



Architectural Review Board Agenda

August 20, 2025 – 3:00 P.M.

ADMINISTRATIVE

The meeting was called to order by the Chair, Catarina Echols, at 3:00pm.

1. Roll Call

Members present: Abby Davis, Catarina Echols, Karrie Maurin, Cameron Pfeiffer-Traylor, Jennifer Roselius, and Barja Wilson

Members absent: Cartledge Blackwell, Stephen Howle, and Stephen McNair

2. Approval of Minutes from August 6, 2025

Abby Davis moved to approve the minutes from the July 16, 2025 meeting.

The motion was seconded by Jennifer Roselius and approved unanimously.

3. Approval of Mid-Month COAs granted by Staff

Barja Wilson moved to approve the mid-month COAs granted by Staff.

The motion was seconded by Cameron Pfeiffer-Traylor and approved unanimously.

MID-MONTH APPROVALS - APPROVED

- 1. Applicant:** John King
Property Address: 8 Hallett St
Date of Approval: 07/30/2025
Project:

 1. Repair rotten siding in-kind where needed.
 2. Reglaze and repair rotten wood on windows in-kind where needed.
 3. Repaint exterior in approved colors.
- 2. Applicant:** FASTSIGNS of Mobile
Property Address: 753 Government Street
Date of Approval: 07/31/2025
Project:

Install a non-illuminated laminated aluminum free-standing sign measuring 36" w x 24" h. (Total sf: 6)

Sign will be located on the southeast corner of the lot and will stand 5' high (to the top of sign)

Sign will read: "Mobile Public Library: Local History & Genealogy Division" with address and hours of operation.

Colors will include black panel with white text.
- 3. Applicant:** Robin Hearn

- Property Address:** 106 S Monterey St
Date of Approval: 07/31/2025
Project: Remove existing asphalt shingle roof and replace with architectural shingle. Shingle color: black.
Paint exterior in approved color scheme:
Repave concrete/asphalt driveway with concrete to cover existing paved surface area.
4. **Applicant:** Robin Hearn
Property Address: 59 Houston Street
Date of Approval: 07/31/2025
Project: Paint exterior trim in approved BLP Mobile colors.
5. **Applicant:** Chad E Foster (BLD)
Property Address: 205 Marine Street
Date of Approval: 08/04/2025
Project: Reroof with shingles. Color: Estate Gray
6. **Applicant:** Mobile Bay Roofing
Property Address: 1558 Monterey St
Date of Approval: 08/04/2025
Project: Reroof with shingles. Color: Glacier
7. **Applicant:** Tuff Shed Inc
Property Address: 159 Davitt St
Date of Approval: 08/04/2025
Project: Install a prefabricated "Tuff Shed" structure at the east end/rear of the lot.
The shed will measure 10'W x12' D.
Exterior walls will be clad in LP Siding (engineered wood)
The structure will sit on grade and be topped by a gable roof clad in pewter grey shingles.
Fenestration will include one painted (white) steel entry door on the south elevation; two 3'x3 aluminum clad windows located on the south and east elevations.
Paint exterior in approved colors.
8. **Applicant:** Allison Russo
Property Address: 1108 Selma Street
Date of Approval: 08/06/2025
Project: 1. Remove deteriorated metal awnings, shutters, and front screen door.
2. Replace existing shutters with louvered cedar shutters and S hooks (see submitted cut sheets). Shutters will be painted to match main body color.
3. Remove paint from front brick steps.
4. Paint exterior of the house and entry door in following colors:
Main body - SW Pure White (SW7005/LRV: 84)
Front Door Paint Color: Benjamin Moore Wythe Blue (HC-143)
5. Install black metal wall sconce adjacent to entry door on facade. Sconce will measure 22 1/4" high x 10" wide.
9. **Applicant:** Marlon Wade
Property Address: 162 St. Emmanuel

Date of Approval: 08/06/2025
Project: Reroof with shingles. Color: Oxford Grey

10. **Applicant:** Mike Rogers
Property Address: 151 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 08/06/2025
Project: Reroof with TPO system where existing.

APPLICATIONS

1. 2025-36-CA

Address: 13 N. Warren Street
Historic District: Lower Dauphin Street
Applicant/Agent: Taylor Atchison/Rata Investments LLC
Project: Demolish historic structure

2. 2025-37-CA

Address: 208 S. Catherine Street
Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Applicant/Agent: Douglas B. Kearley
Project: Addition to north elevation

OTHER BUSINESS

The next ARB meeting is scheduled for September 3, 2025.



Agenda Item #1

Application 2025-27-CA

DETAILS

Location:

13 N Warren Street

Summary of Request:

Demolish existing contributing structure

Applicant (as applicable):

Taylor Atchison/Rata Investments LLC

Property Owner:

Rata Investments LLC

Historic District:

Lower Dauphin

Classification:

Contributing

Report Contents:

Property and Application History	2
Scope of Work	2
Applicable Standards	3
Staff Analysis	6
Attachments	8

Summary of Analysis:

- The subject structure expresses a style unique to Mobile and the broader Gulf Coast region.
- The structure has deteriorated to a structurally unfit state.
- The applicant has plans for redevelopment of the lot
- The property is located in the Downtown Development District

PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District was initially listed in the National Register in 1979 under Criteria A (historic significance) and C (architectural significance) for its local significance in the areas of commerce and architecture. The district is significant for its unique character stemming from the high concentration of closely spaced two- and three-story brick buildings and as Mobile's nineteenth century commercial thoroughfare. The district boundaries were expanded in 1982, 1995, 1998, and 2019.

The property at 13 N. Warren Street is a c. 1870 frame one-and-a-half story raised Creole cottage with a full-width front porch incorporated under the side gable roof. The east facing façade consists of two entry doors and two six-over-six windows. Historic maps and Historic Development records show minimal changes to the form of the dwelling.

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Demolish historic dwelling
2. Install metal fence and gates

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

1. **10.0** Vacant Lots
The appearance of a vacant lot can potentially negatively impact the character of a historic district. When a vacant lot exists or is created through demolition, property owners must properly maintain, landscape and/or screen the property. This applies to a temporarily vacant lot. Owners must landscape a vacant lot with a ground cover approved by the ARB, such as grass. The owner must maintain the ground cover and keep the property free of trash and debris, as required by the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Mobile.
2. **12.0** Demolition Guidelines
 - Consider the current significance of a structure previously determined to be historic.
 - Consider the condition of the structure in question. Demolition may be more appropriate when a building is deteriorated or in poor condition.
 - Consider whether the building is one of the last remaining positive examples of its kind in the neighborhood, county, or region.
 - Consider the impact that demolition will have on surrounding structures, including neighboring properties, properties on the same block or across the street or properties throughout the individual historic district.
 - Consider whether the building is part of an ensemble of historic buildings that create a neighborhood.
 - Consider the future utilization of the site.
 - If a development is proposed to replace a demolished historic structure, determine that the proposed replacement structure is consistent with the guidelines for new construction in historic districts.
3. **10.2** Design a fence to be compatible with the architectural style of the house and existing fences in the neighborhood.
 - Install a painted wood picket fence.
 - Install a simple wood or wire fence. Heights of wooden picket fences are ordinarily restricted to 36". Consideration for up to 48," depending on the location of the fence, shall be given. A variance might be required. Staff can advise and assist applicants with regard to a variance. If combined with a wall, the total vertical dimension of the wall and fence collectively should not exceed 36," or in some cases 48".
 - For surface parking areas associated with commercial uses, size a perimeter parking area fence to not exceed 48" in height.

- Install a cast-iron or other metal fence not exceeding 48" in height if located in the front yard.
 - »Install a fence that uses alternative materials that have a very similar look and feel to wood, proven durability, matte finish and an accurate scale and proportion of components.
 - Face the finished side of a fence toward the public right-of-way.
 - Based on the chosen fence material, use proportions, heights, elements and levels of opacity similar to those of similar material and style seen in the historic district.
- REAR AND NON-CORNER SIDE FENCES (LOCATED BEHIND THE FRONT BUILDING PLANE)
- Design a fence located behind the front building plane to not exceed 72" in height. If the subject property abuts a multi-family residential or commercial property, a fence up to 96" will be considered.
 - An alternative fence material with proven durability, matte finish and an accurate scale and proportion of components is acceptable. A simple wood-and-wire fence is acceptable provided it is appropriate to the style of the house.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The property under review is a contributing structure in the Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District. The subject application seeks approval to demolish the historic dwelling at 13 N Warren Street.

The *Guidelines* state that when demolition is contemplated, the current significance of the structure should be considered. The subject house is considered a contributing property to the Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District. The frame one-and-a-half story Creole cottage, with its deeply pitched roof, recessed porch, and symmetrical façade represents a specific form and style of vernacular architecture found along the Gulf Coast. The particular blend of elements such as the full-width front porch, deep protective overhangs, two front entry doors, and restrained classical decoration characterize a specific style developed and adapted to Mobile's climate and culture.

Per the *Guidelines*, "the condition of the structure in question" should be considered. "Demolition may be more appropriate when a building is deteriorated or in poor condition." From the street, deterioration of the structure is visually evident. There are several openings in the exterior walls due to the decline of the siding and framing. A detailed condition survey submitted by the applicant reveals further deterioration on the interior. Rafter failure, top plate decline, missing framing, and rot of top plates, floor joists, and exterior walls are present, demonstrating a clear state of decline to a dangerous state of disrepair and loss of structural integrity.

Whether the building in question is "one of the last remaining positive examples of its kind in the neighborhood, county or region" should be factored into any decision to allow or disallow demolition in a historic district. As stated above, this structure is a distinctive example of local building customs of the Gulf Coast region. Although there are other examples of the Creole cottage extant in the broader historic area, their numbers are in decline. This is particularly so in the Lower Dauphin Street Commercial District, where this form of residential architecture is considerably rare. A cursory look around the immediate neighborhood and the surrounding district for other similar instances of this style proves challenging. One somewhat comparable structure is the c. 1834 Portier House located at 307 Conti Street. While this dwelling expresses the form of a Creole cottage, it is much more high style in its design features, detailing, and profile. The Portier House, though a few blocks away, is located in a separate historic district. It can be concluded that the structure at 13 N. Warren is one of the last examples of its kind in the Lower Dauphin Commercial District.

The impact that demolition would have on the surrounding structures and neighborhood must be considered. The immediate vicinity and subject block of N. Warren Street has historically been a mix of commercial and residential, yet many residential structures have disappeared. At present, all residential structures along this portion of the street have been deleted apart from the dwelling under review.

The applicant has expressed plans for future development of this parcel. Initially, the building at 13 N. Warren was included in these plans, until closer inspection revealed its loss of structural integrity and unsafe condition. A concept drawing was submitted with the application providing a general idea of how the area is to be developed, with the buildings at 11 and 15 N Warren Street rehabilitated for occupancy and use. These drawings also propose an approximately 7'-0" high metal fence with arched gate, set between square masonry columns with caps. The fence would run along the east property line between 11 and 15 N Warren Street.

This property is located within the Downtown Development District. The demolition of the structure has been reviewed by and received approval from Consolidated Review Committee.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Taylor Atchison, the property owner, was present to discuss the application. Mr. Atchison stated that the creole cottage at 13 N. Warren was one of three adjacent properties he had purchased with the intent of redeveloping all three into a restaurant and event venue. Mr. Atchison stated that he secured interior demo permits to begin interior renovations. Removal of sheetrock and floor sheathing had revealed significant water and termite damage to structural framing members. Mr. Atchison hired a structural engineer to evaluate the property. The engineer found the cottage to be structurally unsound. After determining the planned rehabilitation of the property was unfeasible, Mr. Atchison offered the building to local developers Mike Rogers and Steven May for free if they wanted to relocate it. Both Mr. Rogers and Mr. May were convinced the structure was too far gone to make relocation feasible. Mr. Atchison stated that he had submitted a letter from Mark Rogers to this effect along with the engineer's report declaring the structure unsound.

Mr. Atchison stated that he still planned to renovate the two adjacent structures to be a restaurant and event venue. The new plan would include a landscaped event lawn where the cottage is currently located. An adjacent warehouse would be developed as an event space and a covered, open-air market space.

There were no members of the public present to speak for or against the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Maurin asked if the applicant had submitted the letter from Mike Rogers, which she did not see in the packet provided to the ARB. Mr. Atchison stated that he had. Staff member Annie Allen confirmed that the letter from Mike Rogers was submitted by the applicant.

Ms. Roselius asked if the applicant was concerned that demolition of the cottage would jeopardize the applicant's pursuit of Historic Tax Credits. Mr. Atchison responded that he would wait for approval from the State Historic Preservation Office before going through with the demolition.

Ms. Roselius asked if the applicant planned to salvage any materials from the building for reuse. Mr. Atchison stated that he had offered the mantels and doors to anyone who wanted to salvage them. Other materials, including any salvageable beams and window glass, would be retained for use on future development projects.

Ms. Echols expressed appreciation for the overall development plan for the site. Ms. Echols added that she was glad the applicant was pursuing tax credits, as these would require a high standard of rehabilitation for all three properties.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor asked the applicant to detail how he offered the structure for relocation. Mr. Atchison stated that he contacted local developers that he knew had taken on similar projects in the past. Specifically, he contacted Mike Rogers and Steve May.

Ms. Davis commended the applicant for doing his due diligence. She stated that, while she would be sad to see the it go, demolition seemed to be the only feasible course of action.

Ms. Roselius asked if staff had any information on the history of the structure and its owners. Ms. Allen stated that the file for this property did not contain much information. Mr. Atchison stated that he had purchased the properties from his uncle, who had owned them for quite some time.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor asked the applicant if he had removed the sheetrock or if he had acquired the structure in that condition. Mr. Atchison reiterated that he had removed the sheetrock as part of a preliminary interior demolition to determine the condition of the structural framing.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor stated that the engineer's report made no reference to termite activity. Mr. Atchison stated that, while the report may not cite termite damage specifically, he saw evidence of significant termite damage on site. Mr. Atchison stated that the structure sat very low to the ground with wood in direct contact with soil in some areas.

FINDING FACTS

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

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Ms. Davis moved that, although unfortunate, 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. Roselius seconded the motion. Ms. Davis, Ms. Echols, Ms. Maurin, Ms. Roselius, and Ms. Wilson all voted to grant a COA. Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor voted against granting a COA.



Agenda Item #2

Application 2024-37-CA

DETAILS

Location:

208 S. Catherine

Summary of Request:

Construct a one-story addition on north elevation;
construct a small second-story addition on south
elevation.

Applicant (as applicable):

Douglas B. Kearley

Property Owner:

208 S. Catherine LLC

Historic District:

Old Dauphin Way

Classification:

Contributing

Report Contents:

Property and Application History	2
Scope of Work	2
Applicable Standards	2
Staff Analysis	4
Attachments	5

Summary of Analysis:

- Both additions appear subordinate to the original structure in scale, massing, and placement.
- The proposed materials are approvable for construction in Mobile's historic districts.
- The remaining proposed alterations on the submitted plans are eligible for administrative review

PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

Old Dauphin Way Historic District was initially listed in the National Register in 1984 under Criterion C for significant architecture and community planning. The district includes most nineteenth-century architectural styles and shows adaptations of middle-class domestic designs of the nineteenth century to the regional, Gulf Coast climate. It includes “fine examples of commercial, institutional, and religious structures as well as 20th-century apartments.”

The property at 208 S. Catherine Street is a frame two-story Colonial Revival residence punctuated by an intermingling of Georgian and Spanish architectural detailing. The building was constructed c. 1910 and designed by Mobile architect C.L. Hutchisson. The form and footprint of the structure has changed minimally since construction.

The property has appeared before the Architectural Review Board once. In 2017, a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) was issued for the construction of a small addition off the west (rear) elevation.

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Construct an addition to the north elevation, to the west of the existing porte-cochere.
 - a. The proposed addition would measure approximately 11'-6" wide by 19'-0" deep
 - b. The addition would be topped by a hipped roof clad in fiberglass asphalt shingles.
 - c. Proposed fenestration would include one (1) multi-lite wood door measuring 3'-0" W x 7'-0" H, located on the east elevation; and one (1) casement window, relocated from the original block of the house, which would be placed on the additions' north elevation.
 - d. Exterior wall and foundation heights would match those of the original dwelling.
 - e. Exterior walls would be clad in wood siding to match original.
 - f. A wood landing, steps, and handrail would access the entry door on the addition's north.
2. Construct a small addition on the second floor of the south elevation.
 - a. The proposed addition measure approximately 21'-4" wide by 4'-4" deep.
 - b. The addition would be topped by a hipped roof clad in shingles. Exposed rafter tails would match those on the existing structure.
 - c. There is no proposed fenestration for this addition.
 - d. Exterior wall and roof height would be inferior to the original structure's second-story roof.
 - e. Exterior walls would be clad in wood siding to match existing.

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

1. **6.9** Place an addition so that it is subordinate to the historic residential structure.
 - Place and design an addition to the rear or side of the historic building wherever possible.
 - Place a vertical addition in the rear so it is not visible from the street.
2. **6.10** Design an addition to be compatible in massing and scale with the original historic structure.
 - Design the massing of an addition to appear subordinate to the historic building.
 - Where feasible, use a lower-scale connecting element to join an addition to a historic structure.
 - Where possible, match the foundation and floor heights of an addition to those of the historic building.

3. **6.11** Design the exterior walls of an addition to be compatible in scale and rhythm with the original historic structure.
 - Design the height of an addition to be proportionate with the historic building, paying particular attention to the foundation and other horizontal elements.
 - Design the addition to express floor heights on the exterior of the addition in a fashion that reflects floor heights of the original historic building.
4. **6.12** Clearly differentiate the exterior walls of an addition from the original historic structure.
 - Use a physical break or setback from the original exterior wall to visually separate the old from new.
 - Use an alteration in the roofline to create a visual break between the original and new, but ensure that the pitches generally match.
5. **6.13** 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.
 - Utilize an alternative material for siding as necessary, such as cement-based fiber board, provided that it matches the siding of the historic building in profile, character and finish.
 - Use a material with proven durability.
 - Use a material with a similar appearance in profile, texture and composition to those on the original building.
 - Choose a color and finish that matches or blends with those of the historic building.
 - Do not use a material with a composition that will impair the structural integrity and visual character of the building.
 - Do not use a faux stucco application.
6. **6.14** Design a roof of an addition to be compatible with the existing historic building.
 - Design a roof shape, pitch, material and level of complexity to be similar to those of the existing historic building.
 - Incorporate overhanging exposed rafters, soffits, cornices, fascias, frieze boards, moldings or other elements into an addition that are generally similar to those of the historic building.
 - Use a roofing material for an addition that matches or is compatible with the original historic building and the district.
7. **6.15** Design roofs such that the addition remains subordinate to the existing historic buildings in the district.
 - Where possible, locate a dormer or skylight on a new addition in an inconspicuous location.
 - In most cases, match a roof and window on a dormer to those of the original building.
8. **6.16** Design doors and doorways to an addition to be compatible with the existing historic building.
 - If a historic door is removed to accommodate the addition, consider reusing it on the addition.
 - Design a door and doorway to be compatible with the historic building.

- Use a door material that is compatible with those of the historic building and the district.
 - Use a material with a dimensionality (thickness) and appearance similar to doors on the original historic building.
 - Design the scale of a doorway on an addition to be in keeping with the overall mass, scale and design of the addition as a whole.
9. **6.19** Design piers, foundations and foundation infill on a new addition to be compatible with those on the historic building.
- Match the foundation of an addition to that of the original.
 - Use a material that is similar to that of the historic foundation.
 - Match foundation height to that of the original historic building.
 - Use pier foundations if feasible and if consistent with the original building.
 - Do not use raw concrete block or wood posts on a foundation.
10. **6.20** Use details that are similar in character to those on the historic structure.
- Match a detail on an addition to match the original historic structure in profile, dimension and material.
 - Use ornamentation on an addition that is less elaborate than that on the original structure.
 - Use a material for details on an addition that match those of the original in quality and feel.
 - Match the proportions of details on an addition to match the proportions used on the original historic structure.
11. **6.21** Design a window on an addition to be compatible with the original historic building.
- Size, place and space a window for an addition to be in character with the original historic building.
 - If an aluminum window is used, use dimensions that are similar to the original windows of the house. An extruded custom aluminum window approved by the NPS or an aluminum clad wood window may be used, provided it has a profile, dimension and durability similar to a window in the historic building.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The historic structure at 208 S. Catherine Street is a contributing resource within the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The application under review seeks approval for a one-story kitchen addition on the west end of the north elevation, along with a second-story closet addition on the south elevation.

The *Guidelines* call for the placement of an addition to an existing historic structure to appear subordinate to the main structure. The proposed first-story addition on the north elevation would measure 11'-6" wide by approximately 19'-0" deep (a total of approx. 218sf) and would be located to the west (rear) of the existing porte-cochere. The second-story addition proposed for the south elevation would measure 4'-4" wide by approximately 21'-4" deep. The scale, massing, and placement of both additions create an appearance of subordination to the historic dwelling. (6.9, 6.10)

The proposed additions are further compatible the original structure in its preservation of consistent ceiling and floor heights, traditional fenestration patterns, solid-to-void ratios, and comparable roof shape and design. (6.11, 6.14,6.15)

The submitted drawings differentiate the new additions from the historic design, as directed by the Guidelines. The single-story addition is differentiated by the transition to enclosed exterior walls off the porte-cochere. On the south elevation, the second-story addition is differentiated by the new construction's setback from the second-floor's east façade. (6.12)

The materials, finishes, and details proposed for exterior walls, roof, porches, fenestration, and foundation of the addition match or complement those of the original historic structure, maintaining its architectural integrity and visual character. Likewise, the design and placement of the proposed doors, along with the reuse of an existing historic window further increase the addition's harmony with the original building. (6.13, 6.16, 6.19-6.21)

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Douglas Kearley, architect, was present to discuss the application. Mr. Kearley explained that the owner had requested a one-story kitchen addition behind an existing porte cochere. A second-story sleeping porch would be made into an additional bedroom and bathroom. This would involve infilling some windows. The project would include some modifications to a porch roof and construction of a small rear deck.

There were no members of the public present to discuss the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Roselius asked for clarification on the roof material. Mr. Kearley explained that red asphalt shingles would be installed on a low hipped roof over the porch. The red shingles would match the color of the existing clay tile roof on the rest of the house. Mr. Kearley stated that the clay roof tiles were in good shape and would remain in place.

FINDING FACTS

Ms. Roselius 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

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

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