A. CALL TO ORDER

1. The Chair, Steve Stone called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m. Paige Largue, Historic Development Staff, called the roll as follows:
   - **Members Present:** Andre Rathle, Robert Brown, Joseph Rodrigues, Jim Wagoner, Catarina Echols, Craig Roberts, Steve Stone and Gypsie Van Antwerp.
   - **Members Absent:** David Barr, Abby Davis, Kim Harden, Nick Holmes.
   - **Staff Members Present:** Bridget Daniel, Paige Largue, John Sledge, Shayla Beaco and Flo Kessler.

2. Mr. Brown motioned to approve the minutes of the October 16th meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Rodrigues and approved unanimously.

3. Mr. Wagoner moved to approve the Mid-Months as written. The motion was seconded by Mr. Roberts and the Mid-Months were approved unanimously.

B. MID-MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED.

1. **Applicant:** Patricia Buchanan
   - **Property Address:** 1155 Government Street
   - **Date of Approval:** 10/08/2019
   - **Project:** Repair internal gutter. Reroof with architectural shingles.

2. **Applicant:** Cooner Roofing & Construction
   - **Property Address:** 1416 Brown Street
   - **Date of Approval:** 10/09/2019
   - **Project:** Reroof with architectural shingles in neutral color.

3. **Applicant:** Patrick O. Hand
   - **Property Address:** 1563 Bruister Street
   - **Date of Approval:** 10/11/2019
   - **Project:** Repaint in a neutral color scheme. Repair deteriorated wood to match in dimension, profile and material.

4. **Applicant:** Richard Sherer
   - **Property Address:** 506 Eslava Street
   - **Date of Approval:** 10/14/2019
   - **Project:** Reroof with architectural shingles and repair deteriorated wood soffits fascia to match in dimension, profile and material.

5. **Applicant:** Eric Saucier
   - **Property Address:** 1500 Dauphin Street
   - **Date of Approval:** 10/15/2019
   - **Project:** Repair four windows on second story, secondary elevation. If beyond repair replace sashes with wood sashes to match in dimension, profile, and material. Repaint to match.

6. **Applicant:** David T McConnell, General Contractor
   - **Property Address:** 156 St Anthony Street 1
   - **Date of Approval:** 10/15/2019
   - **Project:** Repaint part of frieze and wrought iron in Bellingrath green.

7. **Applicant:** Curtin & Associates
   - **Property Address:** 16 Le Moyne Place
   - **Date of Approval:** 10/15/2019
   - **Project:** Construct 6ft wood privacy fence to replace metal fence, behind facade of any existing building.
8. **Applicant:** John Mims  
a. Property Address: 310 Marine Street  
b. Date of Approval: 10/18/2019  
c. Project: Repaint exterior body color scheme alabaster white to match in dimension, profile and material.

9. **Applicant:** Virginia Adkisson  
a. Property Address: 1151 Old Shell Rd  
b. Date of Approval: 10/18/2019  
c. Project: Repaint exterior to match in dimension, profile and material - BEHR - (Anonymous) light gray color on house with white trim.

**C. APPLICATIONS**

1. **2019-45-CA:** 103 Beverly Court  
a. Applicant: Mr. Robert L. and Mrs. Abby K. Johnson  
b. Project: Demolition Related: Demolish one story ancillary building.  
   **APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

2. **2019-46-CA:** 1 N. Royal Street  
a. Applicant: Mr. Mark Fillers of Renasant Bank on behalf of One North Royal, LLC  
b. Project: Rehabilitation and Fenestration Related: Conduct in-kind repairs; install ATM and canopy; install dropbox; replace window with door, alter existing door; install signage.  
   **CONCEPTUALLY APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

3. **2019-47-CA:** 2305 Ashland Place  
a. Applicant: Mr. Robby Montgomery of T.E. Montgomery Construction on behalf of Mr. Leyland Moore  
   **APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

4. **2019-48-CA:** 260 N. Jackson Street  
a. Applicant: Mr. Timothy J. Spafford of Architecture and Design, Inc. on behalf of Jackson Street, LLC  
b. Project: Alteration, Addition, and Site Related: Construct front porch, side corridor, and rear porch addition; alter existing fenestration on side elevations; conduct site improvements.  
   **CONCEPTUALLY APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

5. **2019-49-CA:** 350 Marine Street  
a. Applicant: Mr. Michael Rogers on behalf of Porchlight, LLC  
   **APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

**D. OTHER BUSINESS**

1. Next meeting is November 20th, 2019.

Mr. Wagoner stated he had received a call concerning a float barn that was previously approved by the ARB. He further explained the concern was the metal panels used as sidings. Ms. Largue presented the Board with the previously approved plans. The Board agreed the project was being constructed according to the COA. Mr. Rodrigues inquired about CEU credits for AIA/ Mr. Roberts noted the meetings have to be register as a CEU class to qualify.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2019-45-CA:  103 Beverly Court
Applicant:  Mr. Robert L. and Mrs. Abby K. Johnson
Received:  10/15/2019
Meeting:  11/6/2019

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District:  Old Dauphin Way
Classification:  Contributing
Zoning:  R-1
Project:  Demolition Related: Demolish one story ancillary building.

BUILDING HISTORY

The residence was built circa 1940 in the Georgian Revival style. The ancillary building was constructed at a later date.

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 November of 1987 according to the MHDC vertical files. At that time, a rear wing addition was approved. The proposed scope of work includes demolishing a one story ancillary building.

B. The Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts state, in pertinent part:
   1. Demolish an existing ancillary building.
      a. Clear debris from site.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application involves the demolition of a later non-contributing ancillary structure.

The same criteria by which Board reviews the demolition of principle buildings are taken into account for the demolition of ancillary buildings. According to the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts, the considerations taken into account are as follows: architectural significance of the building, condition of the structure, impact on the street & the district, and nature of any proposed development (See B-1). With regard to significance, the ancillary building is not of the same architectural importance and construction quality. As to condition, the building is in bad state of repair with termite damage and rot. With regard to the impact on the streetscape and district, the building is located behind the main dwelling at the very rear of the lot. While building is visible when privacy fence is open, its impact on the streetscape is minimal. If authorized demolition approval, a new ancillary building would be constructed.
STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Johnson, 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. Johnson explained the condition of the building and provided images to staff found in the ARB report. He further explained the rot and termite damage make it beyond repair.

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, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the property or neighborhood and a Certificate of Appropriateness be granted.

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

2019-46-CA: 1 N. Royal Street
Applicant: Mark Fillers of Renasant Bank on behalf of One North Royal, LLC
Received: 10/17/2019
Meeting: 11/6/2019

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: T5.2
Project: Alteration, Fenestration and Signage Related: Conduct in-kind repairs; install ATM and canopy; install dropbox; replace window with door, alter existing door; install signage.

BUILDING HISTORY

The Burke Building was originally a three story brick commercial building of Italianate design with an elaborate two story cast iron gallery at the time of its construction in 1880. The building was significantly altered during a remodel in 1938. At that time, the first floor storefronts were removed. Other alterations occurred in 1986.

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 February of 2109. At that time, the Board granted approval for the removal of the westernmost window on the South elevation and installation of a door. The application up for review calls for new paint; installation of ATM and canopy; installation of dropbox; replacement of window with door, alteration of existing door; installation signage.

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.”
   2. “Distinctive stylistic features or examples of skilled craftsmanship which characterize a building, structure or site should be treated with sensitivity with particular emphasis on preservation of the features.”
   3. “Maintain significant historic façades in their original form.”
   4. “Maintain historic façade elements.”
   5. “Pay special attention to maintaining the historic appearance of building walls of corner buildings.”
   6. “Remove only those materials which are deteriorated, and beyond reason-able repair.”
   7. “Do not cover or obscure original building materials.”
8. “The utilization of period color and paint schemes that reflect the historic character of the property is encouraged.”
9. “Original doors and openings, including their dimensions, should be retained along with any moldings, transoms or sidelights.”
10. “Repair or replace a damaged historic door to maintain its general historic appearance.”
11. “Preserve storefronts, cornices, turned columns, brackets, exposed rafter tails, jigsaw ornaments and other key architectural features that are in good condition.”
12. “Retain and treat exterior stylistic features and examples of skilled craftsman-ship with sensitivity.”
13. “Document the location of a historic feature that must be removed and repaired so it may be repositioned accurately.”
14. “When replacing historic details, match the original in profile, dimension, and material.”
15. “A substitute material may be considered if it appears similar in character and finish to the original. A measured drawing may be required in these instances to recreate missing historic details from photographs.”
16. “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.”
17. “Preserve historic window features, including the frame, sash, muntins, Mullions, glazing, sills, heads, jambs, moldings, operation, and groupings of windows.”
18. “Use a shed type awning for a rectangular window or door opening.”
19. “Design exterior building walls associated with additions and alterations to non-historic structures to respect the character of the historic district.”
20. “Design a new sign to be compatible with the character of a building and the district.”
21. “New signs are restricted to a maximum of 64 square feet.”
22. “Use a sign material that is compatible with the materials of the building on which it is placed and the district. New materials that achieve the effect of traditional materials and lighting solutions will be considered on a case by case basis.”
23. “Where necessary, use a compatible, shielded light source to illuminate a sign.”
24. “Wall signs should be placed to align with signs on nearby buildings and should be relatively flush with the building façade, minimizing the depth of a sign panel or letters. They should sit within, rather than forward of, the fascia or other architectural details of a building, ideally within a panel formed by decorative moldings or transom panels where they exist.”
25. “A window sign is any sign, picture, symbol or combination thereof, designed to communicate information about an activity, business, commodity, event, sale or service that is placed inside within one foot of the inside window pane or upon the windowpanes or glass, and which is visible from the exterior of the window.”
26. “A projecting sign should be designed and located to relate to the building façade and entries. It is appropriate to locate a small projecting sign near the business entrance, just above or to the side of the door or to mount a larger projecting sign higher on the building, centered on the façade or positioned at the corner. The bracket for a projecting sign should complement the sign composition.”

C. Scope of Work:
1. Alter later fenestration on first story.
   a. Install ATM in existing westernmost opening on the Dauphin Street (South) elevation. Painted stucco will fill opening around ATM.
   b. Construct metal canopy with 5V Crimp or standing seam roof composed of wood and metal. Canopy will be installed over ATM.
   c. Install night drop within existing inner bay opening. Glass will surround night drop.
   d. Remove upper panels on existing pair of two-over-two panel door. Replace with glass.
   e. Install new glass lanterns or simulated glass lanterns at the entrance or clean existing fixtures.
2. Alter second story fenestration.
i. Repair existing windows to match in dimension, configuration and material.
ii. Remove westernmost pass-thru window on South (Dauphin Street, side) elevation.
   Install custom wood or metal casement/ French door to match existing window in
dimension, and configuration. Profile of muntins may be slightly larger.

3. Repaint the building. (The color scheme will be as follows :)
   i. Exterior walls: Taupe (see three options on plans)
   ii. Gallery Ceiling: SW 6505 Atmosphere (blue).
   iii. Balcony and Iron work: Bellingrath Green
   iv. Windows and Trim: DeTonti Square Off-White

4. Install signage.
   i. Install concrete one (1) wood or metal hanging blade sign with concealed spotlights
to illuminate sign. Sign shall be 4’9” x 1’9”.
   ii. Install one (1) wood or metal storefront sign above entrance with concealed
   spotlights directing external illumination.
   iii. Signs shall not total more than 64 square feet.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The subject property, 1 N. Royal, is located within the Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District. The
application up for review involves alteration of fenestration and installation of signage. The application has been
approved by the Consolidated Review Committee (CRC) which reviews work in the Downtown Development
District (DDD). The application has also been given a letter to proceed as proposed by the Mobile Historic
Development Commission. The MHDC holds a façade easement on the property.

With regard to fenestration, both the first story and second story would be altered. The first story is not of the
same architectural importance as the second story. The first story will have three openings altered. The front door
entrance located on N. Royal Street will have glass replace the existing upper panels for transparency due to the
nature of the bank use. The secondary elevation, facing Dauphin Street, will have two bays altered. The
westernmost opening will have an ATM with canopy installed. The canopy will be constructed of approvable
materials. An inner bay on the Dauphin (side) Street side will have a night dropbox installed. The existing
opening will remain and glass will surround the dropbox. New lighting will also be installed. The first story
fenestration is not original to the building. The second story of the primary and secondary elevation retains
original features. The second story secondary façade will have its westernmost pass-thru window removed
(see B-12). The Design Review Guidelines state that examples of skilled craftsmanship and historic windows
including their jambs, frame, sash, muntins and operation should be preserved (see B-17). The jamb, sill, molding
and opening will remain in place. A custom wood casement door will be installed to fit the opening. Its design
will mimic that of the existing window in dimension and material (see B-15). The central muntin may be slightly
larger than the existing window, but it will retain a similar profile. This pass-thru window is seen behind the
gallery making it less visible from the street. The building will be repainted in a neutral color scheme.

With regard signage, storefront and hanging blade sign are allowed in historic districts. The hanging blade sign
will be installed under the gallery (see B-26). The storefront sign will be installed over the entrance (see B-24).
The signs are proposed to be constructed of painted metal or wood and will be no more than 64 square feet total in
size (see B-21). Both signs will be externally illuminated (see B-22). The size, materials, and locations meet
traditional standards and therefore are permissible by the Design Review Guidelines.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-17), Staff believes portion of the application requesting the removal of pass-thru window would
impair the architectural or the historical character of the surrounding district. Staff recommends the Board
approve the painting, alteration of first story fenestration and installation of signage of the application but not the removal and replacement of pass-thru window due to its skilled craftsmanship and original fabric.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Mark Fillers, applicant and lessee of the property, and Mr. Jim Walker, contractor, were present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board discussion took place concurrently with the public testimony.

Mr. Stone welcomed the applicant and representative and asked if they had any clarifications, comments or questions. The applicants provided additional images of the pass-thru window.

The applicants confirmed for Mr. Roberts that the pass-thru window proposed to alter is fully functioning. Mr. Stone explained the drawing for the proposed shows the muntins and jamb are thicker. Mr. Roberts commented the proposed looks like a window. Mr. Walker stated the design intent was for the new door/window to still appear close to the original.

Mr. Stone asked if there was a detail drawing of the jamb and muntin for the new door/window. Mr. Roberts inquired if the change in material would require any alterations due to code. Mr. Stone commented it may not. Mr. Roberts stated he would like to receive a section of the proposed window/door. Mr. Stone confirmed for Mr. Roberts all other items could be approved except for the window.

Mr. Roberts and Mr. Stone discussed using the current pass-thru window and reworking to open it out onto the gallery. Mr. Stone stated he thought it would be best to use the current window so that it would be less likely to trigger any code requirements.

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. Stone explained hinging the current window would be best course to minimize any impact and loss of integrity. He explained using the window in such a way would probably positively impact the Section 106 process. Mr. Roberts suggested researching this issue and how developers handled it in the French Quarter of New Orleans. Mr. McNair stated the Vieux Carre Commission would have documentation on file.

Mr. Stone inquired as to the condition of the westernmost opening on the first floor of the South elevation. Mr. Fillers and Ms. Largue explained the alteration was previously applied for by the owner and approved by the ARB. Mr. Rodrigues inquired as to the signs, materials and their locations. Mr. Fillers and Ms. Largue explained the location and materials of painted metal.

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, the application for all work except the pass-thru window does not impair the historic integrity of the property or neighborhood and that a sectioned detail be provided to staff of the proposed pass-thru window at a later date. He moved a Certificate of Appropriateness be granted for all work but the pass-thru window.

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

2019-47-CA: 2305 Ashland Place
Applicant: Mr. Robby Montgomery of T.E. Montgomery Construction on behalf of Mr. Leyland Moore
Received: 10/7/2019
Meeting: 11/6/2019

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Ashland Place
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Alteration and Addition Related: Alter fenestration and construct side and rear addition.

BUILDING HISTORY

The Cowan House was constructed in 1926 in the Tudor Revival style.

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 according to the MHDC vertical file. 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. “Deteriorated architectural features shall be repaired rather than replaced, wherever possible. In the event replacement is necessary, the new material shall match the material being replaced in physical character and durability. Composition, design, texture, and other physical qualities should appear similar to the original.”

2. “Maintain significant historic façades in their original form.”

3. “Repair deteriorated building materials by patching, piecing-in, consolidating or otherwise reinforcing the material.”

4. “Maintain the relationship of solids to voids of an exterior wall as established by the historic building.”

5. “Maintain the original pitch.”

6. “Preserve decorative elements, including crests and chimneys.”

7. “Use new roof materials that convey a scale and texture similar to those used traditionally.”

8. “Use cement tiles when replacing clay tile roofs on larger buildings if clay is not available.”

9. “Retain historic details and ornamentation intact.”

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

11. “Preserve the original roof form of a historic residential structure”

12. “Avoid a new roofing system that permanently damages or alters an existing roof.”

13. “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.”
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14. “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.”
15. “Design an addition to be compatible with the character of the property, neighborhood, and environment.”
16. “The new work shall be differentiated form the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.”
17. “Place an addition so that it is subordinate in scale to the historic structure.”
18. “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.”
19. “Design doors or windows to or onto an addition so to be compatible with the existing structure.”
20. “Design an addition to be compatible with the color, material, and/or character of the property, neighborhood, and environment.”
21. “Design the building components (roof, foundations, doors, and windows) of the addition to be compatible with the historic architecture.”
22. “Maintain the relationship of solids and voids (windows and doors) in an exterior wall as established by the historic building.”
23. “Differentiate an addition from a historic structure using changes in material, color and/or wall plan. Alternative materials, such as cement fiberboard, are allowed when the addition is property differentiated from the original structure.”
24. “Place an addition so that so that it is subordinate to the historic residential structure.”
25. “Place a vertical addition in the rear so that it is not visible from the street.”
26. “As per camelback additions, those “substantially setback from the street” can be “appropriate.”
27. “Design a roof of an addition to be compatible with the existing historic building.”
28. “Design a roof shape, pitch, material, and level of complexity to be similar to those of the existing historic building.”
29. “Incorporate overhanging exposed rafters, soffits, cornices, fascias, frieze board, moldings, or other elements into an addition that are generally similar to those of the historic building.”
30. “Use exterior materials and finishes that are comparable to those of the original historic residential structure in profile, dimension and composition. Modern building materials will be evaluated for appropriateness or compatibility with the original historic structure on an individual basis, with the objective of ensuring the materials are similar in their profile, dimension, and composition to those of the original historic structure.”
31. “Where possible, locate a dormer or skylight on a new addition in an inconspicuous location.”

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

1. Perform general repairs to match the existing in-kind.
   a. Repair flat roof on previous addition.
2. Construct a side addition by extending a central hallway wall on the West (side) elevation.
   a. The addition will extend 21’7-1/2” from the existing wall to the façade plane of a bedroom.
   b. Two windows on a North elevation facing an interior courtyard will be removed. Two windows on the West elevation will be removed and salvaged. A French door accessing the interior courtyard will be removed and salvaged.
   c. The finished floor of the addition will match existing heights.
   d. Salvaged French doors will be flanked by salvaged windows. A set of steps with cheek walls and iron rails will access the door.
   e. Walls will be stucco to match existing.
   f. The roof will be sheathed in 5V crimp of standing seam metal to match existing.
   g. The cricket roof connecting the existing gable roofs will require a dormer be removed and a reconfigured dormer be constructed.
3. Construct a rear addition extending from the South (rear) elevation.
   a. West (side) Elevation
      i. A salvaged door will replace an existing French door on a previous addition.
      ii. A wooden louvered panel will screen a breezeway which connects the rear addition to a proposed carport.
      iii. The roof line will change in height at the proposed carport. The carport will be supported by chamfered wooden posts. A wooden beam with eave detail will be installed below the carport eave.
      iv. The wooden posts and beam will be stained to match existing eave bracket.
   v. The carport will feature two bays.
   b. South (rear) Elevation
      i. The existing gable end roof will have its pitched altered per drawings (See 4.2).
      ii. A triple-paired window will be removed and repurposed. A gable roof will extend from the central portion of the elevation. The pitch will be lower than those found on the original portion of the house.
      iii. The master suite addition will feature a clay barrel tile roof form salvaged tiles, per elevation, but notes asphalt singles on roof plan.
      iv. Eave details will match that of the existing house.
      v. This portion of the addition will have walls clad in a stucco finish.
      vi. A carport will extend from the new addition.
      vii. The carport roof will be the same pitch as the addition.
      viii. A set of steps under a breezeway will access a rear entrance.
      ix. The carport will be two bays.
      x. The bays will be defined by wooden chamfered posts.
   c. East (side) Elevation
      i. An existing pair of windows will be removed and repurposed.
      ii. An existing wall will extend towards the rear of the lot on the southern portion of the residence.
      iii. A new roof system will be constructed over the rear addition.
      iv. The roof will be sheathed in asphalt shingles.
      v. Eave details will match that of the existing house; however the eave will not match existing eave heights.
      vi. The walls will be clad with a stucco finish to match the existing.
      vii. Fenestration on the new addition will be as follows in a northerly to southerly direction: a reconfigured triple-paired window using salvaged windows; a new window to match existing windows in dimension, configuration and material.
      viii. The end of the addition to the residence will be informed by a new carport.
      ix. A carport will extend from the new addition. The roof of the carport will be lower in height than that of the addition.
      x. The carport roof will be the same pitch as the addition.

**STAFF ANALYSIS**

The application calls for the construction of a side and rear addition onto a contributing residence. Minor in kind repair and replacement work also informs the scope of work. Fenestration changes located towards the rear portion of secondary elevations are also proposed.

The proposed repair and replacement work will match existing materials in dimension, profile and configuration (See B-1). A later addition flat roof will be repaired to match.

In accord with the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts, the proposed addition is so designed that the overall characteristics of the property are retained (See B-3). By virtue of being located on rear of an inner...
lot property, the addition is subordinate to the public view (See B-6). While majority of work will be located
towards the rear portion of the building, rooflines on the side and rear additions will be altered (See B-8).

The addition is so designed with different rooflines as to offer differentiation from and compatibility with the
existing fabric. The extension of the East elevation as proposed aligns current and new facades, but the eave
details and roofline do not match in height (See B-18 and B-19). The roof pitch of the addition does not mimic
that of the original house (See B-28). These elements, as well as roofing materials, do not afford compatibility
with the existing house. The side addition will feature a cricket roof sheathed in metal. The location of the
proposed new roof will impact an existing dormer. Foundations, ceiling heights, wall treatment, window light
configurations, and eave treatments are compatible with the existing features (See B 9 -10 & 17-19). The carport
will inform the end of the new addition. The roofline height will be lower than the addition of the residence and
sheathed in asphalt shingles. Eave details will match that of the main house (See B-21).

Fenestration changes on the existing house called for by the proposed addition are located on secondary
elevations and on the rear elevation. Two side windows (East side) would be repurposed and relocated. A
window on the South (side) elevation will be removed. A rear triple-paired window will be removed from the rear
elevation. A door (facing courtyard), two windows (facing courtyard), and two other windows (facing courtyard)
will be removed on the West (side) elevation. The door will be repurposed and the windows will be reconfigured
to be salvaged. The West (side) elevation is recessed from the façade plane, but is located towards the front
portion of the house. The East (side) elevation windows proposed to change are located towards the rear of the
house. The East and South elevations are not visible from the public view and changes to the West (side)
elevations will have minimal impact. The observation of fenestration patterns still responds existing solid-to-void
relationships. With regard to the addition, the light configuration and groupings of fenestration are responsive to
those found on the historic portions of the building (See B-22).

Fenestration changes to the second story on the West (side) elevation calls for the alteration of dormer. The
Design Guidelines state, historic window features including frame, sash, jamb and details shall be retained (See
B-10). The new roof system as proposed requires the existing window be removed and height and configuration
be altered (See B-12). This alteration in fenestration and feature impacts the integrity of house.

Building components employed for the new addition are compatible with those found on the existing house (See
B-19 and 20). The proposed new addition will employ stucco, salvaged windows, eave details, and other elements
that are well-matched with the residence materials as it exists.

**CLARIFICATIONS**

1. Please clarify the material of the rear entrance door and rear entrance steps. (Applicant clarified it will be wood,
aluminum clad or metal.)
2. Please clarify the color of the metal roof. (The roof will now be TPO to match the color of the barrel tiles to
allow for a lower slope that does not interfere with the dormer.)
3. Please clarify the location of the wooden beams will be installed with a space between the eave of the carport.
Sheets 4.1 and 4.2 indicate different locations. (Please see the revised drawing. The beam will be placed under the
eave.)
4. Please confirm the existing South elevation gable roof will not change in pitch. Sheet 4.2 existing and proposed
elevations indicate the pitch will change. (This has been adjusted on drawing to reflect the existing rear roof pitch
will not change.)
5. Please confirm asphalt shingles will be employed on the rear addition roof. Sheet 4.2 notes the addition roof
will match exiting tile. (The applicant clarified the roof on the addition will match the existing clay barrel tile.)
RECOMMENDATIONS/ SUGGESTIONS

1. Alter the design on the roof pitch to the master suite addition to mimic that of the original house (See B (1-12), B (1-27, and 1-28.) (Applicant explained difficulty of mimicking roof pitch.)
2. The carport pitch helps distinguish its use and does not necessarily need to be altered, although staff suggests incorporating the breezeway roof with the carport.
2. Lower the roof pitch of the side addition so that it does not impact the existing dormer (See B 1-6, 9, and 10). (This has been altered to meet guidelines.)
3. Use repurposed clay barrel tiles or imitation barrel tiles on the addition roof surmounting the master suite and extension of the main house (See B 7 and 21). (This has been clarified on the drawings; the roof will be clay barrel tile to match existing.)
4. Consider raising eave height of East (side) addition surmounting main house to match that of the existing (See B 1-29).
5. Simplify roofing system.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Previously, staff recommended denial based on B (1-2) (1-7 and 8), (1-10), (1-13) (1-21) (1-28) (1-29), due to concern over the roofline impacting a historic dormer, roof material, and roof components of eave height, etc.

The applicant has returned to staff with revised drawings addressing several of the issues outlined in the report. Items have been clarified as noted, and several recommendations addressed. Based on improvements to the proposed design, Staff does not believe the application would impair the residence or historic district and recommends approval.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Leyland Moore, owner, and Mr. Robby Montgomery, applicant, 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. Montgomery explained application was explained in full by staff.

Mr. Roberts asked if the roof was to be tile or asphalt or membrane for the side addition. Mr. Montgomery confirmed the roof would be a membrane roof in a color to match the clay tile since it is a low roof pitch. No further discussion from the Board ensued at that time. Ms. Roberts inquired as to the Board and Batten siding on the house and Ms. Largue explained it was existing.

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, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the property or neighborhood and a Certificate of Appropriateness be granted.

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

2019-48-CA: 260 N. Jackson Street
Applicant: Mr. Timothy J. Spafford of Architecture and Design, Inc. on behalf of Jackson Street, LLC
Received: 10/11/2019
Meeting: 11/6/2019

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: DeTonti Square
Classification: Non-contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Alteration, Addition, and Site Related: Construct front porch, side corridor, and rear porch addition; alter existing fenestration on side elevations; conduct site improvements.

BUILDING HISTORY

This two-story masonry and concrete building dates to 1964. It was built as a mixed use residential building—originally a family occupied the downstairs floor and part of the upstairs. Of particular historic note, the building features a bomb shelter. In 2008 exterior alterations were conducted to afford architectural compatibility with the district.

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 May of 2016. At that time the Board approved the alteration of fenestration, construction of rooftop deck, and site alterations such as parking lot. The application up for review calls for the renovation of the building and parking lot.

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

1. “Non-contributing structures are addressed separately in the Design Review Guidelines document from contributing structures. Contributing structures are identified based on historic surveys conducted by professionals in accordance with the guidelines and standards adopted by the National Park Service. These surveys are updated from time to time, at which point the classifications of contributors and non-contributors may change within a given locally designated historic district. In order to ensure efficient administration of the guidelines and predictability for property owners, only properties classified as contributing should be reviewed as such in Mobile’s design review process. Consult the City of Mobile’s website to determine if a property falls in a locally designated historic district and whether the building is contributing or non-contributing.”

2. “This section (below) provides guidelines for rehabilitation, alteration and additions to non-historic (non-contributing) residential buildings in locally-designated historic districts. Preserving the integrity of a non-contributor is not a consideration. 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.”
3. “Design additions and alterations to non-historic structures to be compatible with the placement, massing and scale of surrounding historic structures.”
4. “Design an addition to respect the original orientation of the building and maintain the typical orientation of adjacent historic buildings.”
5. “Design an addition to a non-historic building to preserve setback distances and spacing between buildings to maintain setbacks and spacing typical of surrounding historic structures.”
6. “Design the massing of an addition to be consistent with the massing of historic structures in the district.
7. “Design a roofline, bay, porch or other element associated with an addition to a non-historic building to be in keeping with the scale of surrounding historic structures.”
8. “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.”
9. “Design a cornice line, foundation line, window and door height, and floor and ceiling height of an addition to a non-historic buildings to be similar to those of the original building provided these elements on the original building blend harmoniously with the historic district.”
10. “Use the alteration or addition to a non-historic building to improve the overall structure’s appropriateness within the historic district.”
11. “Use materials with a character compatible to those used historically and with proven durability.”
12. “Maintain original material wherever possible provided the material is durable and compatible with the surrounding historic district.”
13. “Design replacement roofs and roofs of additions to be compatible with the district.”
14. “Design a new porch or an alteration to an existing porch to respect the character of the district.”
15. “Locate and orient a new porch on a non-historic residential building similarly to those seen in the district.”
16. “Size a front porch element to be at a similar proportion to the original structure as those seen in the district.”
17. “Design a foundation to be consistent with those in the district and use a durable foundation material on all sides of a building.”
18. “Design details and ornamentation at a scale that is consistent with details and ornamentation on historic buildings in the district.”
19. “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.”
20. “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.”
21. “Materials that are compatible in character, scale and finish to those used on nearby historic buildings are acceptable. These often include: Stucco, Brick, Stone, Wood (lap siding, shingles, board and batten), Concrete siding, Cement fiber board siding, Skim stucco coat.
22. “Materials that are similar in character, scale, texture and color range to those used on nearby historic buildings are acceptable. These often include: Asphalt dimensional or multi-tab shingles, Wood shake or shingle, Standing seam metal, Metal shingles, 5-V crimp metal, Clay tile, Imitation clay tile or slate.”
23. “Materials that are similar in character, profile, finish and durability to those used on nearby historic buildings are acceptable. These often include: Wood, Vinyl-clad wood, Aluminum-clad customized wood, Extruded Aluminum.”
24. “Materials that are not similar in character, profile, finish and durability to those used on nearby historic buildings are unacceptable. These often include: Mill finish metal windows, Snap-in or artificial muntins, Vinyl.”
25. “Install a simple wood or wire fence. Heights of wooden picket fences are ordinarily restricted to 36”. Consideration for up to 48,” depending on the location of the fence, shall be given. A variance might be required. Staff can advise and assist applicants with regard to a variance. If combined with a
wall, the total vertical dimension of the wall and fence collectively should not exceed 36,” or in some cases 48”
26. “For surface parking areas associated with commercial uses, size a perimeter parking area fence to not exceed 48” in height.”
27. “Install a cast-iron or other metal fence not exceeding 48” in height if located in the front yard.”
28. “Design a fence located behind the front building plane to not exceed 72” in height. If the subject property abuts a multi-family residential or commercial property, a fence up to 96” will be considered.”
29. “Locate a parking area at the rear or to the side of a site whenever possible.”
30. “Use landscaping to screen a parking area.”
31. “Materials that have a similar character, durability and level of detail to walks and paved areas associated with historic properties in the district are acceptable. These often include: Gravel or crushed stone, Shell, Brick, Cobblestone, Grasspave or grasscrete (mix of grass and hard surface paving material that provides a solid surface.”

C. Scope of Work:
1. Conduct general repairs and make replacements (when necessary) to match the existing in kind.
2. Renovate existing elevations and construct addition on North (side) elevation, and East (rear) elevation.
   a. All fenestration will be removed except for the West (façade) elevation, and westernmost windows on the North and South (side) elevations.
   b. Remove existing lighting, stairs, and landing.
   c. New windows will be multi-paned in configuration and fiberglass in construction.
   d. West Elevation (Façade)
      i. A three bay porch will inform the façade.
      ii. The central bay will feature a French door with lintels to match existing.
      iii. The porch will be surmounted by a parapet roof.
      iv. The porch will not feature a foundation to match the existing first floor height.
      v. Rectilinear chamfered posts will define the bays of the porch.
      vi. Light fixtures will punctuate each of the posts.
      vii. A second floor gallery will feature metal balustrade between posts.
      vili. The West Elevation existing fenestration pattern will remain.
      ix. A recessed addition will inform the southernmost portion of the elevation.
      x. The addition will extend from the North elevation.
      xi. The parapet details will match that of the existing.
      xii. The southernmost portion of the addition will feature an open space to access a new corridor.
      xiii. The second story of the open space will feature a metal balustrade.
      xiv. A six-over-six window will punctuate the northernmost portion of the first and second story.
   b. North (a side) Elevation
      i. A porch will define the westernmost portion of the North elevation.
      ii. The porch will feature a slender rectilinear opening with metal balustrade between columns on the second story.
      iii. The side addition will be in recess but close to the front façade line.
      iv. The addition will extend from the existing façade plane.
      v. A partially enclosed exit stair will inform the westernmost portion of the addition.
      vi. A corridor will inform the central portion of the addition on the elevation.
      vii. The corridor will feature four bays.
      viii. A triple paired door and window system will inform the bay openings.
      ix. A new two story porch will inform the East end of the elevation.
      x. The porch will be flush with the existing façade plane.
xi. An advanced portion (a chimney) will be flanked by slender rectilinear openings. The openings will feature metal balustrades on the second story.

c. East (rear) Elevation
   i. The southernmost portion of the rear elevation will feature a partially enclosed exit stairwell addition.
   ii. The addition will feature a slender rectilinear opening on the second story.
   iii. South of the exit stair enclosure will be a corridor addition.
   iv. The central portion of the rear elevation will feature two story porch.
   v. The one bay porch will feature two large rectilinear supports with triple paired door and windows.
   vi. The remaining fenestration will be as follows in a northerly to southerly direction on both floors: six-over-six window; paired three-over-three window.

d. South (side) Elevation
   i. The westernmost portion of the elevation will feature a new porch in recess of the façade plane.
   ii. The South elevation’s fenestration (in a westerly to easterly direction) will be as follows on both stories: existing opening with new six-over-six fiberglass window; smaller six-over-six; paired six-over-six; smaller six-over-six; smaller six-over-six; quadruple paired six-over-six; paired six-over-six; and smaller three-over-three.
   iii. The easternmost end will be informed by a new porch.
   iv. The single bay porch will feature large scaled columnar supports. The second story will feature a metal balustrade between posts.

3. Conduct site improvements.
   i. Install repurposed brick pavers on the West, East and South portions of the lot. Plantings will be located at the rear of the lot.
   ii. On the vacant southern portion of the lot, install parking.
   iii. Lot will be surfaced with concrete.
   iv. A landscape buffer will be provided at the western perimeter of the parking lot.
   v. One curb cut will access the lot. A gate will allow vehicular access at the curb cut.
   vi. A 6’ aluminum fence will surround the parking lot and vines will be planted at the base of fence to screen parking.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The subject property, 260 N. Jackson Street, is located within the DeTonti Square Historic District. The application up for review involves alteration of fenestration, porch and side additions, and construction of parking lot.

Minor in kind repair and replacement work also informs the scope of work. The proposed repair and work will match existing stucco in finish (See B-1).

Fenestration changes on the existing building called for by the renovation and proposed addition are located on secondary elevations and on the rear elevation. The West (front) façade elevation fenestration openings, as well as the westernmost openings on the secondary elevations, will remain. New multi-paned fiberglass windows or doors with simulated divided lite will be installed in openings. Fiberglass is not listed as an approachable door or window material in the guidelines; however it is also not listed as unacceptable. Staff has provided Board Members with specifications of the proposed window for their review. The East (rear) elevation is not visible from the public view and changes to the North and South (sides) elevations are on secondary elevations. The observation of fenestration patterns still responds existing solid-to-void relationships.
In accord with the Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts, the proposed addition is so designed so that the orientation of the building is maintained (See B-4). The exit stairwell and corridor (vestibule) are located off a side elevation facing an inner lot. The exit stairwell and corridor addition is setback from the front façade line. The rear porch is located at the eastern end of the lot making it less visible to the public (See B-6). A new front porch will extend from the existing front façade plane (See B-8).

The Design Review Guidelines state that mass - the relationship of the parts of the larger whole comprising a building – and scale for additions on non-contributing buildings should be in keeping with arrangement and proportion of surrounding historic residences (see B-5 and B-6). The proposed side addition could be setback further from the front façade plane to better fit the massing of the neighborhood.

Regarding design elements associated with the additions, the Design review Guidelines state new elements and materials shall blend in with the district (See B-8). The additions feature a parapet roof with details that match the building (See B-9). New openings employ lintels to match the existing. Stucco will be employed on the additions to match the finish of the existing stucco.

While certain elements meet the Design Review Guidelines, others could be improved. The side addition’s front façade could improve its solid-to-void ratio (See B-20). The location of both the rear and front porch is similar to those seen in the district (See B-15). The porch and side corridor supports/posts are inconsistent with the proportions of those seen in the district (See B-16).

Site improvements are proposed for the property. Existing brick pavers will be reused around the building. The Design Review Guidelines state parking shall be located to the side or rear of a lot (See B-29). The proposed parking lot will be located North adjacent of the building. The lot will be enclosed by a 6’ metal fence. The guidelines state fences may be up to 96” in height behind the front plane of the building. The perimeter of the parking area will feature planted vines along the perimeter, and evergreen hedges along N. Jackson Street (See B-30). Paving materials that are similar to those found in the district include gravel, stone, shell, brick, or grasscrete (See B-31). The surface of the parking lot will be concrete.

**CLARIFICATIONS:**
1. Please confirm the height of the fence along N. Jackson Street.
2. The proposed floor plan shows a single door opening, while the elevations illustrate French doors. Please confirm the openings on the first and second story front façade will be French doors.

**SUGGESTIONS (NON-BINDING)**
1. Recess the side addition from the front façade plane further to lessen the impact of its massing if possible.
2. Utilize more permeable surface options for parking to minimize the impact of the surface parking lot.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

On B (1-6) (1-8) (1-14) (1-16) and (1-20), Staff believes this application as proposed would impair the architectural or the historical character of the surrounding district. Staff believes the materials, alterations to existing fenestration, proposed location of additions, and parking will not impair the district. Staff recommends denial of the application as proposed. Staff recommends the alterations to the proposed porch elements proportion and fenestration pattern on the front façade of the addition to meet the guidelines.

1. Adjust the proportion of the columns to reflect the district.
2. Adjust proportions of openings found on the new additions.
3. Add additional openings or blind shutters to the front façade of the side (exit stair) addition to reflect to solid-to-void ratio patterns in the district.
PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Tim Spafford, architect and 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. Spafford explained the height of the fence is proposed at six feet around the parking perimeter to blend in with the current wall screen height. Mr. Roberts stated the open metal 6' fence height will surround the parking perimeter.

Mr. Roberts asked if the proposed fiberglass windows will feature simulated divided lite. Mr. Spafford replied yes. Ms. Largue reiterated the windows will not be Grill between glass.

Mr. Roberts stated the column size looked large for the neighborhood, but noted it was a new porch/gallery. Mr. Roberts also explained the lanterns on the columns were not necessary.

Ms. Van Antwerp inquired as to the door style on the North elevation. Mr. Roberts stated it looked like tripled-paired windows, with the center window being a door. Mr. Spafford clarified it is a asset of three doors, with two sets being fixed. Mr. Spafford provided clarification on drawings A.5 and A.1 for Mr. Rodrigues.

Mr. Spafford gave a more background on the specifications of the existing building. He further explained some of the limitations of the site.

Mr. Spafford confirmed for Ms. Van Antwerp only the rear units will access the rear porch.

Mr. Spafford explained the position of fenestration on the side addition after Mr. Rodrigues inquired into drawing A.3. Ms. Largue stated the staff recommended a blind opening or faux shutters on the front elevation of the side addition to improve the solid-to-void ratio of the wall. Mr. Wagoner asked if the applicant would be agreeable to the false opening. Mr. Spafford agreed.

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. Douglas Hunter, neighbor the property, stated he was delighted with the design and the building being repurposed. He requested the metal fence be more ornate in design and he is agreeable with the 6' fence height.

Mr. Wagoner stated up lighting would be an aesthetically pleasing choice on the columns versus lanterns.

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. Rodrigues and was unanimously approved.
DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

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

2019-49-CA: 350 Marine Street
Applicant: Mr. Michael Rogers on behalf of Porchlight, LLC
Received: 10/12/2019
Meeting: 11/6/2019

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Vacant Lot
Zoning: R-1
Project: New Construction: Construct a one-story single family residence.

BUILDING HISTORY

A single story wood frame house stood on this site until 2011 after a devastating fire.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

A. This property has not appeared before the Architectural Review Board according to the MHDC vertical files. The 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:

4. Construct a single family residence.
   a. The house will be setback so as to negotiate the setback of the neighboring house at 352 Marine Street.
   b. The raised foundation will measure at least 3’0” in height.
   c. The aforementioned foundation will be skirted by stucco-faced simulated piers spaced at equidistant intervals with wood slat lattice panels set between on the main body of the house.
   d. A continuous skirt board will extend around the house.
   e. The walls will be clad with 6’ fiber-cement siding.
   f. The ceiling heights will be 10’0”.
   g. The windows will be aluminum clad wood in construction and multi-light (six-over-six) in configuration.
   h. Doors will be composed of aluminum clad, metal or wood,
   i. The dominant roof will be hipped in construction.
   j. Architectural shingles will sheath the roof.

k. East Elevation (Façade)
   i. The West Elevation will feature open (porch) and enclosed spaces.
   ii. A three bay porch will inform the northern portion of the façade.
   iii. The porch will be 22’6” in width and 10’6” in depth.
   iv. The porch will be extending around the northern façade.
   v. The northernmost portion of the porch will recess an additional 20’0”.
   vi. A flight of wooden composite steps will access the southernmost bay of the porch.
   vii. Boxed columnar posts will define the bays of the porch.
   viii. Fenestration will be as follows in a southerly to northerly direction: six-over-six window; six-over-six; multi-paned glazed door with transom; six-over-six window; door with transom.

l. South (a side) Elevation
   i. A porch will define the easternmost most portion of the South elevation.
   ii. The South Elevation’s fenestration (in an easterly to westerly direction) will be as follows: six-over-six window; six-over-six window; two-over-two; two-over-two; two-over-two; and two-over-two.
   iii. A set of steps will inform the westernmost end.

m. West (Rear) Elevation
   i. The northern portion of the rear elevation will feature a porch in advance of the rear façade plane.
   ii. The porch will be defined by three bays.
   iii. A hipped roof will surmount the porch.
   iv. The roof will be supported by columnar posts.
   v. A flight of steps will provide access from the southern end.
   vi. The fenestration will be as follows in a northerly to southerly direction: door with transom; paired window; six-over-six; six-over-six.
n. North (side) Elevation
   i. A porch will inform the eastern portion of the elevation.
   ii. The North Elevation’s fenestration (in an easterly to westerly direction) will be as follows: six-over-six; two-over-two; two-over-two.

5. Conduct site improvements.
   i. Install concrete walkway from street to steps leading to front entrance.
   ii. Install concrete driveway from located.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The subject property, 350 Marine Street, is located within the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. The application up for review involves construction of single family residential on a corner lot.

The application is for either a modular or wood frame building type. Other modular constructed houses have appeared before the Board in recent years. Modular construction in terms of both individual component and comprehensive volume possesses a long history in Mobile architecture. Pre-fabricated materials have been utilized in Mobile since the early 1800’s. In 1817, Stephen Hallett shipped in disassembled form multiple house frames to Mobile for 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 pre-fabricated factories. These factories gained more popularity in the Postbellum era. Ironwork and plaster compositions were two locally popular materials compositions that joined pre-fabricated wooden products. Railings, scroll sawn work, Friezes, crestings, and countless other elements went from individual creation to mass production. 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.

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 within 150’ of the building, specifically at the previously approved and soon to be constructed 352 Marine Street. 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 a traditional block-like massing. A continuous foundation and dominant hipped roof anchor the building. A rear porch feature smaller, but proportionally responsive hipped roof. The East (façade) elevations recessed porch is located on the northern portion of the elevation. 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 hipped roof, is similar to massing found in the neighborhood. The scale of the porch and massing of the proposed house respond to historical porch fronted residences (See B-13). The roughly two (3’0”) 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 10’ 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 proposed and approved adjacent building at 352 Marine Street 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 patterns. 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 surrounding architectural and historical context (See B-11). The proposed window spacing mimics a traditional solid-to-void ratio, in particular along Marine and Savannah Streets (See B-10). The window in the gable is rectilinear in shape.

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. Steve Morrison, 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. Morrison replied staff addressed the application in full.

Mr. Stone questioned the closeness of the house to the rear setback. He also referred to the Historic District Overlay.

Mr. Roberts inquired as to the detail of the columns and handrail. Mr. Stone replied for the Board to reference Sheet 5.01 for this detail.

Mr. Roberts requested more detail on the column. Mr. Stone suggested the detail be sent to staff. Mr. Stone further explained it was the same column detail recently approved on a neighboring property at 352 Marine Street.

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, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the property or neighborhood and a Certificate of Appropriateness be granted with understanding a detail of the column be provided.

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