although in the 1912 Trade Annual of the Mobile Press Register, Hutchisson and Denham listed the building at 169 Dauphin Street as one of their designs. A historic rehabilitation tax credit project was executed in 1988.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the change…will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the district…”

STAFF REPORT

A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on June 26, 2019 according to the MHDC vertical files. At that time a request to rehabilitate the building was held over for more information. The Board requested several items including a report on the condition of the windows, a drawing of the profiles proposed, and a mock-up. The proposed scope of work includes altering fenestration from wood to aluminum clad.

B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
1. Chapter 4, Overarching Preservation Principles: “Upgrade existing materials using recognized preservation methods whenever possible.”
2. “If replacement of a historic element is required, replace the historic element in kind, or with a product that is similar in visual character and durability to the original.”
3. “Significant features and stylistic elements should not be removed to the extent possible.”
4. “If disassembly is necessary for repair or restoration, use methods that minimize damage to original materials and facilitate reassembly.”
5. “If replacement of a historic element is required, replace the historic element in kind, or with a product that is similar in visual character and durability to the original.”
6. The following is the preferred sequence of improvements: “preserve, repair, reconstruct, replace or compatible alteration.”
7. “For most historic resources, the front façade is the most important to preserve intact. Alterations are rarely appropriate. Many side walls are also important to preserve where they are highly visible from public streets. By contrast, portions of a side wall that are not as visible may be less sensitive to change.”

8. “Removing original material diminishes the integrity of a historic property by reducing the percentage of building fabric that remains from the period of historic significance. Retaining the original material is always preferred. If this is not feasible, alternative materials may be considered. When used, an alternative material should convey the character, including detail and finish, of the original to the greatest extent feasible.”

9. Chapter 5, Design Guidelines Applicable to All Historic Properties: “Deteriorated architectural features shall be repaired rather than replaced, wherever possible. In the event replacement is necessary, the new material should match the material being replaced in physical character and durability. Composition, design, color, texture, and other visual qualities should appear similar to the original material. Repair or replacement of missing architectural features should be based on accurate duplications of features, substantiated by historic, physical or pictorial evidence.”

10. “The type, size, framing, and dividing lights of windows, as well as their location and configuration (rhythm), help establish the historic character of a building. Original window components should be retained to the extent possible. The character-defining features of a window should be preserved. Historic windows can be repaired through re-glazing and patching and splicing wood elements such as muntins, frame sill and casing. Repair and weatherization is generally more energy efficient and less expensive than replacement. Windows should be in character with the historic building.”

11. “For most contributing properties in historic districts, the windows that are on the front elevation and those on the sidewalls that are visible from the street will be the most important to preserve. Windows in other locations that have distinctive designs and that represent fine craftsmanship may also be important to preserve.”

12. “Where historic (wooden or metal) windows are intact and in repairable condition, retain and repair them to match the existing as per location, light configuration, detail and material.”

13. “Preserve historic window features, including the frame, sash, muntins, mullions, glazing, sills, heads, jambs, moldings, operation, and groupings of windows.”

14. “Repair, rather than replace, frames and sashes, wherever possible.”

15. “When historic windows are not in a repairable condition, match the replacement window design to the original.”

16. “In instances where there is a request to replace a building’s windows, the new windows shall match the existing as per location, framing, and light configuration.”

17. “A new window shall be installed in such a manner as to fit within the original window opening and match in depth and filling of the reveal. A reveal is the part of the side of a window opening that is between the outer surface of the wall and the window.”

18. “A doubled-paned or clad wood window may be considered as a replacement alternative only if the replacement matches the configuration, dimensions, and profiles of original windows.”

19. “For increased efficiency, storm windows can be installed. A storm window shall fit within the window reveal and avoid damaging window casings. Operable storm windows are encouraged.”


21. Chapter 7, Commercial Guidelines: “The placement, orientation and size of windows both on the ground floor and the upper floor significantly impact the appearance of the building and the streetscape. Windows in historic commercial buildings should be preserved.”

22. “Maintain the original space patterns and location of windows. Most display windows have a bulkhead below and a transom above.”

23. “Preserve the size and shape of an upper story window.”

24. “If required, replace original historic windows to be compatible with the windows on the original historic building.”
C. Scope of Work (per submitted site plan):

1. Remove existed wood windows and replace with simulated divided lite, double paned, aluminum clad windows.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the alteration of fenestration for contributing buildings located at 169-171 Dauphin Street. The application was held over on June 26th, 2019 to allow the applicant to gather more information for the Board. The owner would like to replace wooden windows to aluminum clad windows that would match in dimension and profile. Windows would be double paned.

This application calls for the alteration of fenestration. With regard to the windows, replacements will match the existing components as per location, light configuration, and detail (See B-9). In keeping with the Guidelines the proposed materials of aluminum clad in a matching light pattern is similar to the original (see B-9). Based on the MHDC vertical files work executed circa 1988 on the windows was limited to repair.

The Design Review Guidelines state where historic windows are intact they should be repaired, rather than replaced (See B-14). Where windows are not in repairable condition replacements may be employed to match in dimension, profile, and material. However, aluminum clad or double paned wood can be considered if it appears similar to the original in texture, profile, dimension, finish and configuration (see B-18). Based on Certificate of Appropriateness issued, the number of historic windows intact are unknown.

The RSA Battlehouse is an example of a commercial, multi-story, building downtown that was granted approval for replacement of wooden windows to aluminum clad. In 2002, work was approved to rehabilitate the existing windows or match in dimension, profile and material. In 2013, approval was granted for the RSA Battlehouse to remove wooden windows located above the second floor and replace with aluminum clad windows. The clad windows maintained the light configuration, moldings and casings.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-21) and B (1-24), Staff does believe replacing all windows will impair either the architectural or the historical character of the properties or district since the building is listed as contributing. Staff recommends a multi-fold approach. Staff recommends on the unoriginal windows (as noted by the applied muntins) on the second story of the Guesnard Building be replaced with aluminum clad to match in dimension profile or material. Staff recommends replacing the windows above the second story with aluminum clad since the minimal change in texture is not visible from public view. Staff recommends replacing the windows that are irreparable on the second floor of the buildings with wood to match in dimension or profile. Staff recommends repairing windows that are still in fair condition.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Davis McPhillips, applicant’s representative and vendor, and Mr. Richard Inge, owner, were present to discuss the application.
BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Stone welcomed the applicant and asked if he had any clarifications, comments or questions. Mr. McPhillips stated the applicant had been working on replacing the windows when a sash fell on the right of way. He explained the occurrence led to a previous meeting on June 26th with the ARB. He noted all the windows on the Guesnard Building had wooden pieces attached to the sash to prevent any potential incidents from damaged windows falling on the right of way. He further explained some of the window sashes on the Pincus/ Spira Building are original but the glass is tempered.

Mr. Inge stated when the building was purchased the windows were in poor condition. He explained he would prefer double paned aluminum clad windows to help with issues such as condensation and utilities.

Mr. McPhillips clarified for Mr. Roberts that the windows would be replaced on both buildings above the first floor. Mr. Roberts stated he had no issue with this particular window manufactured by Marvin.

Mr. Holmes stated his firm was the architect on the 1988 historic tax credit rehabilitation project on the property and the tempered glass and a wooden bar was installed to meet code. Mr. Holmes explained the proposed custom Marvin brand window was approved by the National Park Service in projects such as Barton Academy and Irby School.

Mr. McPhillips confirmed for Mr. Stone that the arched sash on the Guesnard building was divided.

No further discussion from the Board ensued at that time.

Mr. Stone opened the application to public comment. With no one to speak either for or against the application, Mr. Stone closed the period of public comment.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, as written.

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the facts as approved by the Board, a Certificate of Appropriateness be granted for the installation of custom, double pane, SDL, aluminum clad windows to match the dimension, profile of the current windows.

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

2019-27-CA: 352 S. Broad Street
Applicant: Mr. Douglas B. Kearley of DBK, Inc. on behalf of Mr. DeMarkus Burroughs
Boykin, Sr.
Received: 6/27/2019
Meeting: 7/17/2019

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Rehabilitation, Addition Fenestration Related: Repair/replace to match in kind; Relocate existing front door opening; construct a rear addition and garage.

BUILDING HISTORY

Two residences appeared on the 1904 Sanborn map for this site. A residence on the 1925 Sanborn map is has similar footprint to the current residence. Tax records show a significant increase between 1927 and 1928. The current configuration of this bungalow dates from 1928 and was constructed or reconfigured for W. B. Grimes and family.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9 of the Preservation Ordinance states “the Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds the change…will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the district.”

STAFF REPORT

A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on May 1, 2019 according to the MHDC vertical files. At that time a request for demolition was approved. The proposed scope of work includes repair and replacement of materials in-kind; the relocation of an existing door opening.

B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
   1. “Deteriorated architectural features shall be repaired rather than replaced, wherever possible. In the event replacement is necessary, the new material should match the material being replaced in physical character and durability. Composition, design, color, texture, and other visual qualities should appear similar to the original material. Repair or replacement of missing architectural features should be based on accurate duplications of features, substantiated by historic, physical or pictorial evidence.” (Chapter 5)
   2. “Remove only those materials which are deteriorated, and beyond reasonable repair.”
   3. “Use original materials to replace damaged materials on primary surfaces where possible.”(Section 5.6)
   4. “Use new roof materials that convey a scale and texture similar to those used traditionally.” (Section 5.13)
   5. Pertaining to roofs: “Muted grays and black are generally acceptable shingle colors.”
6. “The type, size, framing, and dividing lights of windows, as well as their location and configuration (rhythm), help establish the historic character of a building. Original window components should be retained to the extent possible. The character-defining features of a window should be preserved. Historic windows can be repaired through re-glazing and patching and splicing wood elements such as muntins, frame sill and casing. Repair and weatherization is generally more energy efficient and less expensive than replacement. Windows should be in character with the historic building.”

7. “For most contributing properties in historic districts, the windows that are on the front elevation and those on the sidewalls that are visible from the street will be the most important to preserve. Windows in other locations that have distinctive designs and that represent fine craftsmanship may also be important to preserve.”

8. “Original doors and openings, including their dimensions, should be retained along with any moldings, transoms or sidelights.” (Section 5.14)

9. “Preserve historic stylistic and architectural details and ornamentation.” (Section 5.17)

10. “Preserve storefronts, cornices, turned columns, brackets, exposed rafter tails, jigsaw ornaments and other key architectural features that are in good condition.”

11. “Where historic (wooden or metal) windows are intact and in repairable condition, retain and repair them to match the existing as per location, light configuration, detail and material.” (Section 5.20)

12. “Preserve historic window features, including the frame, sash, muntins, Mullions, glazing, sills, heads, jambs, moldings, operation, and groupings of windows.”

13. “Repair, rather than replace, frames and sashes, wherever possible.”

14. “For repair of window components, epoxies and related products may serve as effective solutions to material deterioration and operational malfunction.”

15. “When historic windows are not in a repairable condition, match the replacement window design to the original.” (Section 5.21)

16. “In instances where there is a request to replace a building’s windows, the new windows shall match the existing as per location, framing, and light configuration.”

17. “Design an addition so there is the least possible loss of historic fabric and so the character-defining features of the historic building are not destroyed, damaged or obscured.”

18. “Design an addition so that the overall characteristics of the site (site topography, character-defining site features, trees, and significant district vistas and public views) are retained.”

19. “Wherever possible, construct an addition in such a manner that, if the addition were to be removed, the essential form and integrity of the historic structure would be unimpaired.”

20. “Design an addition to be compatible with the color, material and character of the property, neighborhood and environment.”

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

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

23. “Differentiate an addition from a historic structure using changes in material, color and/or wall plane. Alternative materials, such as cement fiberboard, are allowed when the addition is properly differentiated from the original structure.”

24. “If the style of an addition is different than the original, use a style that is compatible with the historic context.”

25. “Place and design an addition to the rear or side of the historic building wherever possible.”

26. “Design the massing of an addition to appear subordinate to the historic building.”
27. “Where feasible, use a lower-scale connecting element to join an addition to a historic structure.”
28. “Where possible, match the foundation and floor heights of an addition to those of the historic building.”
29. “Design the height of an addition to be proportionate with the historic building, paying particular attention to the foundation and other horizontal elements.”
30. “Design the addition to express floor heights on the exterior of the addition in a fashion that reflects floor heights of the original historic building.”
31. “Use a physical break or setback from the original exterior wall to visually separate the old from new.”
32. “Use an alteration in the roofline to create a visual break between the original and new, but ensure that the pitches generally match.”
33. “Utilize an alternative material for siding as necessary, such as cement-based fiber board, provided that it matches the siding of the historic building in profile, character and finish.”
34. “Use a material with proven durability.”
35. “Use a material with a similar appearance in profile, texture and composition to those on the original building.”
36. “Choose a color and finish that matches or blends with those of the historic building.”
37. “Do not use a material with a composition that will impair the structural integrity and visual character of the building.”
38. “Do not use a faux stucco application.”
39. “Design a roof shape, pitch, material and level of complexity to be similar to those of the existing historic building.”
40. “Incorporate overhanging exposed rafters, soffits, cornices, fascias, frieze boards, moldings or other elements into an addition that are generally similar to those of the historic building.”
41. “Use a roofing material for an addition that matches or is compatible with the original historic building and the district.”
42. “If a historic door is removed to accommodate the addition, consider reusing it on the addition.”
43. “Design a door and doorway to be compatible with the historic building.”
44. “Use a door material that is compatible with those of the historic building and the district.”
45. “Use a material with a dimensionality (thickness) and appearance similar to doors on the original historic building.”
46. “Design the scale of a doorway on an addition to be in keeping with the overall mass, scale and design of the addition as a whole.”
47. “Match the foundation of an addition to that of the original.”
48. “Use a material that is similar to that of the historic foundation.”
49. “Match foundation height to that of the original historic building.”
50. “Use pier foundations if feasible and if consistent with the original building.”
51. “Do not use raw concrete block or wood posts on a foundation.”
52. “Match a detail on an addition to match the original historic structure in profile, dimension and material.”
53. “Use ornamentation on an addition that is less elaborate than that on the original structure.”
54. “Use a material for details on an addition that match those of the original in quality and feel.”
55. “A new accessory or ancillary structure should be compatible with those in the district.”
56. “Design an accessory or ancillary structure to be subordinate in scale to that of the primary structure.”
57. “Locate a new accessory or ancillary structure in line with other visible accessory structures in the district. These are traditionally located at the rear of the lot.”

58. “Materials that are the same as the original, or that appear similar in texture and finish to the original are acceptable. These often include: wood panel; wood panel with glass lights; leaded glass with lead cames; and metal with a painted finish.”

59. “Design a garage door to be simple and compatible with the primary building.”

C. Scope of Work:

1. Conduct repairs to the residence.
   a. Reroof the house with architectural shingles in neutral color.
   b. Repair and replace wood elements including columns, rafter tails, siding, fascia, soffits, and windows to match as per profile, dimension and material. Feather in wood siding as necessary.
   c. Repair when necessary wooden windows to match existing as per material, light configurations and moldings.
   d. Repair foundation piers and install new framed lattice fill between piers.
   e. Refinish and repair existing concrete stairs and porch.
   f. Remove a later shed roof addition from the rear of the house.
   g. East (Front Façade) Elevation
      i. Repair existing French doors and front door.
      ii. Relocate front door and northernmost French door further south.
   h. South (Side) Elevation
      i. Remove a centrally located at burned area of the house. Replace with a paired one-over-one wooden window
      ii. Remove casement window located towards the rear of the elevation to reuse on new addition.

2. Construct rear addition rear of residence.
   a. The addition will comprise a rectangular composition.
   b. The addition will be match the existing house in width and 24’8” in depth overall.
   c. The foundation treatment will match that of the existing house.
   d. The walls will be wooden siding to match.
   e. Windows will be wood to match existing.
   f. Corner-boards will be employed.
   g. The existing hipped roof will extend over the addition.
   h. The roof will be sheathed in shingles to match the existing house.
   i. Rafter tails will be employed to match existing.

1. North (side) Elevation
   a. The fenestration sequence will be as follows from East to West: on-over-one window, one-over-one window, repurposed casement window.

2. West (rear) Elevation
   a. A repurposed wooden door with transom will be installed and a stoop with wooden handrails constructed to access a new porch.
   b. A hipped roof will truncate into the existing roof. Aforementioned roof will cover the porch and stoop. The porch will be supported by boxed columns with capital and base.

3. South (side) Elevation
   a. The elevation will feature the following fenestration sequence from an easterly to westerly direction: one-over-one window, repurposed casement window.

3. Construct an ancillary garage at the rear of the residence.
   a. The garage will be a rectangular composition.
b. The garage will be a two vehicular garage located at the rear of the property at the northwest corner.
c. The garage will be 24’8” in depth overall.
d. The foundation treatment will match that of the existing house.
e. The walls will be wooden siding to match the existing house.
f. A hip roofed will surmount the garage.
g. The roof will be sheathed in shingles to match the existing house.
h. Rafter tails will be employed to match existing.
i. The North and West elevations will not feature fenestration.

4. South (façade) Elevation
   a. Two flush roll up garage doors will be employed.

5. East (side) Elevation
   a. A wooden or metal paneled door will be located on the southern portion of the elevation.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The application calls for the rehabilitation of an existing residence. Repair and replacement of in kind materials also informs the scope of work. Fenestration would be modified. A small later addition will be removed and a new addition constructed. An ancillary building will be constructed as well.

In accordance with the Design Review Guidelines, all repair and replacement work will match the original in profile, dimension and material (See B-1). The roof will be re-sheathed with asphalt shingles in a neutral hue (See B-4). Wooden elements will be replaced to match in dimension, profile and material (See B 6 and B-10 and B-13-15). Brick piers will be re-pointed and repaired rather than replaced.

Most of the fenestration changes are minimal to the building and are located on either a secondary elevation or at the rear of the residence. Several windows will be repaired or replaced to match the existing (See B-6). The South (side) Elevation will have a window removed from a burned portion of the house and replaced with an approvable wooden window. The North (side) Elevation will have a window located towards the rear of the original house removed and repurposed on the new elevation. A new window that matches existing windows will be placed in the aforementioned opening (See B-6 and B-7). The rhythm of the window locations on side elevations will be maintained. The application proposes an entrance door and French doors be relocated from the northern portion of the East (façade) Elevation further south to align centrally and symmetrically. The Design Review Guidelines state that front elevations are important to keep intact (See B-7). The guidelines go on to state “original doors and openings including their dimensions, should be retained along with any moldings, sidelights and transoms (See B-8). The relocation of the door and french door on the northern portion of the elevation maintains the original moldings, transoms, sidelights and details. The relocation moves originally located features to a different portion of the elevation altering an original feature of the 1920’s building.

This application calls for an addition informing the side and rear elevation of a residential building. In accord with the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts, the construction of addition will not impair the overall site conditions (See B-2). A small later addition that does not contribute to the house will be removed. A new addition would engage with and extend from the rear portion of the West elevation. By virtue of its situation on the lot and design the addition is subordinate to the contributing building (See B-18, B-19, and B-25). The proposed addition is an enclosed space. It is designed as to afford compatibility with existing fabric (See B-17). Foundation elevation would be maintained and would feature brick piers with lattice fill between to match that of the existing foundation (see B-28). The proposed siding would match the finish of the existing in dimension and profile (See B-52). Changes in wall plane differentiate the addition from the historic fabric (See B-32). The new fenestration on the
addition is of a one-over-one wood single pane design to match that of the house and the neighborhood (See B-52). A gable roofing form with rafter tails to match existing is proposed (B-40).

The Design Review Guidelines state that new ancillary construction should be compatible with those in the district (See B-3). New ancillary construction involves review of considerations: placement, scale, massing, façade elements, and materials so as to obtain compatibility between the new and the existing. As to placement, the proposed new construction, a garage with hyphen-like connector, would occupy a rear portion of the lot and would be located directly behind the main house. Garages were constructed behind the front plane of residential buildings in general and for the subject property (See B-5). Setbacks are permissible by reason of the Historic District Overlay, a planning regulation authorizing (in certain cases) the employment of traditional setbacks within Midtown’s four locally designated National Register Districts (Old Dauphin Way being one). With regard to scale and massing, the Design Review Guidelines state that new ancillary construction should be subordinate to the main building (See B 3- 4). The proposed building’s placement behind the main residence not only subordinate to, but also respectful of the historic body of the house (See B-2). On grade construction is authorized for garages. Façade elements are crucial to compatibility of compatible ancillary construction. Box-like/rectilinear massing, gable roof forms, and matching eave treatments serve engender compatibility between the main house and the garage and hyphen. The aforementioned elements reference the existing fabric. With regard to materials to be employed on ancillary construction, the Design Review Guidelines allow for composite materials if said materials appear similar in texture and finish of the original (See B-6). Wooden siding will be employed on the walls. Said siding will match that found on main residence. Roofing shingles will similarly match those surmounting the body of the house.

**CLARIFICATIONS**

1. What is the design and material of the garage doors?

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-2) Staff does not believe the repair/replacement work, addition, garage, or changes to the side and rear portion of the application would impair either architectural or the historical character of the building or the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of this portion of the application. Based on B-8 staff believes the relocation of the entrance door and a set of French doors is altering an original feature of the period of the house. Staff recommends denial of this portion of the application.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Mr. Douglas Kearley, owner’s representative, was present to discuss the application.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Stone welcomed the applicant and asked if he had any clarifications, comments or questions. Mr. Kearley noted the most significant change is relocating the front door and one French door. Mr. Kearley clarified for Mr. Roberts that the current doors would be repaired.

Mr. Stone noted there is evidence that shows the house was converted from two shotgun houses similar located on the lot which may give insight to the current offset location of the door. Mr. Kearley noted that much of roof structure is left if there were two shotguns converted into one residence. Mr. Holmes suggested the current residence could have been a duplex.
Mr. Roberts stated the proposed plans keeping the current residence was an improvement over the previous first set of plans proposed by the homeowner. Mr. Kearley agreed that even by moving the door the spirit of the house would remain.

No further discussion from the Board ensued at that time.

Mr. Stone opened the application to public comment. With no one to speak either for or against the application, Mr. Stone closed the period of public comment.

**FINDING OF FACT**

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, as written.

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

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the facts as approved by the Board, a Certificate of Appropriateness be granted for the proposed scope of work.

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

2019-28-CA: 1310 Azalea Street
Applicant: Mr. Clark Robenstine and Mr. Tony Matthews
Received: 6/29/2019
Meeting: 7/17/2019

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Fenestration Related: Remove wood windows and replace with double paned wooden windows to match in dimension, profile and configuration.

BUILDING HISTORY

This bungalow was constructed in 1928.

STAFF REPORT

A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board on May 15, 2007 according to the MHDC vertical files. At that time a request to remove former carport posts was granted. The proposed scope of work includes replacing 14 wooden windows to double paned wood to match in dimension, profile and configuration.

B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
   1. Chapter 4, Overarching Preservation Principles: “Upgrade existing materials using recognized preservation methods whenever possible.”
   2. “If replacement of a historic element is required, replace the historic element in kind, or with a product that is similar in visual character and durability to the original.”
   3. “Significant features and stylistic elements should not be removed to the extent possible.”
   4. “If disassembly is necessary for repair or restoration, use methods that minimize damage to original materials and facilitate reassembly.”
   5. “If replacement of a historic element is required, replace the historic element in kind, or with a product that is similar in visual character and durability to the original.”
   6. The following is the preferred sequence of improvements: “preserve, repair, reconstruct, replace or compatible alteration.” “For most historic resources, the front façade is the most important to preserve intact. Alterations are rarely appropriate. Many side walls are also important to preserve where they are highly visible from public streets. By contrast, portions of a side wall that are not as visible may be less sensitive to change.”
   7. Acceptable Materials: “wood sash, steel if original, custom extruded aluminum,”
   8. “Removing original material diminishes the integrity of a historic property by reducing the percentage of building fabric that remains from the period of historic significance. Retaining the original material is always preferred. If this is not feasible, alternative materials may be considered. When used, an alternative material should convey the character, including detail and finish, of the original to the greatest extent feasible.”

Chapter 5, Design Guidelines Applicable to All Historic Properties: “Deteriorated architectural features shall be repaired rather than replaced, wherever possible. In the event replacement is necessary, the new material should match the material being replaced in
physical character and durability. Composition, design, color, texture, and other visual qualities should appear similar to the original material. Repair or replacement of missing architectural features should be based on accurate duplications of features, substantiated by historic, physical or pictorial evidence.”

9. “The type, size, framing, and dividing lights of windows, as well as their location and configuration (rhythm), help establish the historic character of a building. Original window components should be retained to the extent possible. The character-defining features of a window should be preserved. Historic windows can be repaired through re-glazing and patching and splicing wood elements such as muntins, frame sill and casing. Repair and weatherization is generally more energy efficient and less expensive than replacement. Windows should be in character with the historic building.”

10. “For most contributing properties in historic districts, the windows that are on the front elevation and those on the sidewalls that are visible from the street will be the most important to preserve. Windows in other locations that have distinctive designs and that represent fine craftsmanship may also be important to preserve.”

11. “Where historic (wooden or metal) windows are intact and in repairable condition, retain and repair them to match the existing as per location, light configuration, detail and material.”

12. “Preserve historic window features, including the frame, sash, muntins, mullions, glazing, sills, heads, jambs, moldings, operation, and groupings of windows.”

13. “Repair, rather than replace, frames and sashes, wherever possible.”

14. “When historic windows are not in a repairable condition, match the replacement window design to the original.”

15. “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.”

16. “A new window shall be installed in such a manner as to fit within the original window opening and match in depth and filling of the reveal. A reveal is the part of the side of a window opening that is between the outer surface of the wall and the window.”

17. “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.”

18. “For increased efficiency, storm windows can be installed. A storm window shall fit within the window reveal and avoid damaging window casings. Operable storm windows are encouraged.”

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

1. Remove 14 existing wood windows and replace with double paned, wood windows to match in profile, dimension and configuration.

2. STAFF ANALYSIS

This application is for the replacement of 14 single paned wood windows on a contributing building. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s state that fenestration helps to establish the character of the building (See B-20). The Guidelines state the front elevation and side elevations are most important to keep intact (See B-21). The guidelines explain that where original windows are in disrepair, they should be repaired rather than replaced (See B-22).

The Design Review Guidelines further explain that if a window must be replaced it match the “existing as per location, framing, and light configuration” (See B-26). The proposed windows will match the light configuration, material, dimension and profile but be double paned instead of single paned. Double paned windows can be considered by the Board as an alternative to single paned if the proposed replacement matches in size, configuration, and profile.
**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-21), B (1-22) and B (1-26), Staff does believe replacing all windows will impair either the architectural or the historical character of the properties or district since the building is listed as contributing. Staff recommends repairing those windows that can be repaired. Staff then recommends windows that must be replaced on the front elevation and side elevations in public view be single-paned wood to match the existing. Staff recommends the Review Board consider double paned windows on the side and rear elevations that are out of public view.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Mr. Clark Robenstine, owner, was present to discuss the application.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Stone welcomed the applicant and asked if he had any clarifications, comments or questions. Mr. Robenstine stated the issue with the current windows was condensation in the winter months that caused rot. He explained a dehumidifier is in operation during the summer months. He noted he is conflicted with changing the windows since the sashes are in good condition.

Mr. Roberts asked if the applicant had considered storm windows on the interior of the windows explaining this option was usually inexpensive compared to replacement. The applicant responded he had considered the option.

Mr. Robenstine confirmed the new windows would be the same material as the current windows. Mr. Stone stated the house is setback from the street making it hard to determine the window material and noted windows were just approved for replacement on a commercial building. Mr. Holmes asked if a potential compromise could be reached by repairing the front elevation windows since the windows were in good shape and on the first story.

No further discussion from the Board ensued at that time.

Mr. Stone opened the application to public comment. With no one to speak either for or against the application, Mr. Stone closed the period of public comment.

**FINDING OF FACT**

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, as written.

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

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the facts as approved by the Board, a Certificate of Appropriateness be granted for the proposed scope of work.
The motion received a second by Mr. Brown and was approved unanimously.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2019-29-CA: 113 Monroe Street
Applicant: Mr. Larry Posner on behalf of Ft. Conde Restoration Venture, LLC
Received: 7/10/2019
Meeting: 7/17/2019

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: T5.1
Project: Fenestration Related: Repair and replace windows and doors on a non-contributing multi-use building.

BUILDING HISTORY

The Olensky Building is a two story stucco building constructed circa 1930 as a duplex. Open stoops on the East (front) and North (side) facades afforded access into the building. The ornamental balconies were built in 1976.

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 on February 20, 2019. At that time rehabilitation work was approved. The proposed scope of work includes the alteration of fenestration.
B. The Design Review Guidelines state in pertinent part:
   1. Regarding non-historic buildings: “Instead compatibility with the character of the district is the focus, as it is with a new building in a historic district. Where there is a question about materials or compatibility that is not covered below, refer to the previous section on additions for historic buildings for guidance.”
   2. “New elements and materials associated with alterations and additions to non-historic structures should generally blend with those of the existing building. Changes should also respect the character of the historic district.”
   3. “This section provides guidelines for windows related to alterations or additions to non-historic residential structures in locally-designated historic districts. The number and placement of windows is usually a major design element for residential structures, including additions. Windows should also be compatible with the neighborhood.”
   4. 6.33 “Design window alterations and windows on new additions to non-historic structures to be compatible with the neighborhood.”
   5. “Use a material and window type that is similar to those seen historically in the neighborhood. Tempered glass will be considered when required by the Mobile Code of Ordinances.”
6. Regarding doors and doorways on additions: “The number and placement of doors can impact the compatibility of an addition with the existing historic building. A door for additions should be designed to be compatible with the existing building.

7. 6.16 “Design doors and doorways to an addition to be compatible with the existing historic building.”

8. “If a historic door is removed to accommodate the addition, consider reusing it on the addition.”

9. “Design a door and doorway to be compatible with the existing building.”

10. “Use a door material that is compatible with those of the historic building and the district.”

11. “Use a material with a dimensionality (thickness) and appearance similar to doors on the original historic building.”

12. “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.”

13. “A window in a new addition should be compatible with the size, placement and rhythm of those on the historic building.”

14. 6.21 “Design a window on an addition to be compatible with the original historic building.”

15. “Size, place and space a window for an addition to be in character with the original historic building.”

16. “If an aluminum window is used, use dimensions that are similar to the original windows of the house. An extruded custom aluminum window approved by the NPS or an aluminum clad wood window may be used, provided it has a profile, dimension and durability similar to a window in the historic building.”

17. Pertaining to acceptable window materials on historic buildings: “Materials that do not appear similar to the original in texture, profile and finish are unacceptable. These often include: Vinyl; Mill-finished aluminum; Interior snap-in muntins (except when used in concert with exterior muntins and intervening dividers).”

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

1. Alter fenestration.
   A. Conduct in-kind repairs and replacements.
      i. Repair windows as indicated on plan. This includes two windows on the front elevation, two windows on the rear elevation.
      ii. Replace existing two-over-two windows and paired two-over-two windows with double paneled aluminum clad or custom extruded aluminum to match in profile, dimension, and configuration.
      iii. Change all existing exterior doors to aluminum clad or metal paneled and multi-lite glass configuration. Doors will be six-lit with two panels below.
      iv. Remove two pairs of windows on second story of front elevation and replace with multi-lite and paneled doors.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application calls for the repair of four windows, replacement of nine windows, and the alteration of two existing paired windows to doors. The building has been altered over the years significantly. This building was recently decertified as historic by the National Park Service in March 2019 and is now listed as a non-contributing building in Church street East. The current fenestration is not original to the building.

The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s state that when reviewing alterations on non-contributing buildings that new elements and materials should blend in with that of the
existing building and district (See B-2). The guidelines further explain that where elements are not addressed specifically for non-contributing buildings, one should consult the section on additions to residential historic structures (See B-1).

Replacement doors and windows on non-contributing buildings should be compatible with those doors and found on the existing building or in the district (See B-7, B-9, and B-14). While the windows and door fit the previous openings, the light configurations for the windows will remain the same (See B-9, B-12, B-13 and B-14). The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state that the profile and material should be similar to those found in historic districts (See B-5). Historic windows are commonly true divided light. Simulated divided light windows composed of wood, custom extruded aluminum or aluminum clad are typically approved. Vinyl is not an approvable material in historic districts (B-17). Doors should be compatible with the existing building. Metal or aluminum clad doors are approved materials in historic districts.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-13) and B (1-6) Staff does not believe this application would impair either architectural or the historical character of the building or the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval in full.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Nick Holmes recused himself from voting.

Mr. Nick Holmes, applicant’s representative and architect, was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Stone welcomed the applicant and asked if he had any clarifications, comments or questions. Mr. Holmes explained the rehabilitation was originally designed with the utilization of historic tax credits He further explained after the project was reviewed by the SHPO and Park Service it was decertified as historic and contributing to the district. The applicant would prefer doors to access the balcony on the second floor. He also explained the proposed doors would be uniform on the building.

No further discussion from the Board ensued at that time.

Mr. Stone opened the application to public comment. With no one to speak either for or against the application, Mr. Stone closed the period of public comment.

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, as written.

The motion received a second was unanimously approved.

1.
DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the facts as approved by the Board, a Certificate of Appropriateness be granted for the scope of work proposed.

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