



Architectural Review Board Certified Record

October 1, 2025 – 3:00 P.M.

Public Comment

Written comments regarding items on this agenda will be accepted via:

<https://www.buildmobile.org/architectural-review-board?meeting=732>

OR

historicdevelopment@cityofmobile.org

USPS: Historic Development Department, City of Mobile,
P.O. Box 1827, Mobile, AL 36633

until 3:00 PM on Tuesday, September 30, 2025.

Please include your name, home address, and the item number about which you are writing.

SPEAKER TIME LIMITS

In accordance with the Architectural Review Board's rules and regulations, the following time limits will be observed.

- Applicants will have five (5) minutes exclusive of questions from the Board to make their presentations.
- A maximum of four (4) speakers in favor of and opposed to each application will have five (5) minutes apiece to make comments. If more than four proponents or opponents wish to speak, each group shall decide amongst themselves who will speak.
- Alternatively, the parties on the same side of the controversy may designate one of their number to speak for all parties, pooling up to ten (10) minutes.
- The applicant will have an additional three (3) minutes for rebuttal.

Requests for additional time may be made at the beginning of the presentation and may be granted by the Chair at her discretion.

ADMINISTRATIVE

Roll Call

Approval of Minutes from September 17, 2025

Approval of Mid-Month COAs granted by Staff

MID-MONTH APPROVALS

1. **Applicant:** Christopher Pace Home Improvement
Property Address: 120 Espejo Street
Date of Approval: 09/15/2025
Project: Remove rotten wood siding and replace with new wood to match existing. Paint to match existing.
2. **Applicant:** Government Street Presbyterian Church
Property Address: 51 S Jackson Street
Date of Approval: 09/16/2025
Project: Replace rotten boards on second-story gallery porch with new tongue-and-groove wood decking to match existing. Replace areas of rotten/damaged soffit and fascia with new wood as needed to match existing. Paint all new wood in existing color scheme.
3. **Applicant:** Gabriel Graves
Date of Approval: 09/19/2025
Property Address: 17 N Julia Street
Project: Construct a 16'W x 10' D storage shed.
a. The shed will sit on the northwest corner of the lot, 60' from the ROW behind an existing privacy fence.
b. The shed will sit on an existing concrete and be topped by a gable roof clad in shingles to match the dwelling.
c. The exterior walls will be clad in T-11 vertical siding or lap wood siding to match the main dwelling.
d. One solid wood door would be located on the east elevation.
e. The shed would be painted in the following Sherwin Williams colors:
siding - Pure White
trim - Dorian Gray
4. **Applicant:** LaSarge Marine Inc. c/o Michael LaSarge
Property Address: 68 S Georgia Ave
Date of Approval: 09/19/2025
Project: Install a 4' wood privacy fence along the north property line, following the footprint of a previously existing fence. The fence would stretch along the north property line and abut the rear of the dwelling.
5. **Applicant:** SDB Construction
Property Address: 1673 Government Street
Date of Approval: 09/22/2025
Project: Repair 70'-0" of brick on existing brick wall along southwest corner of the lot. Match mortar joints to existing. All replacement materials to match existing.

6. **Applicant:** Enen Yu
Property Address: 957 Old Shell Road
Date of Approval: 09/22/2025
Project: Repair siding. Remove rotten siding as needed and replace with wood to match existing. Paint with BLP paint colors:
Main Body: Government Street Olive
Trim: De Tonti Square Off White
7. **Applicant:** Thomas Industries Inc. (BLD)
Property Address: 404 Chatham Street
Date of Approval: 09/22/25
Project: Reroof with shingles. Color: Pewter Gray

APPLICATIONS

- 1. 2025-39-CA - WITHDRAWN**
Address: 1008 Elmira Street
Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Applicant/Agent: GeeGee Watt on behalf of Jesse Burks
Project: Demolish historic dwelling
- 2. 2025-40-CA - WITHDRAWN**
Address: 356 Dunham Street
Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Applicant/Agent: GeeGee Watt on behalf of Jesse Burks
Project: Demolish historic dwelling
- 3. 2025-43-CA**
Address: 401 Civic Center Drive
Historic District: Church Street East
Applicant/Agent: Sam Matheny/Volkert, Inc.
Project: Architectural metal screen fretwork pattern and detail of cementitious panel color/texture selections
- 4. 2025-44-CA**
Address: 706 Monroe Street
Historic District: Church Street East
Applicant/Agent: Lucy Barr on behalf of Shannon L. Kenny
Project: Construct a 2-car front entry garage; rear porch addition; false gable addition over front porch

OTHER BUSINESS

The next ARB meeting is scheduled for October 15, 2025.



Agenda Item #1

Certified Record 2025-43-CA

DETAILS

Location:

401 Civic Center Drive

Summary of Request:

Approve exterior cladding panels and decorative ironwork

Applicant (as applicable):

Sam Matheny/Volkert, Inc.

Property Owner:

City of Mobile

Historic District:

Church Street East

Classification:

Non-Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The proposed building materials, as presented, are compatible with other historic buildings in Mobile's historic districts, but also differentiate the subject structure as non-historic, as directed by the Guidelines.
- The decorative ironwork specifically uses stylized representations of several symbols of Mobile, including the fleur-de-lis, live oak trees, and azaleas.

Report Contents:

Property and Application History	2
Scope of Work	2
Applicable Standards	3
Staff Analysis.....	3
Attachments.....	4

PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

Church Street East Historic District was initially listed in the National Register in 1971 under Criteria A (historic significance) and C (architectural significance) for its local significance in the areas of architecture, education, and urban planning. The district is significant for its concentration of multiple 19th century architectural styles and because it encompasses the site of Mobile in the early 1700s. The district boundaries were expanded in 1984 and 2005.

The subject property, which recently has been subdivided to accommodate a new U.S. Army Corps of Engineers building and a six-story parking garage, is occupied by the 1964 Civic Center theater and arena and the 1973 exposition hall. The 1876 Hopkins ward map of Mobile showed the area bounded by Church, Lawrence, Canal, and Claiborne streets was densely developed with residences. The 1885 Sanborn map illustrates only the far northwest corner of the current Civic Center property, showing an area populated with one-story frame dwellings, “tenements”, and “shanties.” The entire Civic Center area is illustrated on the 1891 Sanborn map, which continues to show a densely developed residential area. Interspersed with the mostly one-story frame houses of varying size were grocery stores, barber shops, an ice cream shop, retail stores, a fire station, a church, a saloon, and a restaurant. Sanborn Maps published in 1904 and 1924, as well as the 1955 update to the 1924 map, show a similar pattern with a few exceptions. The grocery stores and barbers seem to have disappeared, and the block bounded by Madison, Claiborne, Canal, and Franklin streets had been cleared for use as a “Public Play Ground”. The two and one-half story brick Robert E. Lee Public School occupied the block bounded by Madison, Franklin, Hamilton, and Canal streets. Available aerial photographs of the Civic Center area taken in 1938, 1952, 1955, and 1960 show essentially the same development as reflected in the 1924/1955 Sanborn map.

By the time of the next available aerial photograph, 1967, more than seven blocks had been leveled to make way for the Civic Center. The only structure remaining was the public school bounded by Madison, Franklin, Hamilton, and Canal streets. The school disappeared by the time of the next available aerial photograph, taken in 1980. Demolition of the 1960s Civic Center building was completed in early 2025.

According to the vertical files of the Historic Development Department, the larger parcel, of which the subject complex was part until recently, has previously appeared eight (8) times before the Architectural Review Board (ARB). In November 1983, the ARB approved placement of a commemorative plaque on a brick base at the corner of Claiborne Street and Auditorium Drive (now Civic Center Drive). The installation of a 100’ telecommunications tower and construction of a one-story 10’x16’ accessory structure on a small parcel to the immediate north of the current site of a new office building was approved by the ARB in July 1998. The ARB approved the construction of two steel and glass bus shelters located along the Lawrence Street side of the parcel was approved in October 2009. The ARB approved construction of a six-story office building at the southeast corner of the Civic Center site over three meetings from August 2022 through April 2023. A six-level City parking garage was approved by the ARB in July 2023. In June of 2024, the demolition of the Civic Center Complex (including the theater, arena/auditorium, and exposition hall) was granted approval by the ARB. In October 2024, the ARB approved conceptual design for a new Civic Arena, with the caveat that additional design details – such as the cladding panels and decorative ironwork – would return to the Board for approval at a later date.

SCOPE OF WORK

Materials

1. The exterior walls of the main concourse and suite levels would be clad in cementitious panels laid horizontally.
 - a. Each cementitious panel will feature an irregular pattern of “blocks” of varying size, texture, and tones within the same neutral color palette.
 - b. The four panel types are as follows:
 - i. FC01 – Patina Inline P545 (with horizontal striations)
 - ii. FC02 – Patina Original P545
 - iii. FC03 – Patina Rough P545
 - iv. FC04 – Patin Inline P545 (with vertical striations)
2. The terrace balustrade would consist of steel architectural arched panels.
 - a. Panel color: Solanum Steel
 - b. Panel fretwork pattern: a custom pattern of incorporating a fleur-de-lis and oak leaf motif, both nods to Mobile’s historic architecture and native live oak trees.

- c. The arched ironwork screens would be assembled using hexagonal, triangular, and square modular panels. Modular panels would come in a set number of different designs that would repeat in a regular pattern across the arcade screen.

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

1. **7.0** In order to assure that historic resources are appreciated as authentic contributing buildings, it is important that new buildings be distinguishable from them. Therefore, new construction should appear as a product of its own time, while also being compatible with the historically significant features of the area...Building materials and finishes for new structures...should contribute to the visual continuity of the district and appear similar to those seen traditionally.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The subject property is a non-contributing site within the Church Street East Historic District. The application under review seeks approval for cementitious exterior cladding panels and decorative ironwork, as required by the Board's conditional approval of the design for a municipal arena in October 2024. As part of the October 2024 decision, the Board approved the use and placement of cementitious cladding panels and ironwork screens.

The Guidelines call for new construction projects to be distinguishable from existing contributing buildings and a "product of their own time." However, the Guidelines also state that new construction should be "compatible with the historically significant features of the area." On the question of modern construction materials, the Guidelines specify that building materials and finishes should "contribute to the visual continuity of the district and appear similar to those seen traditionally." The proposed designs for the cementitious cladding panels and ironwork screen satisfy both directives by referencing Mobile's natural and architectural landscape while remaining obviously modern.

The cementitious panels echo architectural building trends from various eras of Mobile's history. The pattern of long horizontal blocks is a nod to the brick cladding used elsewhere in the building. It also references historic brick building found throughout Church Street East. However, instead of a repetitive bond pattern of uniform sized units, the pattern features a random pattern of elongated horizontal blocks of various sizes. This references both stone ashlar – perhaps the earliest form of masonry construction – and the irregular Roman brick veneer found on Mid-Century Modern buildings in the district, such as 210 Government Street and 112 S Broad Street. The mix of textures on the cementitious panels creates visual interest and breaks up the long expanses of windowless walls required for a large arena structure.

Similarly, the decorative iron panels reference Mobile's architectural, cultural, and natural heritage while remaining decidedly modern in design. The staff have previously noted that "the decorative metal balustrade, which would enclose the terrace on the main concourse level, is suggestive of the cast iron galleries common in Mobile's historic architecture." This application adds to that a modular pattern of stylized oak leaves, azalea blooms, and fleur-de-lis. The fleur-de-lis are a clear reference to Mobile's beginnings as a French colonial town and its identity as the birthplace of Mardi Gras. The stylized live oak leaves and azalea blossoms are less overt references to two popular symbols of Mobile. The pattern itself is a modern adaptation of the highly decorative ironwork found on nearby historic residences, including those at 359 and 407 Church Street.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Sam Metheny was present to discuss the application.

No members of the public spoke for or against the application

BOARD DISCUSSION

Stephen McNair asked if the cementitious panels required any specialized cleaning to maintain their appearance. Mr. Metheny stated that they did not.

Catarina Echols stated that the panels were attractive and that the design was progressing well. Ms. Echols particularly praised the aluminum screen material, which she stated had the appearance of corten steel.

FINDING FACTS

Mr. McNair moved that, based on the evidence presented, the Board find the facts in the Staff's report as written.

Stephen Howle seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Howle moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, the application would not impair the architectural or historic character of the property or the district, and that the application should be granted a COA.

Cameron Pfeiffer-Traylor seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.



Agenda Item #4

Certified Record 2025-44-CA

DETAILS

Location:

706 Monroe Street

Summary of Request:

Construct a 2-car front entry garage; rear porch addition; false gable addition over front porch

Applicant (as applicable):

Lucy Barr

Property Owner:

Shannon L. Kenny

Historic District:

Church Street East

Classification:

Non-contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The proposed accessory structure would be attached to the east elevation of the existing main dwelling, functioning as a new addition.
- The placement of the proposed addition does not disrupt the character of the historic districts
- The proposed exterior materials match those on the existing structure and are approvable under the Guidelines

Report Contents:

Property and Application History	2
Scope of Work	2
Applicable Standards	2
Staff Analysis	4

PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

Church Street East Historic District was initially listed in the National Register in 1971 under Criteria A (historic significance) and C (architectural significance) for its local significance in the areas of architecture, education, and urban planning. The district is significant for its concentration of multiple 19th century architectural styles and because it encompasses the site of Mobile in the early 1700s. The district boundaries were expanded in 1984 and 2005.

The property at 706 Monroe is a one-story cottage which was constructed in 2007. The parcel, which backs up to the historic Church Street Cemetery on its north boundary, has historically been occupied by small one-story frame structures. The 1885 and 1891 Sanborn Insurance maps show a simple rectangular frame structure. The 1904 overlay expresses a slightly larger frame structure, also rectangular in form, with a full-width front porch across the south façade. This structure could possibly be an altered form of the same dwelling, or a new home. It is one in a continuous grouping of approximately ten shotgun houses and small cottages stretching westward along the north side of Monroe Street. Aerial photographs reveal that these homes began to disappear, beginning on the east end of the street, after 1980. By 1997, the entire stretch of buildings was deleted. In 2007, designs were approved to construct three new one-story houses on newly drawn lots which occupy the former vacant parcels, including the current residence at 706 Monroe Street.

This property has appeared once before the Architectural Review Board. Approval to construct a new single-family home was granted a COA in 2007.

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Construct a two-car garage
 - a. The garage addition would be constructed off the dwelling's east elevation and would measure 22'-0" wide by 33'-10" deep.
 - b. The addition would be topped by a gable roof clad in shingles to match those on the existing dwelling.
 - c. The addition's slab foundation would match the existing in height and material.
 - d. Exterior walls would be clad in smooth Hardi siding to match the existing. Ceiling heights would match those on the existing dwelling.
 - e. Fenestration would include two fiberglass garage doors measuring 9'-0" wide by 8'-0" overhanging doors, centered on the garage's south façade. One fiberglass paneled rear entry door measuring 3'0" wide by 6'-8" high would be located on the garage's north elevation.
 - f. A concrete small concrete slab landing would access the rear entry door.
2. Construct a rear porch addition
 - a. The rear porch would be located on the north (rear) elevation. It would measure 18'-0" wide by 8'-6" deep.
 - b. The porch would consist of a concrete slab with one 8" x 8" boxed column with base and cap supporting a shed roof which would extent from the existing roofline to the west and the new garage roof to the south.
3. Install a false decorative gable over existing hip roof of front porch. Gable would be clad in smooth Hardi horizontal siding to match existing.
4. Construct a brick knee wall on secondary recessed front porch. The three existing boxed columns would rest on the new knee wall.

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

1. **9.1** Design an accessory structure to be subordinate in scale to that of the primary structure.
 - If a proposed accessory structure is larger than the size of typical historic accessory structures in the district, break up the mass of the larger structure into smaller modules that reflect traditional accessory structures.
2. **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)

3. **6.25** Design additions and alterations to non-historic structures to be compatible with the placement, massing and scale of surrounding historic structures.
 - Design an addition to respect the original orientation of the building and maintain the typical orientation of adjacent historic buildings.
 - 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.
4. **6.27** Design exterior building walls associated with additions and alterations to non-historic structures to respect the character of the historic district.
 - 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.
 - Use the alteration or addition to a non-historic building to improve the overall structure's appropriateness within the historic district.
5. **6.28** Design exterior materials and finishes associated with additions and alterations to non-historic structures to be compatible with the historic district.
 - Use materials with a character compatible to those used historically and with proven durability.
 - Maintain original material wherever possible provided the material is durable and compatible with the surrounding historic district.
6. **6.29** Design replacement roofs and roofs of additions to be compatible with the district.
 - Use a roof material that is in keeping with the historic district.
7. **6.30** Design a new porch or an alteration to an existing porch to respect the character of the district.
 - Locate and orient a new porch on a non-historic residential building similarly to those seen in the district.
 - Size a front porch element to be at a similar proportion to the original structure as those seen in the district.
8. **6.31** Design a foundation to be consistent with those in the district and use a durable foundation material on all sides of a building.
9. **6.32** Design details and ornamentation to minimize impacts to the historic district.
 - Design details and ornamentation at a scale that is consistent with details and ornamentation on historic buildings in the district.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The subject property is a non-contributing structure in the Church Street East Historic District. The application under review proposes the construction of two-car garage addition, a rear porch addition, and other alterations.

The *Guidelines* call for an addition to a non-historic structure to respect the orientation and setback of the adjacent historic structures. Most of the historic fabric along the subject portion of Monroe Street has been replaced with new construction. The nearest historic structures are the dwelling at 200 S. Washington Street and the two commercial structures along the west end the block, 800 and 755 Monroe. The placement of the proposed design sits within the rhythm established by these historic properties.

The addition's ceiling and foundation heights match those of the original structure, as directed by the Guidelines. The Guidelines further state that the design of an addition to a non-historic structure should improve the harmony of the original structure with the historic district when needed. The existing slab-on-grade foundation is not considered appropriate under the current Guidelines for residential construction. However, slab-on-grade foundation is allowed for new accessory structures, and is a commonly seen foundation type for historic accessory structures. (6.27, 6.31)

Materials proposed for exterior walls, details, and the roof match the existing and are approvable under the Guidelines for new construction, new accessory structures, and additions to non-historic structures. Currently, the Guidelines do not specifically speak the use of fiberglass for doors on non-historic structures or additions. The paneled profile of both the proposed garage door and rear entry door reflects a traditional design that is seen within the surrounding historic district. The proposed new roof is a traditional form used on historic residences in the surrounding district. The restrained profile of design details proposed for the addition such as boxed columns, brick knee wall, and false gable are compatible with those seen on smaller historic cottages located in the immediate area. (6.28, 6.29, 6.32)

The location, size, and orientation of the proposed rear porch do not impair the character of the surrounding district. (6.30)

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Ms. Lucy Barre was present to discuss the application. Ms. Barre explained that the new owners of the property wished to construct a two-car attached garage for increased security. Ms. Barre stated that the proposed design utilized complimentary materials to the existing structure. Ms. Barre also stated that the proposed gable roof over the existing porch would echo the shape of the gable-front garage addition.

No members of the public spoke for or against the application

BOARD DISCUSSION

Karrie Maurin stated that it was unfortunate that the garage had to face the street but added that this appeared to be the only practical configuration on the lot. Ms. Barre confirmed that a garage with a side entrance was not possible on the lot. Ms. Maurin commended the design for using materials and design elements that were compatible both with the subject property and the district. Ms. Maurin also pointed out that the subject property was relatively modern and non-contributing, which made the addition of a street-facing garage less of a concern than it would be on a contributing structure. Stephen Howle expressed agreement with Ms. Maurin's comments.

FINDING FACTS

Stephen McNair moved that, based on the evidence presented, the Board find the facts in the Staff's report as written.

Ms. Maurin seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Cameron Pfeiffer-Traylor moved that, based on the facts approved by the Board, the application would not impair the architectural or historic character of the property or the district, and that the application should be granted a COA.

Ms. Maurin seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned by 3:14.