ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
May 1st, 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 3:07 p.m. Paige Largue, MHDC Staff, called the roll as follows:
   - Members Present: Steve Stone, Jim Wagoner, Kim Harden, Catarina Echols and Craig Roberts.
   - Members Absent: Robert Brown, Nick Holmes, Abby Davis and David Barr.
   - Staff Members Present: John Sledge, Bridget Daniel, Paige Largue, Marion McElroy and Flo Kessler

2. Mr. Stone requested the minutes be updated to reflect his opposition to the application for 412 S. Broad Street. Mr. Wagoner moved to approve the minutes as amended. Ms. Harden seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

Mr. Roberts moved to approve the Mid-Months as written. Ms. Harden seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

B. MID-MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED.

1. Applicant: Charlotte Haas
   a. Property Address: 1009 Augusta Street
   b. Date of Approval: 4/10/2019
   c. Project: Construct brick wall feature with fountain head to empty into existing pond. Fountain is located out of public view on rear facing wall.

2. Applicant: Ryan and Shannon Beale
   a. Property Address: 51 N. Monterey Street
   b. Date of Approval: 4/10/2019
   c. Project: Repair/replace rotten deck, railings and columns, porch boards upper and lower; replace porch ceiling bead board; all to match in material, dimension and profile. Repoint piers as needed.

3. Applicant: Peyton Lazari
   a. Property Address: 1508 Monroe Street
   b. Date of Approval: 4/10/2019
   c. Project: Repaint house in the following color scheme: Trim-white; Porch Decking-repaint to match; Body: Grey/Green/Sage. Repair and replace wood to match existing.

4. Applicant: Brad Robertson
   a. Property Address: 312 Marine Street
   b. Date of Approval: 4/12/2019
   c. Project: Repaint cream.

5. Applicant: Godwin Construction, LLC
   a. Property Address: 21 Hannon Avenue
   b. Date of Approval: 4/11/2019
   c. Project: Repair and replace deteriorated wood to match existing in dimension, profile and material. Repaint to match.

6. Applicant: Bradley Robertson
   a. Property Address: 952 Savannah Street
   b. Date of Approval: 4/12/2019
   c. Project: Repaint house greenish gray.
6. **Applicant:** Wayne Askew Contracting, Inc.
   a. Property Address: 214 S. Dearborn Street
   b. Date of Approval: 4/15/2019
   c. Project: Repair deteriorated woodwork and windows to match in dimension, profile and material. Repaint to match.

7. **Applicant:** Jerry Graham Roofing
   a. Property Address: 250 Everett Street
   b. Date of Approval: 4/16/2019
   c. Project: Reroof with charcoal shingles.

8. **Applicant:** Teague Construction Systems, Inc.
   a. Property Address: 7 North Royal Street
   b. Date of Approval: 4/16/2019
   c. Project: Reroof with TPO membrane.

9. **Applicant:** DBL-P Properties
   a. Property Address: 102 Dauphin Street
   b. Date of Approval: 4/16/2019
   c. Project: Repaint in the following color scheme: body-cream; window hoods and other accents-khaki/tan; and accents-blue.

10. **Applicant:** James Larriviere
    a. Property Address: 14 Houston Street
    b. Date of Approval: 4/22/2019
    c. Project: Repaint front porch - Benjamin Moore paint color Ozark Shadows.

11. **Applicant:** Melissa Swafford
    a. Property Address: 1413 Brown Street
    b. Date of Approval: 4/22/2019
    c. Project: Replace rotten decking if necessary, reroof with charcoal black shingles.

12. **Applicant:** John Willis
    a. Property Address: 1174 Texas Street
    b. Date of Approval: 4/22/2019
    c. Project: Existing non-historic outbuilding, deck/reroof, repair/replace inverted board and batten siding, re-deck front and back porches, add aluminum clad windows.

13. **Applicant:** Paul Morris
    a. Property Address: 123 Houston Street
    b. Date of Approval: 4/22/2019
    c. Project: Repaint in neutral color scheme.

14. **Applicant:** James Larriviere
    a. Property Address: 14 Houston Street
    b. Date of Approval: 4/23/2019
    c. Project: Repaint porch area white, door and screen door powder blue.

15. **Applicant:** Michael Kennedy
    a. Property Address: 1056 Palmetto Street
    b. Date of Approval: 4/23/2019
    c. Project: Jack and level house, repair/replace rotten siding to match original in material, dimension and profile, rework all windows to match existing in material, dimension and profile, repair/replace decorative rails, cornices, eaves, and lunettes to match original in material, dimension and profile. Repaint as necessary, body gray, trim white.

16. **Applicant:** Robert and Crystal Owens
    a. Property Address: 12 Straight Street
    b. Date of Approval: 4/24/2019
    c. Project: Remove chain link fence, erect six foot wood privacy fence.
D. APPLICATIONS

1. 2019-15-CA: 352 S. Broad Street (Held over from April 17th, 2019)
   a. Applicant: Mr. DeMarkus Burroughs Boykin, Sr.
   b. Project: Demolition Related: Demolish a contributing residence.
      APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

2. 2019-20-CA: 15 Semmes Avenue
   a. Applicant: Mr. Jacob Hartley of Prime Design Homes, LLC on behalf of
      SSK Asset Management, LLC
      APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

3. 2019-21-CA: 405 Chatham Street
   a. Applicant: Porchlight, LLC
      APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

4. 2019-22-CA: 1009 Selma Street
   a. Applicant: Porchlight, LLC
      APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

5. 2019-23-CA: 1011 Selma Street
   a. Applicant: Porchlight, LLC
      APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.

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

2019-15-CA: 352 S. Broad Street
Applicant: Mr. DeMarkus Burroughs Boykin, Sr.
Received: 4/1/2019 (Held over 4/17/2019)
Meeting: 5/1/2019

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Demolition Related: Demolish a contributing residence.

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 April 17th, 2019 according
to the MHDC vertical files. At that time a request for demolition was held over so the Board
could hold a Design Review Committee onsite. The proposed scope of work includes the
demolition of a contributing residence.
B. With regards to demolition, the Guidelines read as follows: “Proposed demolition of a building
must be brought before the Board for consideration. The Board may deny a demolition request if the
building’s loss will impair the historic integrity of the district.” However, our ordinance mirrors the
Mobile City Code, see §44-79, which sets forth the following standard of review and required
findings for the demolition of historic structures:

1. Required findings; demolition/relocation. The Board shall not grant certificates of
appropriateness for the demolition or relocation of any property within a historic district
unless the Board finds that the removal or relocation of such building will not be detrimental
to the historical or architectural character of the district.
2. The Design Review Guidelines state in pertinent part:
a. This section provides general guidelines for consideration of demolition
of a historic structure. The demolition of historic structures is generally not allowed
unless there are extraordinary circumstances. When demolition is proposed, consider the
following general guidelines.
b. As an initial step, determine the significance of the historic structure. An analysis should be undertaken to determine if the historic structure retains its integrity. In some cases, a property previously identified as a contributing historic structure may no longer retain its integrity due to changes to the structure since the time it was originally determined to be historic.
c. Consider the current significance of a structure previously determined to be historic.
d. In some cases, the original designation of a structure as contributing or noncontributing to the historic district in which it is located may no longer be valid either because the structure has lost its historic integrity or because the passage of time or change in appreciation of the structure has resulted in the structure contributing to the character of the district.
d. The physical condition of the historic structure should be considered when determining whether or not a structure may be demolished.
e. Consider the condition of the structure in question. Demolition may be more appropriate when a building is deteriorated or in poor condition.
f. Consider the impact of removing the historic structure relative to its context. Demolition may be more appropriate where the removal of the historic structure does not significantly impact the perception of the block as viewed from the street.
f. Consider whether the building is one of the last remaining positive examples of its kind in the neighborhood, county, or region.
g. Also consider the potential impact of demolition of the structure on the overall context of the structure.
h. Consider the impact that demolition will have on surrounding structures, including neighboring properties, properties on the same block or across the street or properties throughout the individual historic district.
i. Consider whether the building is part of an ensemble of historic buildings that create a neighborhood.
j. When applicable, the project proposed to replace the structure proposed for demolition should be considered.
k. Consider the future utilization of the site.
l. If a development is proposed to replace a demolished historic structure, determine that the proposed replacement structure is consistent with the guidelines for new construction in historic districts in Chapters 6 and 7 of this document.

3. In making this determination, the Board shall consider:
   i. The historic or architectural significance of the structure:
      1. Portions of this property possibly date from 1905. The present configuration dates from 1928. This building is listed as a contributing structure in the Old Oakleigh Garden District. It holds architectural merit and historical significance.
   ii. The importance of the structure to the integrity of the historic district, the immediate vicinity, an area, or relationship to other structures:
      1. The dwelling adds to the built density of the Oakleigh Garden Historic District.
   iii. The difficulty or the impossibility of reproducing the structure because of its design, texture, material, detail or unique location:
      1. The building materials are capable of being reproduced or acquired.
   iv. Whether the structure is one of the last remaining examples of its kind in the neighborhood, the county, or the region or is a good example of its type, or is part of an ensemble of historic buildings creating a neighborhood:
1. The wood framed structure is a bungalow which once made up a largely residential avenue. This house sits on an inner lot between two residences.

v. Whether there are definite plans for reuse of the property if the proposed demolition is carried out, and what effect such plans will have on the architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological, social, aesthetic, or environmental character of the surrounding area.
   1. If granted demolition approval, the house would be demolished, and the applicant would return at a later date for approval of a new residence based on plans submitted with this application.

vi. The date the owner acquired the property, purchase price, and condition on date of acquisition;
   1. N/A.

vii. The number and types of adaptive uses of the property considered by the owner;
   1. The owner initially sought to rehabilitate the property but is seeking to demolish the residence and rebuild due to cost.
   viii. Whether the property has been listed for sale, prices asked and offers received, if any;
   1. To staff’s knowledge, the property has not been put up for sale.

ix. Description of the options currently held for the purchase of such property, including the price received for such option, the conditions placed upon such option and the date of expiration of such option;
   1. N.A.

x. Replacement construction plans for the property in question and amounts expended upon such plans, and the dates of such expenditures;
   1. Elevations and site plans have been submitted.

xi. Financial proof of the ability to complete the replacement project, which may include but not be limited to a performance bond, a letter of credit, a trust for completion of improvements, or a letter of commitment from a financial institution.
   1. A performance bond and line of credit has been obtained.

xii. Such other information as may reasonably be required by the board.
   1. Structural Engineer report provided.
   2. See other submitted materials.

   2. Post demolition or relocation plans required. In no event shall the Board entertain any application for the demolition or relocation of any historic property unless the applicant also presents at the same time the post-demolition or post-relocation plans for the site.”

C. Scope of Work:
   1. Demolish a residence.
   2. Remove the debris from the site.
   3. Stabilize the site.
   4. Return to ARB for approval of full construction plans based on drawings submitted.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application concerns the demolition of a deteriorated residential building which is listed as a contributing building in the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. When reviewing demolition applications, the Board takes into the account the following considerations: the architectural significance of the building; the condition of the building; the impact the demolition will have on the streetscape; and the nature of any proposed redevelopment.
352 S. Broad Street is listed as a contributing building located within the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. It is an example of a bungalow built or altered to its current condition in 1928. The residence exemplifies the trends spurred by growth and streetcar lines in the neighborhood during that period. Broad Street is first seen on the Goodwin and Haire map of 1824. The street was the furthest boundary of the city at that time. The street evolved from the urban grid seen at the core of the city into a more spacious lot size and grid. By the late 19th century Broad Street was a key thoroughfare complete with a trolley line. The residences on Broad Street are a reminder of the splendid and active avenue. This wood frame building is in an advanced state of disrepair. Staff conducted an on-site inspection of the exterior on ground and noted termite damage and deteriorated wood. The southern elevation has extensive fire damage to the wall and portion of the roof. According to a blight survey completed in 2018, the property was not deemed a danger to the right of way, or neighboring structures. The aforementioned report indicated fire damage, roof damage, and water penetrating structure. A structural engineer’s report was submitted and stated the structure was compromised due to fire damage, termite damage, and framing issues.

The house contributes to the built density, rhythmic sequencing of the landscape, and to historic character and physical experience of Broad Street. As an inner block dwelling, the building is only viewed from head on or an oblique angle. The house is part of an intact residential block face of Broad Street.

If granted demolition approval, the building would be demolished and debris would be removed. The applicant would return to the Board with an application for new residential construction based on drawings submitted

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-2) Staff does believe this application would impair either architectural or the historical character of the building or the surrounding district. Staff recommends denial.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. DeMarkus Boykin, Sr., owner was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Stone welcomed Mr. Boykin. Mr. Roberts reported about the Design Review Committee meeting held on site April 29, 2019. He explained issues the residence had and that Mr. Boykin was willing to work with a Design Review Committee if the residence was granted a COA for demolition. Mr. Roberts further explained the roof pitch of the proposed design needed to be lower.

Mr. Stone stated the applicant was willing to salvage components such as windows, one door, masonry, and windows. He explained the house was once two shotguns, and then it was combined. He further explained the damage to the house.

Mr. Boykin stated it was his first time interacting with the Board, and that previously he had spoken with Devereaux Bemis and Cart Blackwell. He noted he did not know Mr. Roberts and Mr. Stone were architects when they met on site. He commented the DRC was helpful and appreciated them working around his work schedule.

No further discussion from the Board ensued.
Mr. Stone opened the application to public comment. With no one to speak in favor of or opposition to, Mr. Stone closed the period of public comment.

Mr. Roberts stated that the building already has a loss of integrity due to the amount of materials deteriorated.

**FINDING OF FACT**

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, as amended to reflect the findings of the Design Review Committee.

The motion received a second by 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 issued for demolition because of the loss of integrity due to deteriorated materials and with the understanding the applicant will work with a DRC to get a better design that fits the neighborhood.

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

**CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS EXPIRATION DATE: May 2nd, 2020**
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2019-21-CA: 15 Semmes Avenue
Applicant: Mr. Jacob Hartley of Prime Design Homes, LLC on behalf of SSK Asset Management, LLC
Received: 4/24/2019
Meeting: 5/1/2019

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Classification: Non-Contributing (Vacant Lot)
Zoning: R-1
Project: New Construction: Construct new single family residence

BUILDING HISTORY

This bungalow was constructed circa 1920.

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 January 2nd, 2019 according to the MHDC vertical files. At that time, the applicant was granted approval for the demolition of a house. The proposed scope of work includes the new construction of a single family residence.

B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
   1. “Maintain alignment of front setbacks.”
   2. “Maintain the rhythm of buildings and side yards.”
   3. “Design the massing of new construction to appear similar to that of historic buildings in the district.”
   4. “Design the scale of new construction to appear similar to that of historic buildings in the district.”
   5. “Design piers, a foundation, and foundation fill to be compatible with those of nearby historic properties.
   6. “Size foundations and floor heights to appear similar to those of nearby historic buildings.”
   7. “Use building height in front that is compatible with adjacent contributing properties.”
   8. “Design building elements on exterior buildings walls to be compatible with those on nearby historic buildings. These elements often include but are not limited to: balconies, chimneys, and dormers.”
   9. “Use exterior building materials and finishes that complement the character of the surrounding district.”
10. “Locate and size a window to create a solid-to-void ratio similar to the ratios seen on nearby historic windows.”
11. “Use traditional window casement and trim similar to those seen in nearby historic buildings.”
12. “Place and size a special feature, including a transom, sidelight or decorative framing element, to complement those seen in nearby historic buildings.
13. “Match the scale of a porch to the main building and reflect the scale of porches of nearby historic buildings.”
14. “When using artificial materials, use a blind or shutter unit that has a thickness, weight and design similar to wood.”
15. “Design a roof on new construction to be compatible with those on adjacent historic buildings.”

C. Scope of Work:
1. Construct a single family residence.
   a. The house will be setback so as to negotiate the setback of the neighboring houses at 13 and 19 Semmes Avenue (29’0”).
   b. The house will cover a footprint of 30’0” in width and 91’8” in depth.
   c. The raised slab foundation will measure at least 2’0” in height.
   d. The aforementioned foundation will be skirted by brick-faced simulated piers spaced at equidistant intervals with framed lattice panels on the front façade, and brick faced skirting on secondary elevations.
   e. A continuous skirt board will extend around the house.
   f. The walls will be clad with 6” hardieplank siding.
   g. The ceiling height will be 10’0” for the first floor and 9’1” on the second floor.
   h. The windows will be aluminum clad in construction and two-over-two in configuration.
   i. The windows will shutters on the East elevation only.
   j. A shed roof dormer will be featured on the second floor front facade.
   k. Architectural GAF shingles will sheath the roof.
   l. East Elevation (Façade)
      i. The East Elevation will feature a five bay porch across the full width of the facade.
      ii. The porch will be supported by six boxed columns with a balustrade between.
      iii. A flight of wooden composite steps will access the central bay of the porch.
      iv. A shed roof dormer will punctuate the dominant gable.
      v. A wood, wood composite or metal four paneled door will provide ingress to and egress from the porch. The door will feature sidelights.
      vi. A set of two equidistant aluminum clad or wood windows will flank the front door.
   m. South (a side) Elevation
      i. The end of the porch bay will define the easternmost portion of the South elevation as it relates to the body of the house.
      ii. An advanced portion will extend 58’0” in length from the easternmost end.
      iii. The South Elevation’s fenestration (in a easterly to westerly direction) will be as follows on the first floor: 24”x48” window; paired window.
      iv. The South Elevation’s fenestration (in a easterly to westerly direction) will be as follows on the second floor: two equidistant 30” x 60” windows.
      v. An open porch space ten feet in width will inform the western end of the advanced portion.
vi. A wooden glazed or metal glazed door will access the aforementioned open porch space.

vii. A 33’8” in length recessed section of the elevation will extend from the open porch space to the westernmost portion of the elevation.

viii. A 5’10” section of open porch space will recess by 8’0” from the advanced portion.

ix. A corner board will be installed at the beginning of an enclosed garage that will inform the westernmost portion of the elevation.

x. A hipped roof will surmount the garage and truncate into the gable roof.

xi. A double vehicular garage door will be employed.

xii. The door will be paneled.

n. West (Rear) Elevation

i. The northern portion of the rear elevation will feature a garage.

ii. An open porch space will inform the southernmost portion of the elevation.

iii. A Paired window will view onto the porch.

o. North (side) Elevation

i. The North Elevation’s fenestration (in an easterly to westerly direction) will be as follows on the first floor: two 30”x60” windows flanking advanced portion of wall; paired 30” x 60” windows; 36”48” window; 36”x48” window.

2. Conduct site improvements.

i. Install concrete walkway from street to steps leading to front entrance.

ii. Construct concrete driveway from an existing curb cut located at southeast corner of the lot.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The subject property 15 Semmes Avenue, is located within the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The application up for review involves construction of single family residential infill between extant historic dwellings located to either side of the subject lot. When reviewing the applications for new residential construction, the following criteria are taken into account: placement; orientation; massing; scale; building elements; and materials.

With regard to placement, two components are taken into account – setback from the street and distance between buildings. The Design Review Guidelines for New Residential Construction in Mobile’s Historic Districts state that new buildings should be responsive to and maintain alignment of traditional façade lines (See B 1), as well as the rhythm of side & rear setbacks (See B-2.). The property under review, an inner block situation, is located adjacent to/in the vicinity of contributing buildings situated to either side of it. In accord with Design Guidelines, the side setbacks reflect the historical character of the contributing aspects of the built landscape. The proposed placement negotiates the placement of two buildings located to either side of it (some buildings on the lot line and other at varying setbacks). The side setbacks are traditional in dimension. The façade engages the street, while the backward placement of parking follows tradition and allows for screening. The front setback is 29’0” from the right of way which reflects the setback of the neighboring property at 13 Semmes Avenue.

The Design Review Guidelines state that mass - the relationship of the parts of the larger whole comprising a building - for new construction should be in keeping with arrangement and proportion of surrounding historic residences (B-3). The proposed house is two part in composition - a house; and a garage. The body of the house adopts the elemental massing of a traditional Mobile dwelling – a porch fronted residence. The two foot height of the foundation is reflective of traditional foundation elevations
(See B-5.) and dwellings on properties abutting the subject address. The façade’s multiple bay porch treatment is even more responsive to historical traditions (See B-5.). The massing of the structure, one informed by 10’ ceilings on the first floor, is compatible with the architectural context of the contributing landscape which it is situated (See B-7.) The gable roof is relieved by a shed roof dormer (See B-15.).

Scale refers to a building’s size in relationship to other buildings. The Design Review Guidelines for New Residential Construction state that new construction should be in scale with nearby historic buildings (See B-4). The neighboring property at 19 Semmes Avenue is two stories in height. As mentioned in the preceding paragraph addressing massing, the elevation of the foundations, height of the ceilings, and pitch of the roof of the proposed residence combine to form a whole that would be compatible with 19 Semmes Avenue and the surrounding architectural landscape.

With regard to building components, the Design Review Guidelines call for responsiveness to traditional design traditions. Innovation is not ruled out, but compatibility is the goal. The porch-fronted residence takes inspiration in both general and specific from several architectural typologies that animated Mobile’s architecture during the latter half of the 19th Century and the first half of the 20th Century. The side gabled porch distinguishing the façade is compatible with immediate and larger residential architectural vocabulary of the district (See B-8.). Going further into building components, the building employs sash window types (aluminum clad) and wall treatment (cement fiber board lapsiding) that mimic the immediate and vast majority of the surrounding architectural and historical context (See B-11.). In accord with the Design Guidelines for New Construction, the building materials, while of the present day, blend with those employed in the past and in immediate surroundings (See B 9 & 14). Hardiboard siding and aluminum clad windows are approved for new construction within Mobile’s Historic Districts.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-15), Staff does not believe this application would impair either the architectural or the historical character of the historic district. Staff recommends the approval of the application.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Mr. Jacob Hartley, applicant, was present to discuss the application.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Stone welcomed Mr. Jacob Hartley and asked if he had any clarifications, comments or questions. Mr. Hartley expressed staff was easy to work with and assisted in getting a design that blends with the neighborhood.

Ms. Harden asked if the side elevations were to have simulated brick piers. Mr. Hartley explained it will be brick face over CMU on the side elevations, but the front elevation would have simulated brick piers with lattice in between piers.

Mr. Hartley confirmed for Ms. Harden the chimney did not extend to the second floor. Mr. Hartley stated the fireplace will step out.

Mr. Roberts stated the house was very attractive and the proportions were aesthetically pleasing and historically appropriate. Mr. Roberts inquired as to the details of the balustrade and window casing. Ms. Largue stated she would give Mr. Hartley copies of the MHDC stock designs.
Ms. Harden requested the chimney have a foundation underneath.

No further discussion from the Board ensued.

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

**FINDING OF FACT**

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, as amended to reflect the necessary balustrade design, columnar post design, and foundation under the chimney.

The motion received a second by Ms. Harden and was unanimously approved.

**DECISION ON THE APPLICATION**

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the facts as amended by the Board, a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued for the construction of a new residence.

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

**CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS EXPIRATION DATE: May 2nd, 2020**
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2019-12-CA: 405 Chatham Street
Applicant: Porchlight, LLC
Received: 4/24/2019
Meeting: 5/1/2019

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Non-contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: New Construction – Construct a single family residence.

BUILDING HISTORY

According the 1904 Sanborn Map, a “dilapidated” structure stood on the subject property.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

A. This property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The application up for review calls for the construction of a single family residence on the site.
B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
   1. “Maintain alignment of front setbacks.”
   2. “Maintain the rhythm of buildings and side yards.”
   3. “Design the massing of new construction to appear similar to that of historic buildings in the district.”
   4. “Design the scale of new construction to appear similar to that of historic buildings in the district.”
   5. “Design piers, a foundation, and foundation infill to be compatible with those of nearby historic properties.
   6. “Size foundations and floor heights to appear similar to those of nearby historic buildings.”
   7. “Use building height in front that is compatible with adjacent contributing properties.”
   8. “Design building elements on exterior buildings walls to be compatible with those on nearby historic buildings. These elements often include but are not limited to: balconies, chimneys, and dormers.”
   9. “Use exterior building materials and finishes that complement the character of the surrounding district.”
   10. “Locate and size a window to create a solid-to-void ratio similar to the ratios seen on nearby historic windows.”
   11. “Use traditional window casement and trim similar to those seen in nearby historic buildings.”
12. “Place and size a special feature, including a transom, sidelight or decorative framing element, to complement those seen in nearby historic buildings.

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

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

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

C. Scope of Work:

1. Construct a single family residence.
   a. The house will be setback so as to negotiate the setback of the neighboring house at 407 Chatham Street (9’6”).
   b. The raised slab foundation will measure at least 1’9” in height.
   c. The aforementioned foundation will be skirted by stucco-faced simulated piers spaced at equidistant intervals with framed lattice panels set between on the North and South Elevations.
   d. A continuous 10” skirt board will extend around the house.
   e. The walls will be clad with 6” hardiplank siding.
   f. The ceiling heights will be 9’5”.
   g. The windows will be aluminum clad wood in construction and multi-light in configuration.
   h. The dominant roof will be a gable in construction.
   i. Exposed rafter tails and brackets will be employed.
   j. Secondary roofs will also be gable in construction.
   k. Architectural GAF shingles will sheath the roof.

l. West Elevation (Façade)
   i. The West Elevation will feature enclosed and open (porch) spaces.
   ii. A single bay porch will advance from the southernmost portion of the portion of the façade.
   iii. The porch will be 15’0” in length and gable roof in form.
   iv. A flight of wooden composite steps will access the central bay of the porch.
   v. Brackets will be employed along the rakes and at the apex of the aforementioned gable.
   vi. A louvered vent will punctuate the gable.
   vii. Two sets of square section columnar posts will define the porch.
   viii. A glazed and paneled wood door (painted) will provide ingress to and egress from the porch.
   ix. A paired window will be employed on the eastern portion of the porch. Said windows will be six-over-six in configuration and flanked by louvered wood shutters. (Two panes across, three below.)
   x. The westernmost portion of the facade will feature paired windows with louvered wood shutters.

m. South (a side) Elevation
i. The end of the porch bay will define the westernmost portion of the West elevation as it relates to the body of the house.

ii. The South Elevation’s fenestration (in a westerly to easterly direction) will be as follows: one six-over-six; followed by a pair of six-over-six windows; and a single six-over-six window.

iii. The small gable roofed (roof oriented to the East and setback from the subject elevation) rear wing will not feature fenestration.

iv. A wooden stop with flight of steps (oriented to the East) with square sections newel posts and picketed railings will situated at the juncture of the body of the house and aforementioned smaller rear wing.

n. East (Rear) Elevation

i. The southernmost portion of the Rear Elevation will feature a glazed and panel door.

ii. The previously mentioned wooden stoop and flight of steps with their associated railing will provide access to the porch.

iii. A louvered vent will punctuate the dominate gable.

iv. A 15’0’ wide advanced small rear wing located off of the northernmost portion of the East Elevation will feature two six-over-six windows (two across, three below).

v. A gable roof will surmount the aforementioned rear wing.

o. North (side) Elevation

i. The North Elevation’s fenestration (in an easterly to westerly direction) will be as follows: a paired six-over-six window; two four-over-four windows; one six-over-six window; two four-over-four window.

2. Conduct site improvements.

i. Install concrete walkway from street to steps leading to front entrance.

ii. Install concrete driveway from an existing curb cut located at southwest corner of the lot.

iii. Replace existing fence with 6’ wooden fence behind the front facade line.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The subject property, 405 Chatham Street, is located within the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. The application up for review involves construction of single family residential infill between a two houses.

The application is the second modular building typology to appear before the Board. Modular construction in terms of both individual component and comprehensive volume possesses a long history in Mobile architecture. In 1817, Stephen Hallett, an individual who would become one of the leading figures in Mobile’s Antebellum epoch, shipped in disassembled form multiple house frames to Mobile for ultimate construction. Hallett and his brother would go on to develop Mobile’s first sash and blind factories. The City would become a center for that particular expression of early industrial prefabrication. Window sashes, louvered shutters, paneled doors, and eared architraves (“Egyptian Doors”) were the predominant constructions of those outfits. These were shipped across the City, Gulf, and Black Belt.
The types of pre-manufactured components increased in number, design, and material during the last decade of the Antebellum era before exploding during the Postbellum era. Ironwork and plaster compositions were two locally popular material compositions that joined the more pervasive wooden products. Railings, scroll sawn work, Friezes, crestings, and countless other elements went from individual creation to mass production. Scale and scope also expanded. Following on the heels of Stephen Hallett was Hinkle and Guild of Cincinnati went on to design construct, and ship whole houses. Azalea Manor located at 1624 Spring Hill Avenue is undoubtedly Hinkle and Guild creation. James Barber and latterly Aladdin and Sears & Roebuck followed suit. Modular is then not new phenomenon. The City of Mobile has experimented with it in one recent instance. A house resembling a double shotgun is the single instance of that test project. Known as the “Delaware Double”, that building is located at 906-908 Delaware Street not too far south of the subject property.

All proposed designs located within locally designated historic districts will be reviewed by the Board so as to ensure compatibility with the surrounding historical character of the surrounding properties and districts. As will all infill, context is key when reviewing all new construction in historic districts. When reviewing the applications for new residential construction, the following criteria are taken into account so as retain architectural and respect historical contexts: placement; orientation; massing; scale; building elements; and materials.

With regard to placement, two components are taken into account – setback from the street and distance between buildings. The Design Review Guidelines for New Residential Construction in Mobile’s Historic Districts state that new buildings should be responsive to and maintain the alignment of traditional façade lines (See B-1), as well as the rhythm of side & rear setbacks (See B-2.). The property under review, an inner block situation, is located adjacent to/in the vicinity of contributing buildings. In accord with Design Guidelines, the setbacks reflect the historical character of the contributing aspects of the built landscape. The proposed placement negotiates the placement the buildings located south adjacent to it. To the South stands 407 Chatham Street, the residence that the proposed placement responds. The side setbacks are traditional in dimension. The façade directly engages the street in its orientation. The proposed front walk and side drive would reintroduce lost rhythmic sequence of elements respectful of traditional placement patterns.

The Design Review Guidelines state that mass - the relationship of the parts of the larger whole comprising a building - for new construction should be in keeping with arrangement and proportion of surrounding historic residences (B-3). The proposed house adopts the large block-like of the Arts and Crafts Movement’s predominant residential typology – a “bungalow”. A continuous foundation and dominant roof anchor the building. A rear wing and advance porch feature smaller, but proportionally responsive gable roofs. These advances and recesses of plan, coupled with the depth of the front porch, serve to relieve and enliven the massing without causing for irregularity. The outward massing of the building, a block with a corner porch surmounted by a gabled roof, is one found adjacent to the property at 407 Chatham Street. The scale of the porch and massing of the proposed house respond to a prevalent historical typology in general and specific. – a porch fronted residence, more specifically the corner porch bungalow (See B-13.). The roughly two (2’0”) foot height of the foundation is reflective of traditional foundation elevations (See B-5.) and dwellings on properties abutting the subject address. While a raised slab in construction, the foundation would feature a regularized sequence of simulated stucco-faced piers which would serve to simultaneously unify and compartmentalize that lowest level of the built elevation. The massing of the structure, one informed by 9’ ceilings atop a continuous 1’ skirt board, is compatible with the architectural context of the contributing landscape which it is situated amidst (See B-7.). As mentioned previously, the dominant street-oriented gable roof is relieved by a secondary roof informing the front porch, as well as secondary roof informing the surmounting (See B-15.).
Scale refers to a building’s size in relationship to other buildings. The Design Review Guidelines for New Residential Construction state that new construction should be in scale with nearby historic buildings (See B-4.). The adjacent building is one story in height. As mentioned in the preceding paragraph addressing massing, the elevation of the foundations, height of the ceilings, and pitch of the roof combine to form a whole that would be compatible with surrounding architectural landscape.

With regard to building components, the Design Review Guidelines call for responsiveness to traditional design traditions. As mentioned in the portion of the narrative articulating massing, the typology evoked has precedent in the immediate and surrounding landscape (See B-8.). Going further into building components, the building employs sash window types (sash) and wall treatment (siding) that inform the immediate and vast majority of the surrounding architectural and historical context (See B-11.). While the type of window is responsive, the configuration could be bettered. The proposed window spacing mimics a traditional solid-to-void ratio (See B-10). A previously proposed grouping of small transom windows has altered to better respond to the solid-to-void ratio, as has a previously separated window which has now been paired. Placement and employ of special features such as brackets and vents also serve to tie the building to other historic buildings. Historically shutters were employed on revival styles and bungalows and included types such as paneled, louvered, and board and batten. By the 1920’s, shutters became mostly decorative but still had the appearance of being functional. The proposed shutters are composed of approvable materials in accordance with the guidelines.

In accord with the Design Guidelines for New Construction, the building materials, while of the present day, blend with those employed in the past and in immediate surroundings (See B 9 & 14.). Hardieboard siding and aluminum clad windows are approved for new construction within Mobile’s Historic Districts.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-15), Staff does not believe this application would impair the architectural or the historical character of the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of the application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Mike Rogers, applicant, was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Stone welcomed Mr. Rogers and asked if he had any clarifications, comments or questions. Mr. Rogers requested that if any minor changes could be made in the meeting, he would prefer that over having to return. Mr. Stone stated the Board has the authority to amend application details at meetings.

Mr. Stone noted Mr. Jamie Betbeze sent a letter supporting the changes to the application.

Mr. Roberts had a suggestion to make the shutters fit the opening noting that the proposed come above the casing. Mr. Rogers replied the additional height was for support. Mr. Roberts said he never heard of the shutter height giving more support, but was not dismissing Mr. Rogers’ reply.

No further discussion from the Board ensued.

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

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, as 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 issued for the construction of a new residence.

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

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS EXPIRATION DATE: May 2nd, 2020
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2019-13-CA: 1009 Selma Street
Applicant: Porchlight, LLC
Received: 4/24/2019
Meeting: 5/1/2019

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Non-contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: New Construction – Construct a single family residence.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to the 1904 Sanborn Map, a storage structure stood on the subject property.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

A. This property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. The application up for review calls for the construction of a single family residence on the site.
B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
   1. “Maintain alignment of front setbacks.”
   2. “Maintain the rhythm of buildings and side yards.”
   3. “Design the massing of new construction to appear similar to that of historic buildings in the district.”
   4. “Design the scale of new construction to appear similar to that of historic buildings in the district.”
   5. “Design piers, a foundation, and foundation infill to be compatible with those of nearby historic properties.
   6. “Size foundations and floor heights to appear similar to those of nearby historic buildings.”
   7. “Use building height in front that is compatible with adjacent contributing properties.”
   8. “Design building elements on exterior buildings walls to be compatible with those on nearby historic buildings. These elements often include but are not limited to: balconies, chimneys, and dormers.”
   9. “Use exterior building materials and finishes that complement the character of the surrounding district.”
   10. “Locate and size a window to create a solid-to-void ratio similar to the ratios seen on nearby historic windows.”
11. “Use traditional window casement and trim similar to those seen in nearby historic buildings.”
12. “Place and size a special feature, including a transom, sidelight or decorative framing element, to complement those seen in nearby historic buildings.”
13. “Match the scale of a porch to the main building and reflect the scale of porches of nearby historic buildings.”
14. ”When using artificial materials, use a blind or shutter unit that has a thickness, weight and design similar to wood.”
15. “Design a roof on new construction to be compatible with those on adjacent historic buildings.”

C. Scope of Work:
1. Construct a single family residence.
   a. The house will be setback 13’1” so as to negotiate the setback of the neighboring houses at 1013 and 1007 Selma Street.
   b. The raised slab foundation will measure at least 1’9” in height.
   c. The aforementioned foundation will be skirted by stucco-faced simulated piers spaced at equidistant intervals with wooden panels set between.
   d. A continuous 1’ skirt board will extend around the house.
   e. The walls will be clad with 6” hardiplank siding.
   f. The ceiling heights will be 9’5”.
   g. The windows will be aluminum clad wood in construction and multi-light in configuration.
   h. The roof will be a gable in construction.
   i. Architectural GAF shingles will sheath the roof.
   j. North Elevation (Façade)
      i. The North Elevation will feature an open (porch) space.
      ii. The four bay porch will be 30’0” in length and span the full width of the front façade.
      iii. A flight of wooden composite steps will access the central bay of the porch.
      iv. A louvered vent will punctuate the gable.
      v. Square section columnar posts will define the porch bays.
      vi. A wooden balustrade will be installed between posts.
      vii. A glazed and paneled wood door (painted) will provide ingress to and egress from the porch.
      viii. A double window will be employed on the western portion of the porch. Said windows will be six-over-six (two across, three below) in configuration and flanked by paneled wood shutters.
      ix. The westernmost portion of the facade will feature two six-over-six (two across, three below) windows with paneled wood or wood composite shutters.
   k. West (a side) Elevation
      i. The end of the porch bay will define the northernmost portion of the West elevation as it relates to the body of the house.
      ii. The West Elevation’s fenestration (in a northerly to southerly direction) will be as follows: one six-over-six window; followed by a pair of six-over-six windows; and a single six-over-six window.
      iii. A wooden stop with flight of steps (oriented to the South) with square sections newel posts and picketed railings will situated at the juncture of the body of the house and aforementioned smaller rear wing.
l. South (Rear) Elevation
   i. The westernmost portion of the rear elevation will feature a glazed and panel door.
   ii. The previously mentioned wooden stoop and flight of steps with their associated railing will provide access to the porch.
   iii. A louvered vent will punctuate the gable.
   iv. The eastern portion of the South Elevation will feature two six-over-six windows.

m. East (side) Elevation
   i. The East Elevation’s fenestration (in a southerly to northerly direction) will be as follows: a pair of six-over-six windows; three four-over-four window; and one six over six.

2. Conduct site improvements.
   i. Install concrete walkway from street to steps leading to front entrance.
   ii. Remove existing concrete curb cut.
   iii. Install new curb cut and concrete driveway.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The subject property, 1009 Selma Street, is located within the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. The application up for review involves construction of single family residential infill between a vacant lot to the West and a contributing house to the East.

The application is the third modular building typology to appear before the Board. Modular construction in terms of both individual component and comprehensive volume possesses a long history in Mobile architecture. In 1817, Stephen Hallett, an individual who would become one of the leading figures in Mobile’s Antebellum epoch, shipped in disassembled form multiple house frames to Mobile for ultimate construction. Hallett and his brother would go on to develop Mobile’s first sash and blind factories. The City would become a center for that particular expression of early industrial prefabrication. Window sashes, louvered shutters, paneled doors, and eared architraves (“Egyptian Doors”) were the predominant constructions of those outfits. These were shipped across the City, Gulf, and Black Belt. The types of pre-manufactured components increased in number, design, and material during the last decade of the Antebellum era before exploding during the Postbellum era. Ironwork and plaster compositions were two locally popular material compositions that joined the more pervasive wooden products. Railings, scroll sawn work, Friezes, crestings, and countless other elements went from individual creation to mass production. Scale and scope also expanded. Following on the heels of Stephen Hallett was Hinkle and Guild of Cincinnati went on to design construct, and ship whole houses. Azalea Manor located at 1624 Spring Hill Avenue is undoubtedly Hinkle and Guild creation. James Barber and latterly Aladdin and Sears & Roebuck followed suit. Modular is then not new phenomenon. The City of Mobile has experimented with it in one recent instance. A house resembling a double shotgun is the single instance of that test project. Known as the “Delaware Double”, that building is located at 906-908 Delaware Street not too far south of the subject property.

When reviewing the applications for new residential construction, the following criteria are taken into account so as retain architectural and respect historical contexts: placement; orientation; massing; scale; building elements; and materials. Here follows the analysis of this first instance of modular infill construction by the applicant for execution within Mobile’s Historic districts.
With regard to placement, two components are taken into account – setback from the street and distance between buildings. The Design Review Guidelines for New Residential Construction in Mobile’s Historic Districts state that new buildings should be responsive to and maintain the alignment of traditional façade lines (See B-1), as well as the rhythm of side & rear setbacks (See B-2.). The property under review, an inner block situation, is located adjacent to/in the vicinity of contributing buildings and beside a vacant lot. In accord with Design Guidelines, the setbacks reflect the historical character of the contributing aspects of the built landscape. The proposed placement negotiates the placement of buildings located on the dame facing block. The side setbacks are traditional in dimension. The façade directly engages the street in its orientation. The proposed front walk and side drive would reintroduce lost rhythmic sequence of elements respectful of traditional placement patterns.

The Design Review Guidelines state that mass - the relationship of the parts of the larger whole comprising a building - for new construction should be in keeping with arrangement and proportion of surrounding historic residences (B-3). The proposed house adopts the large block-like massing of other residences in the neighborhood. A continuous foundation and dominant roof anchor the building. The outward massing of the building, a block with a full-width recessed porch surmounted by a gabled roof, is one found within and beyond the boundaries of the surrounding Oakleigh Garden district. The scale of the porch and massing of the proposed house respond to a prevalent historical typology in general and specific. – a porch fronted residence (See B-13.). The roughly two (2) foot height of the foundation is reflective of traditional foundation elevations (See B-5.) and dwellings on properties abutting the subject address. The four bay porch assists in the compartmentalization of the dwelling. While a raised slab in construction, the foundation would feature a regularized sequence of simulated stucco-faced piers which would serve to simultaneously unify and compartmentalize that lowest level of the built elevation. The massing of the structure, one informed by 9’ ceilings atop a continuous 1’ skirt board, is compatible with the architectural context of the contributing landscape which it is situated amidst (See B-7.)

Scale refers to a building’s size in relationship to other buildings. The Design Review Guidelines for New Residential Construction state that new construction should be in scale with nearby historic buildings (See B-4.). the one story is compatible with structures on the same facing block as 1009 Selma Street. As mentioned in the preceding paragraph addressing massing, the elevation of the foundations, height of the ceilings, and pitch of the roof combine to form a whole that would be compatible with surrounding architectural landscape.

With regard to building components, the Design Review Guidelines call for responsiveness to traditional design traditions. The asymmetrically composed and full-width porch-fronted residence takes inspiration in both general and more importantly in specific senses from an architectural typology that animated Mobile’s architecture. (See image provided.) Going further into building components, the building employs sash window types (sash) and wall treatment (siding) that inform the immediate and vast majority of the surrounding architectural and historical context (See B-11.). The proposed window spacing affords a traditional solid-to-void ratio (See B-10.). A previously proposed set of three transom windows has been replaced with one six-over-six window. This change in configuration mimics the traditional solid-to-void ratio of the found in the landscape. Other special features employed are shutters. Historically shutters were seen on revival styles and bungalows and included types such as paneled, louvered, and board and batten. By the 1920’s, shutters became mostly decorative but still had the appearance of being functional. The proposed shutters fit the window openings and are composed of approvable materials in accordance with the guidelines.

In accord with the Design Guidelines for New Construction, the building materials, while of the present day, blend with those employed in the past and in immediate surroundings (See B 9 & 14.). Hardieboard siding and aluminum clad windows are approved for new construction within Mobile’s Historic Districts.
STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-15), Staff does not believe this application would impair the architectural or the historical character of the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of this application.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Mike Rogers, applicant, was present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Stone welcomed Mr. Rogers and asked if he had any clarifications, comments or questions.

Mr. Stone noted Mr. Jamie Betbeze sent a letter supporting the changes to the application.

Mr. Roberts stated his suggestion on the shutters on the 405 Chatham Street residence applied for this application as well.

No further discussion from the Board ensued.

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

FINDING OF FACT

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, as 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, that the application does not impair the district and a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued for the construction of a new residence.

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

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS EXPIRATION DATE: May 2nd, 2020
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2019-13-CA: 1011 Selma Street
Applicant: Porchlight, LLC
Received: 4/24/2019
Meeting: 5/1/2019

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Non-contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: New Construction – Construct a single family residence.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to the 1904 Sanborn Map, an “L” shaped wood framed dwelling with gallery stood on the subject property. The aforementioned property was eventually demolished. A one story dwelling with recessed porch was constructed circa 1940. The residence was demolished in 2005.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

A. This property appeared before the Architectural Review Board in 2005 according to the MHDC vertical files. At that time, a request for demolition was granted. The application up for review calls for the construction of a single family residence on the site.
B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
   16. “Maintain alignment of front setbacks.”
   17. “Maintain the rhythm of buildings and side yards.”
   18. “Design the massing of new construction to appear similar to that of historic buildings in the district.”
   19. “Design the scale of new construction to appear similar to that of historic buildings in the district.”
   20. “Design piers, a foundation, and foundation infill to be compatible with those of nearby historic properties.
   21. “Size foundations and floor heights to appear similar to those of nearby historic buildings.”
   22. “Use building height in front that is compatible with adjacent contributing properties.”
   23. “Design building elements on exterior buildings walls to be compatible with those on nearby historic buildings. These elements often include but are not limited to: balconies, chimneys, and dormers.”
   24. “Use exterior building materials and finishes that complement the character of the surrounding district.”
   25. “Locate and size a window to create a solid-to-void ratio similar to the ratios seen on
nearby historic windows.”
26. “Use traditional window casement and trim similar to those seen in nearby historic
buildings.”
27. “Place and size a special feature, including a transom, sidelight or decorative framing
element, to complement those seen in nearby historic buildings.
28. “Match the scale of a porch to the main building and reflect the scale of porches of
nearby historic buildings.”
29. "When using artificial materials, use a blind or shutter unit that has a thickness, weight
and design similar to wood.”
30. “Design a roof on new construction to be compatible with those on adjacent historic
buildings.”

C. Scope of Work:
1. Construct a single family residence.
   a. The house will be setback so as to negotiate the setback of the neighboring house
      at 1013 and 1007 Selma Streets (14’1”).
   b. The raised slab foundation will measure at least 1’9” in height.
   c. The aforementioned foundation will be skirted by stucco-faced simulated piers
      spaced at equidistant intervals with horizontal wood slat panels.
   d. A continuous 10” skirt board will extend around the house.
   e. The walls will be clad with 6” hardiplank siding.
   f. The ceiling heights will be 9’5”.
   g. The windows will be aluminum clad wood in construction and multi-light in
      configuration.
   h. The dominant roof will be a gable in construction.
   i. Exposed rafter tails and brackets will be employed.
   j. Secondary roofs will also be gable in construction.
   k. Architectural GAF shingles will sheath the roof.
   l. North Elevation (Façade)
      i. The North Elevation will feature enclosed and open (porch) spaces.
      ii. A single bay porch will advance from the westernmost portion of the
          portion of the façade.
      iii. The porch will be 15’0” in length and gable roof in form.
      iv. A flight of wooden composite steps will access the central bay of the porch.
      v. Brackets will be employed along the rakes and at the apex of the
         aforementioned gable.
      vi. A louvered vent will punctuate the dominant gable.
      vii. Two sets of square section columnar posts will define the porch.
      viii. A glazed and paneled wood door (painted) will provide ingress to and
            egress from the porch.
      ix. A double window will be employed on the eastern portion of the porch. Said
          windows will be six-over-six in configuration and flanked by paneled
          wood shutters. (Two panes across, three below.)
      x. The easternmost portion of the façade will feature paired six-over-six
          windows (Two panes across, three below.) with paneled wood shutters.
   m. West (a side) Elevation
      i. The end of the porch bay will define the westernmost portion of the West
         elevation as it relates to the body of the house.
      ii. The West Elevation’s fenestration (in a northerly to southerly direction) will
          be as follows: one six-over-six; followed by a pair of nine-over-nine
          windows; and a single six-over-six window.
iii. A wooden stoop with flight of steps (oriented to the South) with square sections newel posts and picketed railings will situated at the juncture of the body of the house.

n. South (Rear) Elevation
i. The westernmost portion of the Rear Elevation will feature a glazed and panel door.
ii. The previously mentioned wooden stoop and flight of steps with their associated railing will provide access to the residence.
iii. A louvered vent will punctuate the gable.
iv. The eastern portion of the East Elevation will feature two six-over-six windows (two across, three below).

o. East (side) Elevation
i. The East Elevation’s fenestration (in a southerly to northerly direction) will be as follows: a pair of nine-over-nine windows; two four-over-four windows; one six-over-six window; a four-over-four window.

2. Conduct site improvements.
i. Install concrete walkway from street to steps leading to front entrance.
ii. Construct concrete driveway from a new curb cut located at northwest corner of the lot.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The subject property, 1011 Selma Street, is located within the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. The application up for review involves construction of single family residential infill between a vacant lot to the East and a vacant lot to the West.

The application is the first modular building typology to appear before the Board. A succession of other typologies will appear before the Board in the coming months and years. Modular construction in terms of both individual component and comprehensive volume possesses a long history in Mobile architecture. In 1817, Stephen Hallett, an individual who would become one of the leading figures in Mobile’s Antebellum epoch, shipped in disassembled form multiple house frames to Mobile for ultimate construction. Hallett and his brother would go on to develop Mobile’s first sash and blind factories. The City would become a center for that particular expression of early industrial prefabrication. Window sashes, louvered shutters, paneled doors, and eared architraves (“Egyptian Doors”) were the predominant constructions of those outfits. These were shipped across the City, Gulf, and Black Belt. The types of pre-manufactured components increased in number, design, and material during the last decade of the Antebellum era before exploding during the Postbellum era. Ironwork and plaster compositions were two locally popular material compositions that joined the more pervasive wooden products. Railings, scroll sawn work, Friezes, crestings, and countless other elements went from individual creation to mass production. Scale and scope also expanded. Following on the heels of Stephen Hallett was Hinkle and Guild of Cincinnati went on to design construct, and ship whole houses. Azalea Manor located at 1624 Spring Hill Avenue is undoubtedly Hinkle and Guild creation. James Barber and latterly Aladdin and Sears & Roebuck followed suit. Modular is then not new phenomenon. The City of Mobile has experimented with it in one recent instance. A house resembling a double shotgun is the single instance of that test project. Known as the “Delaware Double”, that building is located at 906-908 Delaware Street not too far south of the subject property.

All proposed designs for similar projects located within locally designated historic districts will be reviewed by the Board so as to ensure compatibility with the surrounding historical character of the surrounding properties and districts. As with all infill, context is key when reviewing all new construction
in historic districts. When reviewing the applications for new residential construction, the following criteria are taken into account so as retain architectural and respect historical contexts: placement; orientation; massing; scale; building elements; and materials. Here follows the analysis of this first instance of modular infill construction by the applicant for execution within Mobile’s Historic districts.

With regard to placement, two components are taken into account – setback from the street and distance between buildings. The Design Review Guidelines for New Residential Construction in Mobile’s Historic Districts state that new buildings should be responsive to and maintain the alignment of traditional façade lines (See B-1), as well as the rhythm of side & rear setbacks (See B-2). The property under review, an inner block situation, is located adjacent to/in the vicinity of contributing buildings and between vacant lots. In accord with Design Guidelines, the setbacks reflect the historical character of the contributing aspects of the built landscape. The proposed placement negotiates the placement of two nearest buildings located to either side of it. The side setbacks are traditional in dimension. The façade directly engages the street in its orientation. The proposed front walk and side drive would reintroduce lost rhythmic sequence of elements respectful of traditional placement patterns.

The Design Review Guidelines state that mass - the relationship of the parts of the larger whole comprising a building - for new construction should be in keeping with arrangement and proportion of surrounding historic residences (B-3). The proposed house adopts the large block-like massing a residential typology – a “bungalow. A neighboring bungalow can be viewed on the same block face located at 1004 Selma Street A continuous foundation and dominant roof anchor the building. A rear wing and advance porch feature smaller, but proportionally responsive gable roofs. These advances and recesses of plan, coupled with the depth of the front porch, serve to relieve and enliven the massing without causing for irregularity. The outward massing of the building, a block with a corner porch surmounted by a gabled roof, is one found within and beyond the boundaries of the surrounding Oakleigh Garden district as previously mentioned. The scale of the porch and massing of the proposed house respond to a prevalent historical typology in general and specific. – a porch fronted residence, more specifically the corner porch bungalow (See B-13). The roughly two (2) foot height of the foundation is reflective of traditional foundation elevations (See B-5) and dwellings on properties abutting the subject address. While a raised slab in construction, the foundation would feature a regularized sequence of simulated stucco-faced piers which would serve to simultaneously unify and compartmentalize that lowest level of the built elevation The massing of the structure, one informed by 9”5” ceilings atop a continuous 1’ skirt board, is compatible with the architectural context of the contributing landscape which it is situated amidst (See B-7). As mentioned previously, the dominant street-oriented gable roof is relieved by a secondary roof informing the front porch (See B-15).

Scale refers to a building’s size in relationship to other buildings. The Design Review Guidelines for New Residential Construction state that new construction should be in scale with nearby historic buildings (See B-4). Neighboring block face structures are one story in height. As mentioned in the preceding paragraph addressing massing, the elevation of the foundations, height of the ceilings, and pitch of the roof combine to form a whole that would be compatible with surrounding architectural landscape.

With regard to building components, the Design Review Guidelines call for responsiveness to traditional design traditions. Compatibility is the goal. The asymmetrically composed and partially porch-fronted residence takes inspiration from an architectural typology that animated Mobile’s architecture during the first third of the 20th Century - the corner porch bungalow. As mentioned in the portion of the narrative articulating massing, the typology evoked has precedent in the immediate and surrounding landscape (See B-8). Going further into building components, the building employs sash window types (sash) and wall treatment (siding) that inform the immediate and vast majority of the surrounding architectural and historical context (See B-11). The proposed window spacing affords a traditional solid-to-void ratio.
(See B-10). Other special features employed are shutters. Historically shutters were seen on revival styles and bungalows and included types such as paneled, louvered, and board and batten. By the 1920’s, shutters became mostly decorative but still had the appearance of being functional. The proposed shutters fit the window openings and are composed of approvable materials in accordance with the guidelines. Placement and employ of special features such as brackets and vents also serve to tie the building to other historic buildings.

In accord with the Design Guidelines for New Construction, the building materials, while of the present day, blend with those employed in the past and in immediate surroundings (See B 9 & 14.). Hardieboard siding and aluminum clad windows are approved for new construction within Mobile’s Historic Districts.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Based on B (1-15), Staff does not believe this application would impair the architectural or the historical character of the surrounding district. Staff recommends approval of this application.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Mr. Mike Rogers, applicant, was present to discuss the application.

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Stone welcomed Mr. Rogers and asked if he had any clarifications, comments or questions. Mr. Stone noted this application was identical to the 405 Chatham Street application, but the rear porch was different. MR. Rogers also noted a slight difference in the window configuration. Mr. Stone noted that the windows looked proportional, and that in the future if the previous design moves one of the windows more in form the corner board, it would meet the guidelines.

Mr. Stone noted Mr. Jamie Betbeze sent a letter supporting the changes to the application.

Mr. Roberts stated his comments on the shutters on the 405 Chatham Street application applied to this application as well.

No further discussion from the Board ensued.

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

**FINDING OF FACT**

Mr. Roberts moved that, based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public testimony the Board finds the facts in the Staff report, as 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 issued for the construction of a new residence. The motion received a second by Mr. Wagoner and was approved unanimously.

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS EXPIRATION DATE: May 2nd, 2020

Mr. Roberts thanked Mr. Rogers for his work in the historic district. Mr. Rogers thanked the Board and appreciated their willingness to work with the application.