ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
October 16th, 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 3:03 p.m. Paige Largue, Historic Development Staff, called the roll as follows:
   **Members Present:** David Barr, Abby Davis, Andre Rathle, Joseph Rodrigues, Jim Wagoner, Catarina Echols, Craig Roberts, and Steve Stone.
   **Members Absent:** Robert Brown, Kim Harden, Nick Holmes, and Gypsie Van Antwerp.
   **Staff Members Present:** Bridget Daniel, Paige Largue, Marion McElroy and Flo Kessler.
2. Mr. Rodrigues motioned to approve the minutes of the September 18th and October 2nd meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Roberts and approved unanimously.
3. Mr. Roberts moved to approve the Mid-Months as written. The motion was seconded by Mr. Rodrigues and the Mid-Months were approved unanimously.

B. MID-MONTH APPROVALS: APPROVED.

1. **Applicant:** Rellim Contracting LLC
   a. Property Address: 205 Church Street
   b. Date of Approval: 09/25/2019
   c. Project: Repair damaged stucco to match. Use formula to match stucco.

2. **Applicant:** Rellim Contracting LLC
   a. Property Address: 200 Lanier Avenue
   b. Date of Approval: 09/25/2019
   c. Project: Repair termite damage to match in dimension, profile, and material.

3. **Applicant:** Adam Holdings LLC
   a. Property Address: 1002 Elmira Street
   b. Date of Approval: 09/26/2019
   c. Project: Repair and replace deteriorated wood including wood siding to match in dimension, profile, and material.

4. **Applicant:** Ronald Schmidting
   a. Property Address: 54 N Ann Street
   b. Date of Approval: 09/26/2019
   c. Project: Repair and replace deteriorated wood on privacy fence to match in dimension, profile and material.

5. **Applicant:** McCrory Contracting LLC
   a. Property Address: 1717 Dauphin Street
   b. Date of Approval: 09/26/2019
   c. Project: Reroof flat roof with TPO roof.

6. **Applicant:** Ben Murphy Co Inc
   a. Property Address: 1123 Palmetto Street
   b. Date of Approval: 09/27/2019
   c. Project: Reroof with architectural shingles in pewter.

7. **Applicant:** Rellim Contracting LLC
   a. Property Address: 157 Dexter Avenue
   b. Date of Approval: 09/27/2019
   c. Project: Reroof with architectural shingles in pewter.
8. **Applicant: Maurin Architecture PC**
   a. Property Address: 911 Government Street
   b. Date of Approval: 09/27/2019
   c. Project: Rehabilitate existing structure. Majority of work will take place on rear elevation not visible from public view. Repair deteriorated windows to match existing in dimension, profile, and material. Repair and replace deteriorated wood and wooden elements to match existing in dimension, profile, and material. An in filled rear portion will be opened and any windows repurposed. On the East (side) elevation, a door and covering will return to a one-over-one window. On the rear portion of the East (side) elevation an two salvaged windows will be installed: one on the first floor and on the second in previous openings. The rear elevation will have wood siding feathered in to match existing. One refurbished window will be installed in previous opening. A new concrete ADA and wooden stair will be installed on the rear elevation.

9. **Applicant: The Guild (GC)**
   a. Property Address: 204 S Georgia Avenue
   b. Date of Approval: 10/01/2019
   c. Project: Repair deteriorated siding and other wood to match in dimension, profile and material. Repaint to match.

C. APPLICATIONS

1. **2019-42-CA: 308 Charles Street**
   a. Applicant: Mr. Andrew Dooley of Andrew Dooley Design and Associates on behalf of Mr. Witt and Mrs. Ashley Dukes
   b. Project: Restoration and Addition – Conduct in-kind repairs; alter fenestration; and construct a rear addition.
   **APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

2. **2019-43-CA: 352 Marine Street**
   a. Applicant: Mr. Michael Rogers on behalf of Porchlight, LLC
   **APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

3. **2019-44-CA: 355 Marine Street**
   a. Applicant: Mr. Michael Rogers on behalf of Porchlight, LLC
   **APPROVED. CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED.**

D. **OTHER BUSINESS**
   1. Next meeting is November 6th, 2019.
APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD

2019-39-CA: 308 Charles Street
Applicant: Mr. Andrew Dooley of Andrew Dooley Design and Associates on behalf of
Mr. Witt and Mrs. Ashley Dukes
Received: 9/13/2019
Meeting: 10/16/2019

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1
Project: Restoration and Addition – Conduct in-kind repairs; alter fenestration; and
construct a rear addition.

BUILDING HISTORY

This Victorian influenced residence was constructed in 1904. The residence is a center hall, wood frame
construction with and semi-octagonal gable bay on the north end of the façade.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

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

STAFF REPORT

A. This property last appeared before the Architectural Review Board in July of 2016 according
to the MHDC vertical files. A that time, repair work, construction of a rear porch, and addition
of a dormer on a side elevation was approved. The proposed scope of work includes
constructing a new rear addition and porch; construct a new side addition and new dormers
on the front and side elevations.

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 the relationship of solids to voids of an exterior wall as established by the
      historic building.”
   3. “Design an addition so there is the least possible loss of historic fabric and so the
      character-defining features of the historic building are not destroyed, damaged or
      obscured.”
   4. “Design an addition so that the overall characteristics of the site (site topography,
      character-defining site features, trees, and significant district vistas and public views) are
      retained.”
   5. “Design an addition to be compatible with the character of the property, neighborhood,
      and environment.”
6. “The new work shall be differentiated from 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.”
7. “Place an addition so that it is subordinate in scale to the historic structure.”
8. “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.”
9. “Design doors or windows to or onto an addition so to be compatible with the existing structure.”
10. “Design an addition to be compatible with the color, material, and/or character of the property, neighborhood, and environment.”
11. “Design the building components (roof, foundations, doors, and windows) of the addition to be compatible with the historic architecture.”
12. “Maintain the relationship of solids and voids (windows and doors) in an exterior wall as established by the historic building.”
13. “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 properly differentiated from the original structure.”
14. “Place an addition so that so that it is subordinate to the historic residential structure.”
15. “Place a vertical addition in the rear so that it is not visible from the street.”
16. “As per camelback additions, those “substantially setback from the street” can be appropriate.”
17. “Design a roof of an addition to be compatible with the existing historic building.”
18. “Design a roof shape, pitch, material, and level of complexity to be similar to those of the existing historic building.”
19. “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.”
20. “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.”
21. “Where possible, locate a dormer or skylight on a new addition in an inconspicuous location.”
22. “Design a new porch to be compatible with the existing historic building.”
23. “Design a rear porch so that its height and slopes are compatible with the original historic structure.”
24. “Design the scale, proportion and character of a porch addition element, including columns, corner brackets, railings and pickets, to be compatible with the existing historic residential structure.”
25. “Match the foundation height of a porch addition to that of the existing historic structure.”
26. “Design a porch addition roofline to be compatible with the existing historic structure. However, a porch addition roofline need not match exactly that of the existing historic building. For example, a porch addition may have a shed roof.”
27. “Use materials for a porch addition that are appropriate to the building.”
28. “Do not use a contemporary deck railing for a porch addition placed at a location visible from the public street.”
C. Scope of Work (per submitted site plan):

1. Perform general repairs and makes replacements (when necessary) to match the existing in-kind.
   a. Reroof the house with architectural shingles.
   b. Repair and replace wood elements including siding, fascia, soffits, to match as per profile, dimension and material.
   c. Repair existing column on West (façade) elevation.
   d. Repair when necessary wooden windows to match existing as per material, light configurations and moldings.
   e. Install new wooden louvered shutters on West (front) elevation.
   f. Repair existing brick piers and concrete steps to match.
   g. Install new painted lattice between piers.
   h. Install new glass lantern over West (façade) entrance.

2. Construct a rear addition from extending the East (rear) and South (side) elevations.
   a. The addition of the building envelope will extend 7’11” from the existing rear elevation. The South side elevation will extend by roughly 6’0”.
   b. The South elevation will be setback 3’1” from the lot line; the East elevation will be setback 15’6” from the lot line, the North elevation will be remain 8’1” from the lot line.
   c. Corner boards are currently not employed.
   d. The addition will rest atop brick faced piers with framed wood lattice between.
   e. Walls will be clad with wooden lapsiding to match existing.
   f. The current hipped roof line will be extended and intersect with other roof forms, and dormers will be constructed on each elevation.

3. West (façade) Elevation.
   a. The Southernmost portion will be informed by a new addition extending from the South elevation.
   b. The aforementioned addition will be in recess of the front façade plane.
   c. A wood column will inform the southernmost portion of the addition. Fixed louvered shutters will be used as wall cladding on the addition.
   d. A diamond window in either wood or aluminum clad will be employed
   e. A gas lantern will be installed over the front entrance.
   f. A dormer will be constructed and installed centrally on the existing roof.
   g. A multi-paned wood or aluminum clad casement window be punctuate the gable roof dormer.
   h. The gable will be clad in shingles matching the façade bay window gable.

4. South (side) Elevation.
   a. An existing porch deck will be removed.
   b. The existing hipped roof will be extended.
   c. A small window located on the western end of the existing elevation will be removed.
   d. An existing porch deck will be removed.
   e. The westernmost portion of the addition will feature the terminal bay of a new porch with a gable roof. The porch will be recessed from the new South elevation’s facade plane.
   f. A corner board will be employed at the western end of the addition wall.
   g. A side addition will be in advanced of the wall plane and extend from the South elevation and feature a hipped roof.
   h. The aforementioned addition will employ fixed louvered shutters and be punctuated by a diamond window.
i. A new set of dormers with four-paired windows between with be constructed on the second floor.

   a. The existing hipped roof will be extended.
   b. Two existing windows on the western portion will be relocated further west on the elevation.
   c. A porch will inform the westernmost portion of the elevation. The porch will be surmounted with a gable roof extending from the hipped roof.
   d. A dormer with two multi-paned windows will be employed on the North elevation.

6. West (rear) Elevation.
   a. An existing porch deck will be removed.
   b. The existing hipped roof will be extended.
   c. A small window located on the southern end of the existing elevation; four paneled door; and one-over-one window will be removed.
   d. The northern portion of the new addition will feature a porch.
   e. The porch will be surmounted by a gable roof in advance of the façade plane.
   f. The three bay porch will be supported by boxed columnar supports.
   g. A flight of wooden steps will cascade from the porch’s three bays.
   h. The porch will be 10’0” depth.
   i. The interior will be accessed by a set of three French doors with transoms above from the porch.
   j. The southern portion will be punctuated by two blind shutters.
   k. The southernmost portion will be informed by a side addition recessed from the façade plane. The side addition will be punctuated by a six panel door with canvas awning above.
   f. A corner board will be employed at the western end of the addition wall.

7. Site Improvements
   a. A 6’ wooden privacy fence will be constructed behind the front plane of the house.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The application calls for the construction of a rear addition onto a contributing residence. Minor in kind repair and replacement work also informs the scope of work. A rear deck would have to be removed, and roofline altered to construct the addition. The removal of porch deck possesses neither architectural nor historical value. 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). Deteriorated windows will be repaired and deteriorated wood elements will be replaced to match in kind.

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 a 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, the roofline will be extended making the proposed addition less reversible (See B-8).

In addition to siting, the proposed addition is so designed as to offer differentiation from and compatibility with the existing fabric. While set back from the street (less noticeable), the rear addition does not afford a clear differentiation between old and new. The extension of the existing roof further
blends in with the original portion of the house and offers no distinction (See B-6). Foundations, ceiling heights, siding, window light configurations, eave treatments, roof forms, and other elements match or are compatible with the existing features (See B 9 -10 & 17-19).

Fenestration changes on the existing house called for by the proposed addition are located on the rear portion of secondary elevations and on the rear elevation. Two side windows (North side) would be moved further to the rear. A small window on the South (side) elevation will be removed. A rear window and wooden door will be removed from the rear elevation. The house features singular windows in at least one location. The West (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. 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-12). The rear elevation of the addition is not seen form public view and features two blind louvered shutters responsive to the landscape and three sets of French doors.

Fenestration changes to the second story calls for the addition of dormers on each elevation. Previously a COA was issued for repair work and an addition of a side dormer. The Design Guidelines state, “Where possible, locate a dormer…on a new addition in an inconspicuous location,” (See B-21). The side and rear dormers are recessed from the front plane and impact the landscape less. The addition of a dormer on the front façade is highly visible to the public. The windows for the dormers are proposed to be multi-paned with decorative wood moldings surrounding the openings. These window molding and glass panes are more elaborate than what is currently found on the house (See B-11). This alteration in fenestration while aesthetically pleasing, is more elaborate in detail than what is currently found on the house (see B-11).

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 wood siding, aluminum clad windows, framed lattice between brick faced piers, and other elements that are well-matched with the residence as it exists.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on B (1-20), Staff believes this application meets the guidelines regarding site placement, materials, and building components. Staff is concerned the major alteration to the roof line with no distinction from the original house, and front dormer would impair the architectural or historical character of the building, but not the district. Staff recommends the applicant consider the following recommendations:

1. Employ corner boards to distinguish the existing envelope of the house from the new addition (See B-13).
2. Simplify the design of the dormers, in particular the molding and window pane configuration (See B-21).
3. Use cement fiber board to clad the dormers to distinguish them from existing fabric (See B-13).
4. Consider relocating the front façade dormer to the side (See B-21).

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Andrew Dooley of Andrew Dooley and Design Associates, design professional, 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. Dooley stated staff had addressed the application in full. He noted the corner board will be added to the North elevation, but is not necessary on the South elevation. Mr. Dooley explained he drew inspiration from the front door for the dormer design, but was willing to simplify it. He noted the side dormers look more pronounced than they will be in actual view. Mr. Dooley then explained the height of the dormers was to accommodate the client.

Mr. Roberts stated he has no issues with the design but agreed a corner board should be employed.

Mr. Rodrigues asked the clearance height for the second story. Mr. Dooley responded the ceiling height would be 9’0”.

Mr. Roberts noted the three window dormer on the rear elevation mimicked quirky design elements found on Queen Anne houses. Mr. Dooley noted the inspiration for the windows was from 210 George 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. 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 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

2019-43-CA: 352 Marine Street
Applicant: Michael Rogers on behalf of Porchlight, LLC
Received: 9/30/2019
Meeting: 10/16/2019

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

According the MHDC vertical file, a circa 1904 two bay shotgun house previously sat on the lot. Sometime after 1995 it was demolished.

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 358 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 and stucco-faced simulated piers with recessed stucco-faced foundation supporting the side porch.
   d. The West and East Elevations will be stucco over CMU.
   e. A continuous skirt board will extend around the house.
   f. The walls will be clad with 4” fiber-cement siding.
   g. The ceiling heights will be 10’3”.
   h. The windows will be aluminum clad wood in construction and multi-light (six-over-six) in configuration.
   i. Doors will be composed of aluminum clad, metal or wood,
   j. The dominant roof will be hipped in construction.
   k. Secondary roofs will also be shed in construction.
   l. Architectural GAF shingles will sheath the roof.
   m. East Elevation (Facade)
      i. The East Elevation will feature open (porch) space.
      ii. A three bay porch will inform the facade.
      iii. The porch will be 16’0” in width and 6’6” in depth
      iv. A flight of wooden composite steps will access the southernmost bay of the porch.
      v. Boxed columnar posts will define the bays of the porch.
      vi. Fenestration will be as follows in a southerly to northerly direction: glazed and paneled wood door (painted); six-over-six window; six-over-six window.
      vii. A recessed side porch will inform the southernmost portion of the elevation.
   n. South (a side) Elevation
      i. A corner board will define the westernmost portion of the South elevation.
      ii. The South Elevation’s fenestration (in a westerly to easterly direction) will be as follows: paired six-over-six; multi-paned glazed door; six-over-six window; six-over-six window.
      iii. A porch addition with a shed roof will be located off the South elevation.
      iv. The porch will access the multi-paned glazed door.
      v. The porch shed roof will be sheathed in 5V crimp metal.
      vi. A wooden stop with flight of steps (oriented to the West) with square sections newel posts and picketed railings will be situated at the juncture the aforementioned porch.
1. West (Rear) Elevation
   i. The southernmost portion of the rear elevation will feature a side porch in recess of the rear façade plane.
   ii. Two equidistant windows will punctuate the rear elevation.

p. North (side) Elevation
   i. The North Elevation’s fenestration (in a westerly to easterly direction) will be as follows: paired six-over-six; small six-over-six; six-over-six window; six-over-six window.

2. Conduct site improvements.
   i. Install concrete walkway from street to steps leading to front entrance.
   ii. Install concrete driveway from located at southeast corner of the lot.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The subject property, 352 Marine, is located within the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. The application up for review involves construction of single family residence.

The application is for either a wood framed or modular building type. Previously, other modular construed houses have appeared before the Board in recent years. To appear before the Board. 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 prefabication. 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, Friizes, 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 south and north of the building. Along the same block face is 358 Marine 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 narrow rectilinear block-like of the shotgun typology. A continuous foundation and dominant gable roof anchor the building. A front porch features proportionally responsive shed roof. The outward massing of the building, a block with a front porch surmounted predominantly by a gable roof, can be similarly found on a nearby Victorian influenced house (hipped roof with shed porch) and in the Old Dauphin Way district on Caroline Street. The
working class shotguns found on Caroline Street possess separate roof forms for the main house and front porch. 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 (3’0”) foot height of the foundation is reflective of traditional foundation elevations (See B-5) and dwellings on properties abutting the subject address. 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 9’3” ceilings and loft space atop a continuous skirt board, is compatible with other structures found further North along Marine Street and on nearby Savannah Street (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). 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 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). The proposed window spacing mimics a traditional solid-to-void ratio (See B-10). Placement of features such as boxed columns 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). Cement fiber board 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. Michael Rogers on behalf of Porchlight, LLC 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. Rogers stated Ms. Largue addressed the application in full.

Mr. Roberts inquired as to what type of skirting would be used around the foundation. Mr. Rogers replied the skirting would be lattice or horizontal slats as previously used.

Mr. Stone noted the paint colors indicated the paint images were incorrect. Mr. Rogers noted there may have been a correction to that discrepancy.
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. 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 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

2019-44-CA: 355 Marine Street
Applicant: Michael Rogers on behalf of Porchlight, LLC
Received: 9/30/2019
Meeting: 10/16/2019

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 two bay shotgun house with bracket and bargeboard details stood on this site until 2012 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 last appeared before the Architectural Review Board in November of 2012. At that time the Board approved the demolition of the remains of a fire damaged house. 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:
3. Construct a single family residence.
   a. The house will be setback so as to negotiate the setback of the neighboring house at 357 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 and stucco-faced simulated piers with recessed stucco-faced foundation supporting the side porch.
   d. The West and East Elevations will be stucco over CMU.
   e. A continuous skirt board will extend around the house.
   f. The walls will be clad with 4” fiber-cement siding.
   g. The ceiling heights will be 8’9-1/2”.
   h. The windows will be aluminum clad wood in construction and multi-light (six-over-six) in configuration.
   i. Doors will be composed of aluminum clad, metal or wood,
   j. The dominant roof will be gable in construction.
   k. Exposed rafter tails will be employed.
   l. Secondary roofs will be shed in construction.
   m. 5V crimp or standing seam metal (disregard corrugated metal on drawings) will sheath the roof.
   n. West Elevation (Façade)
      i. The West Elevation will feature open (porch) space.
      ii. A three bay porch will inform the façade.
      iii. The porch will be 16’0” in width and 7’1-9/16” in depth
      iv. The porch will be surmounted by a shed roof.
      v. The gable will be punctuated by a rectilinear window.
      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: glazed and paneled wood door (painted); six-over-six window; six-over-six window.
      ix. A recessed side porch will inform the southernmost portion of the elevation.
   o. South (a side) Elevation
      i. A corner board will define the westernmost portion of the South elevation.
      ii. The South Elevation’s fenestration (in a easterly to westerly direction) will be as follows: six-over-six window; six-over-six window; six-over-six window; multi-paned glazed door; six-over-six window; six-over-six window.
      iii. A porch addition with a shed roof will be located off the South elevation.
iv. The porch will access the multi-paned glazed door.
v. The porch shed roof will be sheathed in 5V crimp metal or standing seam (not corrugated as shown).
vi. A wooden stop with flight of steps (oriented to the East) with square sections newel posts and picketed railings will be situated at the juncture the aforementioned porch.

p. West (Rear) Elevation
i. The southernmost portion of the rear elevation will feature a side porch in recess of the rear façade plane.
ii. Two equidistant windows will punctuate the rear elevation.

q. North (side) Elevation
i. The North Elevation’s fenestration (in a easterly to westerly direction) will be as follows: six-over-six; small six-over-six; small six-over-six; six-over-six window; six-over-six window; six-over-six window.

4. Conduct site improvements.
i. Install concrete walkway from street to steps leading to front entrance.
ii. Install concrete driveway from located at southeast corner of the lot.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The subject property, 355 Marine 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 for either a wood framed or modular building type. Previously, other modular construed houses have appeared before the Board in recent years. To appear before the Board. 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 357 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 narrow rectilinear block-like of the shotgun typology. 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). The proposed window spacing mimics a traditional solid-to-void ratio (See B-10). The window in the gable, is rectilinear in shape. While the proportion of the aforementioned window is not historic, the shape is responsive to vertical proportions seen in the landscape.

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. Michael Rogers on behalf of Porchlight, LLC 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. Rogers stated Ms. Largue addressed the application in full.

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. Barr 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. Barr and was approved unanimously.