Architectural Review Board Minutes
July 1, 2026 – 3:00 P.M.

ADMINISTRATIVE

The meeting was called to order by the Chair, Cartledge Blackwell at 3:04 pm.

1. Roll Call
Annie Sawyer Allen, Historic Development staff, called the roll as follows:

Members Present: Stephen McNair, Barja Wilson, Cartledge Blackwell, Abby Davis, and Karrie Maurin.

Members Absent: Cameron Pfieffer-Traylor, Jennifer Roselius, Stephen Howle, and Catarina Echols

Staff Members Present: Annie Sawyer Allen, Bruce McGowin, Kimberly Thomas, Hannon Falls, and Matthew Sanford

2. **Approval of Minutes from June 17, 2026**
Mr. Stephen McNair moved to approve the minutes of the June 3, 2026, meeting.
Mr. Stephen Howle seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.

3. **Approval of Mid-Month COAs granted by Staff**
Mr. Cartledge Blackwell moved to approve the mid-month COAs granted by Staff.
Ms. Barja Wilson seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.

MID-MONTH APPROVALS

1. **Applicant:** JW Rentals LLC
   Property Address: 14 Lafayette Street
   Date of Approval: 06/09/2026
   Project: Repaint the exterior (including the previously painted brick) the following Sherwin Williams colors.
   Main Body Color: Conti Street Grey Green
   Trim: White
   Accent Area Colors: White
2. **Applicant:** Harold Small
   Property Address: 163 Roberts Street
   Date of Approval: 06/09/2026
   Project: In-kind repairs to existing flat roof section.
3. **Applicant:** Gillian McGee
   Property Address: 911 Augusta Street
   Date of: 06/10/2026
   Project: Replace damaged wood siding on side and rear elevations with Hardi cementitious siding. Reveal to match existing.
   Repaint exterior in colors to be submitted to Historic Development Staff prior to application.

4. **Applicant:** Jaubert Design Studio
   Property Address: 32 S Lafayette Street
   Date of Approval: 06/12/2026
   Project: 1) Replace existing metal front steps that have collapsed with new wood steps on the east facade front porch.
   2) Install wood lattice to enclose space beneath front steps.
   3) Replace a small section of the existing front porch wood decking boards in-kind.
   4) Repair in kind wood railing cap on the south end of the porch to match existing.
   5) Refurbish existing metal railing on the front steps or replace in-kind.
   6) Paint trim and porch to match existing colors.
5. **Applicant:** Inc. Walker Brothers Investments
   Property Address: 470 Dauphin Street
   Date of Approval: 06/16/2026
   Project: Repaint the exterior plywood wall on the south facade, facing Dauphin Street, to match the existing color.

6. **Applicant:** B&B Roofing and Gutter
   Property Address: 152 S Catherine Street
   Date of Approval: 06/18/2026
   Project: Reroof to replace existing asbestos shingles with Atlas Pinnacle Pristine Hearthstone Architectural Shingles.
7. **Applicant:** Real Broker LLC
   Property Address: 1001 New St Francis Street
   Date of Approval: 06/18/2026
   Project: Reroof to replace existing shingle roof with a galvanized (silver/gray) standing seam metal roof with a matte finish.

APPLICATIONS

1. 2026-38-CA

Address: 257 N Jackson Street
Historic District: DeTonti Square
Applicant/Agent Simon Thornton
Project: New construction of a single-family dwelling (in concept)
Application Tabled - Certified Record Attached

OTHER BUSINESS

The next ARB meeting is scheduled for July 15, 2026.

Agenda Item # 1
Certified Record 2026-38-CA

DETAILS

Location:
257 N Jackson Street

Summary of Request:
Concept approval for the form, placement, and massing of a two-story brick single family home

Applicant:
Simon and Pam Thorton

Property Owner:
Simon and Pam Thorton

Historic District:
DeTonti Square

Classification:
Vacant lot

Summary of Analysis:

- The scale and placement of the proposed single-family home are compliant with the *Design Guidelines* for new residential structures.
- The forward-facing garage doors of the home would be a slight departure from historic development patterns in DeTonti Square.

Report Contents:

PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

DeTonti Square Historic District was initially listed in the National Register in 1972 under Criterion A for social and urban planning significance and Criterion C for significant architecture. The district was one of two historic districts created by a municipal ordinance in 1962 in an effort to halt the rapid demolition of historic buildings near the city's central business district. The district, named for the French explorer Henri DeTonti, contains a few structures surviving from the 1830s, but the majority were built in the 1850s as residences of the wealthy and influential cotton factors, merchants, and planters.

The property proposed for development is vacant. The 1885 Sanborn map (the earliest available) shows a two-story frame house with front and rear two-story porches on the property that was listed as 61 N Jackson Street. The building displayed a compound plan with a wing extending from the northwest elevation. The house remained unchanged in the 1924 Sanborn map other than a street number change to 257 N Jackson Street. The 1955 updated Sanborn map also shows no change. Historic Aerial imagery and survey photos show that the residence was demolished sometime around 1980.

This property has appeared before the Architectural Review Board three times. May 20, 2013, a COA was issued for a single-family residence. On August 7, 2013, the plans approved in the previous meeting for the single-family home were amended. The approved structure was never constructed. An earlier version of this application was presented to the Board on February 4, 2026, and the application was sent to a Design Review Committee that took place on February 13, 2026.

SCOPE OF WORK

Construct two-story brick single-family residence.

1. The proposed structure would be located on N Jackson Street with its east facade facing the road. It will measure 69'6" W x 58'9" D.
2. Front setback from N Jackson to front porch stoop will be 37'2" and rear set back will be 6'8". Home will be set 7' from north property line and 7'4" from the south property line.
3. The house features multiple front gabled roofs with each gabled end featuring a parapet wall and pedestal and a shed roof projection over the north porch. Roofs will be architectural shingle. The roof ridge height from finished floor will be approximately 34'. All gable ends will feature a brick faux gable vent.
4. The main block of the structure will sit on a 4' raised foundation which will be clad in brick.
5. The north covered porches will be supported by brick columns.
6. The home will be of brick construction. The application proposes painting the exterior brick with DeTonti Square Off White (BLP Mobile Paint).

East facade

1. A covered front entry porch, roughly centered along the façade, will measure 7'6" W x 5'10" D. Three brick steps will access the front porch across from entry door. The steps will be flanked by old Chicago brick capped handrails.
2. East façade will read as follows (from south to north):
    a. First floor- 9' W x 8' H metal recessed panel garage door; 9' W x 8' H metal recessed panel garage door; aluminum-clad 8-lite casement window; 3' W x 8' H wood multi-lite door with transom; aluminum-clad 6- lite casement window measuring 3' W x 6' H; aluminum-clad 6- lite casement window measuring 3' W x 6' H; 3 brick steps that lead to the side porch.

b. Second floor- Three aluminum-clad 6- lite casement windows each measuring approximately 3’ W x 6’ H located above the garage doors; two aluminum-clad 6- lite casement window measuring approximately 3’ W x 6’ H located above primary entrance; one aluminum-clad 6- lite casement window measuring approximately 3’ W x 6’ H.

South elevation

1. South elevation will read as follows (from west to east)
    a. First floor- 2’6” W x 5’6” H aluminum-clad 6-lite fixed window; 5’ W x 8’ H metal 8 panel roll up garage door; 3’ W x 6’ H aluminum-clad 6-lite casement window with 2-lite aluminum clad transom above measuring 3’ W x 1’6” H.
    b. Second floor- 2’6” W x 4’6” H aluminum-clad 6-lite fixed window; 3’ W x 4’6” H aluminum-clad 6-lite fixed window; 3’ W x 4’6” H aluminum-clad 6-lite fixed window.

West elevation

1. A covered porch will span the northern bay measuring 18’1” W x 14’3” D.
    a. There will be two sets of 3 brick steps accessing the porch on its north and south ends.
2. West elevation will read as follows (from north to south):
    a. First floor- 6’ W x 4’ H aluminum-clad 6-lite fixed window; 12’ W x 8’ H wood French glider door; 3’ W x 5’6”H aluminum-clad 6-lite fixed window; 3’ W x5’6”H aluminum-clad 6-lite fixed window; 3’ W 5’6” aluminum clad 6-lite window; aluminum-clad double 6-lite casement measuring 3’ W 5’6”.
    b. Second floor- 3’ W x 5” H aluminum-clad 6-lite casement window.

North elevation

1. North elevation will read as follows (from east to west):
    a. First floor- 10’ W x 8’8” H wood French glider door.

Site Improvements

1. The proposed driveway will access the front facing garage doors and will not extend beyond the structure’s front plane. The driveway will measure approximately 20’ W x 50’ D.
2. Two new automated metal entry gates will be installed in the existing openings along the existing brick wall. Design of gate will reflect the design of existing wall.

APPLICABLE STANDARDS (*Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts*)

- 6.34 Maintain the visual line created by the fronts of buildings along a street.
    - Where front yard setbacks are uniform, place a new structure in general alignment with its neighbors.
    - Where front yard setbacks vary, place a new structure within the established range of front yard setbacks on a block.
- 6.35 Maintain the side yard spacing pattern on the block.
    - Locate a structure to preserve the side yard spacing pattern on the block as seen from the street.
    - Provide sufficient side setbacks for property maintenance.
    - Provide sufficient side setbacks to allow needed parking to occur behind the front wall of the house.
- 6.36 Design the massing of new construction to appear similar to that of historic buildings in the district.

    - Choose the massing and shape of the new structure to maintain a rhythm of massing along the street.
    - Match the proportions of the front elevations of a new structure with those in the surrounding district.
- 6.37 Design the scale of new construction to appear similar to that of historic buildings in the district.
    - Use a building height in front that is compatible with adjacent contributing properties.
    - Size foundation and floor heights to appear similar to those of nearby historic buildings
    - Match the scale of a porch to the main building and reflect the scale of porches of nearby historic buildings
- 6.38 Design exterior building walls to reflect traditional development patterns of nearby historic buildings.
    - Use a ratio of solid to void that is similar in proportion to those of nearby historic buildings.
    - Reflect the rhythm of windows and doors in a similar fashion on all exterior building walls. The ARB will consider all building walls; however, building walls facing streets may face increased scrutiny.
    - Use steps and balustrades in a similar fashion to nearby historic structures.
    - Design building elements on exterior building walls to be compatible with those on nearby historic buildings. These elements include, but are not limited to:
        - Balconies
        - Chimneys
        - Dormers
- 6.39 Use exterior materials and finishes that complement the character of the surrounding district.
    - Use material, ornamentation or a color scheme that blends with the historic district rather than making the building stand out.
    - If an alternative material is used that represents an evolution of a traditional material, suggest the finish of the original historic material from which it evolved.
    - Use a material with proven durability in the Mobile climate and that is similar in scale, character and finish to those used on nearby historic buildings.

    ACCEPTABLE MATERIALS
    - 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

    UNACCEPTABLE MATERIALS
    - Materials that are incompatible in character, scale and finish to those used on nearby historic buildings are unacceptable. These often include:
        - Metal siding
        - Vinyl siding
        - Unfinished concrete block

        - Plywood
        - Masonite
        - Vinyl coatings
        - Ceramic coatings
        - Exterior insulation and finishing system (EIFS) wall systems
- 6.40 Design a roof on new construction to be compatible with those on adjacent historic buildings.
    - Design the roof shape, height, pitch and overall complexity to be similar to those on nearby historic buildings.
    - Use materials that appear similar in character, scale, texture and color range to those on nearby historic buildings.
    - New materials that have proven durability may be used.

    ACCEPTABLE ROOF MATERIALS
    - 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
- 6.41 Design a new door and doorway on new construction to be compatible with the historic district.
    - Place and size a door to establish a solid-to-void ratio similar to that of nearby historic buildings.
    - Place a door in a fashion that contributes to the traditional rhythm of the district as seen in nearby historic buildings.
    - Incorporate a door casement and trim similar to those seen on nearby historic buildings.
    - Place and size a special feature, including a transom, sidelight or decorative framing element, to complement those seen in nearby historic buildings.
    - Use a door material that blends well with surrounding historic buildings. Wood is preferred. Paneled doors with or without glass are generally appropriate.
- 6.42 Design a porch to be compatible with the neighborhood.
    - Include a front porch as part of new construction if it is contextual and feasible.
    - When designing a porch, consider porch location, proportion, rhythm, roof form, supports, steps, balustrades and ornamentation relative to the main building and porches in the district.
    - Design the elements of a porch to be at a scale proportional to the main building.
    - Where a rhythm of porches exists on a street or block, design a porch that continues this historic rhythm.
    - Design a rear or side porch that is visible from the public right-of-way to be subordinate in character to the front porch.
- 6.43 Design piers, a foundation and foundation infill to be compatible with those of nearby historic properties.
    - Use raised, pier foundations.
    - If raised foundations are not feasible, use a simulated raised foundation.

- Do not use slab-on-grade construction. This is not appropriate for Mobile's historic neighborhoods. If a raised slab is required, use water tables, exaggerated bases, faux piers or other methods to simulate a raised foundation.
- Do not use raw concrete block or exposed slabs.
- If foundation infill must be used, ensure that it is compatible with the neighborhood.
- If solid infill is used, recess it and screen it with landscaping.
- If lattice is used, hang it below the floor framing and between the piers. Finish it with trim.
- Do not secure lattice to the face of the building or foundation.
- Do not use landscaping to disguise inappropriate foundation design.

ACCEPTABLE FOUNDATION MATERIALS

- Materials that are similar in character, texture and durability to those used on nearby historic buildings are acceptable. These often include:
  - Brick piers
  - Brick infill
  - Wood (vertical pickets)
  - Framed lattice infill

UNACCEPTABLE FOUNDATION MATERIALS

- Materials that are not similar in character, texture and durability to those used on nearby historic buildings are unacceptable. These often include:
  - Mineral board panels
  - Concrete block infill
  - Metal infill
  - Plywood panel infill
  - Plastic sheeting infill
  - Vinyl sheeting infill

- 6.45 Locate and design windows to be compatible with those in the district.
  - Locate and size a window to create a solid-to-void ratio similar to the ratios seen on nearby historic buildings.
  - Locate a window to create a traditional rhythm and a proportion of openings similar to that seen in nearby historic buildings.
  - Use a traditional window casement and trim similar to those seen in nearby historic buildings.
  - Place a window to match the height of the front doorway.
  - Place a window so that there is proportionate space between the window and the floor level.
  - Do not place a window to directly abut the fascia of a building.
  - Use a window material that is compatible with other building materials.
  - Do not use a reflective or tinted glass window.
  - Use a 1/1 window instead of window with false muntins. A double paned window may be acceptable if the interior dividers and dimensional muntins are used on multi-light windows. A double paned 1/1 window is acceptable.
  - Do not use false, interior muntins except as stated above.
  - Recess window openings on masonry buildings.
  - Use a window opening with a raised surround on a wood frame building.

  ACCEPTABLE WINDOW MATERIALS

- 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

  UNACCEPTABLE WINDOW MATERIALS
- 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

- 9.2 Locate a new accessory structure in line with other visible accessory structures in the district.
    - These are traditionally located at the rear of a lot.

  ACCEPTABLE ACCESSORY STRUCTURE MATERIALS
    - Materials that are compatible with the historic district in scale and character are acceptable. These often include:
        - Wood frame
        - Masonry
        - Cement-based fiber siding
        - Installations (Pre-made store-bought sheds, provided they are minimally visible from public areas)

  UNACCEPTABLE ACCESSORY STRUCTURE MATERIALS
    - Materials that are not compatible with the historic district in scale and character are unacceptable. These often include:
        - Metal (except for a greenhouse)
        - Plastic (except for a greenhouse)
        - Fiberglass (except for a greenhouse)
- 10.7 Minimize the visual impact of parking.
    - Locate a parking area at the rear or to the side of a site whenever possible.
    - Use landscaping to screen a parking area.
    - Minimize the widths of a paved area or a curb cut.
    - If a curb cut is no longer in use, repair the curb. In some areas, granite curbs may be required.
    - Do not use paving in the front yard for a parking area. Paving stones might be acceptable in certain instances.
    - Do not create a new driveway or garage that opens onto a primary street.

  ACCEPTABLE WALK AND PAVING MATERIALS
    - 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)

STAFF ANALYSIS

The property under review is a vacant lot parcel located in the DeTonti Square Historic District. The application proposes concept approval to include the form, placement, and massing of a two-story single-family residence at 257 N Jackson Street. An earlier iteration of this proposal was presented to the board, and concerns were expressed regarding the pitch of the roofs and the amount of roof that would be visible from the ROW. The application was then sent to a Design Review Committee (DRC). Comments from the DRC included concerns about the porch posts, the building mass having too many offsets and multiple roofs, and the window and door configuration. Suggestions made to address these concerns included simplifying the roof forms with the implementation of parapet walls. A new application was then submitted addressing the concerns made during the DRC.
For both the previous and current submissions, the 37'2" front setback is sympathetic to the surrounding homes and would comply with the *Guidelines* (6.34). The given 7' side setback on northern portion of the parcel and 7'4" on the southern portion would respect 6.35 of the Guidelines.
The following analysis primarily discusses how the form and massing of the new proposed design compare to contributing properties on the same block of N. Jackson Street. In some instances, other properties farther from the subject lot, but still within the district, are discussed. This analysis should be read in the context of the *Guidelines* directives that new construction should be compatible with nearby contributing structures and the district as a whole. Specifically, the *Guidelines* state that the massing and scale of new construction should appear similar to that of the historic buildings in the district (6.36, 6.37). The *Guidelines* state that the design of roofs for new construction should be compatible with those on the nearby historic buildings (6.40). The *Guidelines* call for the design of a porch to be compatible with the neighborhood (6.42).

Description of Proposed Design

Overall Massing

The proposed structure has a complex massing made up of three smaller rectangular masses. The primary mass of the dwelling is rectangular with its long axis oriented parallel to the street. This mass is approximately 4 bays wide and 3 bays deep. Bays are irregular. A secondary rectangular mass abuts the primary mass on its south side. This mass is recessed 5 feet behind the main mass and oriented so that its long axis is perpendicular to the street. It is approximately 2 bays wide and 4 bays deep. The third mass is an 8-foot projection from of the two south end bays of the primary mass.

Roof Massing and Shape

The three main masses of the proposed structure each feature a gable-front roof behind a masonry parapet. Each parapet features a squared pediment cap that aligns with the roof ridge beam behind it. A low-sloped hipped roof extends north beyond the parapet wall of the primary building mass. This roof structure shelters a corner porch at its east end and finished living space at its west (rear) end.

Form and Placement of Porches

The proposed design features two porch structures on the primary façade. These include a small entry porch on the east façade and a larger secondary porch at the northwest corner of the primary mass. The single-story entry porch is recessed under the second story of the smallest building mass. The secondary porch is recessed under a low-sloped hip that extends north from behind the parapet wall of the main building mass. A third porch at the rear of the property will not be visible from the public right-of-way.

The inset entry porch is of a similar scale to the entry porches at 254 and 263 N. Jackson Street and even the stoop and slightly recessed entry at 258 State Street. The secondary corner porch is somewhat unusual for the district, but it does echo wrap-around porches found at 310 N. Claiborne Street and 312 N. Jackson Street. The secondary corner porch also helps to break up the long façade of the building. As stated previously, the low-slope hip roof over the corner porch is incongruous with the rest of the design and does not have an obvious precedent in nearby contributing properties.

Analysis of Compatibility

Overall Massing

While the complex massing of the structure is not typical of most structures in DeTonti Square, including the properties along the same block of N. Jackson Street. However, there is at least one example of a contributing structure of comparable complex massing within the district. The most incompatible aspect of the massing proposed design is the fact that its long axis runs so prominently parallel to the street. All but one of the neighboring properties have a long axis that runs perpendicular to the street, and even this property has a considerably narrower façade than the proposed design.

There are 5 contributing properties along the same block of N. Jackson Street as the subject lot. These are 254, 259, 261, and 263 N Jackson Street and 258 State Street. The dwellings at 254, 259, and 263 N Jackson and 258 State Street all demonstrate the long, narrow rectangular plan most frequently associated with DeTonti Square. All four are two-story sidehall town houses with their long axis running perpendicular to the street. 258 State Street is a sidehall-with-wing plan, meaning it features a prominent secondary massing to one side and recessed approximately 10 to 12 feet behind the façade plane of the primary dwelling. Both 254 and 263 N. Jackson feature trapezoidal façade projects that break up somewhat their overall simple rectangular massing.

261 N. Jackson is an outlier on the street. While its primary massing is also a simple rectangle, its long axis runs parallel to the street rather than perpendicular. While 261 N Jackson does have a long axis that runs parallel to the street, its façade is only three bays wide. In contrast, the subject property presents a façade that is approximately six bays wide. The visual impact of this discrepancy would be greatly improved by recessing the south garage wing farther back from the principle front building plane. It is currently set back 5'-9" from the front building plane of the primary massing. Increasing this distance to 10' would create a massing more similar to that of 258 State Street, which features a prominent side wing that is approximately half the size of the main dwelling. It would also minimize the view of the two-bay garage from the street, in line with the *Guidelines'* directive that parking be minimally visible from the street (6.35, 10.7).

The dwelling at 310 N Claiborne Street, a notable outlier on the edge of the district, exhibits a complex form and massing not unlike the proposed design. This c. 1899 wood-frame dwelling was listed as conditionally contributing due to condition concerns when the district was first delineated in 1974. "Conditionally contributing" is an outdated listing no longer used in National Register districts, and this property would be considered contributing today. The two-story dwelling features a complex massing made up of a large rectangular mass with prominent projections from the west façade and north side elevations. A trapezoidal bay on the façade and a semi-octagonal wrap-around porch further complicate

the massing. While an aerial view shows the building's long axis does run perpendicular to the street, the façade massing is so complex as to not make this easily readable from the street.

Roof Massing and Shape

While a front gable is not the most common roof form in DeTonti Square, there is precedent for this form. The roof form most typically associated with DeTonti Square is a low-sloped gable or hip roof behind a masonry parapet that creates the appearance of a flat roof system. This simple parapeted roof system is seen at 254 and 259 N Jackson Street and at 258 State Street. However, the dwelling at 263 N. Jackson Street features a simple gable-front roof without a pediment. Several properties with either hipped or side-gable primary roof systems also feature prominent cross-gables, including 261 N. Jackson Street, 312 N. Jackson Street, and 310 N. Claiborne.

The sloped parapet wall and pediment caps of the proposed design is a treatment typically seen on the side elevations of parapeted townhouses in the district. The proposed design closely mimics the side elevation of 258 State Street, which presents a parapeted gable end to N. Jackson Street. While the use of this treatment on a façade is atypical of the district, it does reuse a traditional design feature in a way that clearly identifies the proposed dwelling as a modern construction. This complies with the *Guidelines*' directive that new construction should "differentiate itself from existing historic structures" while "drawing on the historic context" (p. 26).

The low-sloped hipped roof extending north beyond the parapet wall is incongruous with the overall design of the proposed structure. Staff were unable to find comparable combinations of parapeted and exposed hipped roofs on contributing properties within the district.

Form and Placement of Porches

The proposed design features two porch structures on the primary façade. These include a small entry porch on the east façade and a larger secondary porch at the northwest corner of the primary mass. The single-story entry porch is recessed under the second story of the smallest building mass. The secondary porch is recessed under a low-sloped hip that extends north from behind the parapet wall of the main building mass. A third porch at the rear of the property will not be visible from the public right-of-way.

The inset entry porch is of a similar scale to the entry porches at 254 and 263 N. Jackson Street and even the stoop and slightly recessed entry at 258 State Street. The secondary corner porch is somewhat unusual for the district, but it does echo wrap-around porches found at 310 N. Claiborne Street and 312 N. Jackson Street. The secondary corner porch also helps to break up the long façade of the building. As stated previously, the low-slope hip roof over the corner porch is incongruous with the rest of the design and does not have an obvious precedent in nearby contributing properties.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Simon Thorton, owner of the property, presented the project.

Paul Murden expressed concern about the garage facing the street and the precedent that it may set for future development in DeTonti Square.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Stephen McNair thanked the applicant for interest in Mobile Historic Districts. He continued that the massing fits into the neighborhood.

Mr. Cartledge Blackwell appreciated that the home was broken up into different planes.

Ms. Abby Davis stated that the updated design was an improvement. She presented her concerns about the roof plan and that it does not match the drawing.

Ms. Karrie Maurin expressed concern about the second floor and the attic space and stated that the home appears suburban and doesn't match the DeTonti neighborhood.

Ms. Davis expanded on the concern expressed by Ms. Maurin about the attic space and discussed the placement of the windows along the roof lines, pitch of the roof, and the orientation of the parapet walls.

Mr. Bruce McGowin interjected to suggest the application go to a Design Review Committee.

Mr. Thorton said that he was amenable to table the application and move to a DRC.

Ms. Maurin, Mr. Blackwell, and Ms. Davis stated that given the size of the lot and existence of the privacy wall, they would be willing to compromise on the garage as long as more consideration is given to the selected garage doors. They added that a front facing garage on this particular lot would not set a precedent for future projects in the district.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Ms. Karrie Maurin made a motion to table the application.

Ms. Abby Davis seconded the motion, all approved.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:27 PM