



Architectural Review Board Minutes

April 2, 2025 – 3:00 P.M.

ADMINISTRATIVE

The meeting was called to order by the Chair, Catarina Echols, at 3:03 pm.

1. Roll Call

Annie Allen, Historic Development staff, called the roll as follows:

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

Members Absent: Cartledge Blackwell and Stephen McNair

Staff Members Present: Annie Allen, Kimberly Branch-Thomas, Marion McElroy, Bruce McGowin, and Meredith Wilson

2. Approval of Minutes from February 19, 2025

Jennifer Roselius moved to approve the minutes from the January 15, 2025, meeting.

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

3. Approval of Mid-Month COAs granted by Staff

Ms. Traylor moved to approve the mid-month COAs granted by Staff.

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

MID-MONTH APPROVALS - APPROVED

1. Applicant:	Quintina Martin
Property Address:	1053 Texas Street
Date of Approval:	02/10/2025
Project:	1. Install 6'-0" wood privacy fence. Fence will run along the west property line, beginning at the southwest corner of the structure. A gate will stretch between the west elevation and connect to the fence at the southwest corner of the structure

2. Install 6'-0" wood gate on the east side of the property, which will abut the east elevation on the structure behind the front plant.
3. Replace in-kind the bottom front step which accesses the front porch.
4. Install a concrete driveway to the west of the structure which matches the footprint of the existing driveway.
Cochran Investments Inc.

2. Applicant:

Property Address:

Date of Approval:

Project:

2255 Ashland Place
02/10/2025
Install a brick retaining wall along the north property line. The wall will measure approximately 18" high and be around 80' long. Brick to match the existing dwelling.

3. Applicant:

Property Address:

Date of Approval:

Project:

RATA Investments LLC
926 Conti Street
02/11/2025
1. Install a picket fence.
The fence will run along the south property line, then turn north along the east property line and run for approximately 25'-0" where it will abut existing privacy.
2. Install a wood privacy fence.
Privacy fence will sit inside the property and run east to west approximately 24'-0" abutting the east property line.

4. Applicant:

Property Address:

Date of Approval:

Project:

Southern Bay Construction
950 Elmira Street
02/11/2025
Reroof with shingles. Color: Charcoal
Replace wood lap siding in-kind along all exterior elevations where needed. Repaint to match existing.
Repair and/or replace front porch decking and ceiling to match existing tongue and groove material where needed.
Install a new driveway and parking area of crushed stone. The new driveway will match the footprint of the existing driveway and parking area.

5. Applicant:

Property Address:

Date of Approval:

Project:

Franchise Management Service
1658 Dauphin Street
02/13/2025
Reroof with shingles. Color: Weather Wood

6. Applicant:

Property Address:

Date of Approval:

Project:

All Weather Roofing and Construction LLC
204 S. Dearborn St
02/13/2025
Reroof with Shingles Color: Pewter

- 7. Applicant:** Fortified Exteriors LLC
Property Address: 918 Conti Street
Date of Approval: 02/13/2025
Project: Reroof with shingles. Color: Weathered Wood
- 8. Applicant:** Fast Signs of Mobile
Property Address: 362 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 02/14/2025
Project: Install a double-faced hanging blade sign on the southwest corner of structure.
a. The sign will be an aluminum composite with a printed vinyl application to include the company's logo, street number, and "Buzzed Bull Creamery: Liquid Nitrogen Ice Cream & Milkshakes" (colors: black and white)
b. The sign will suspend from a metal blade with scrolled bracket mounted to the brick façade.
c. The sign will measure 2'-6" wide by 3'-0" high, for a total of 15sf.
- 9 Applicant:** Grimes Property Services LLC
Property Address: 1707 Conti Street
Date of Approval: 02/14/2025
Project: Remove and replace rotted wood on the front porch.
Remove and replace front porch screening in-kind.
Remove and replace front porch posts in-kind
- 10. Applicant:** Achitson's Property LLC
Property address: 159 Jefferson Street
Date of Approval: 02/18/2025
Project: 1. Install 578 sf wood deck on the south side of the structure which will connect the main dwelling to the accessory structure to the east.
2. Replace rotten wood decking on the main dwelling's front porch with tongue-and-groove decking to match existing.
3. Replace the rotten front door on the main dwelling with reclaimed wood pane-and-panel door with light pattern matching the original front door.
4. Install one pair of painted wood louvered shutters flanking the main dwelling's front door.
5. Replace wood windows with accessory structure to match existing material, dimensions, and light pattern.
6. Replace compromised entry door on accessory structure with a wood two-over-two light pane-and-panel door to fit existing opening.
- 11. Applicant:** Robert Dueitt Const.
Property Address: 10 Common Street
Date of Approval: 02/19/2025

Project: Repair and replace rotten siding in-kind where needed.
Repair and restore existing windows in-kind.
Repaint exterior in following Behr colors:
Body - Back to Nature
Trim - White
Porch Decking and Accent areas - North Woods
Front entry door - Medieval Wine

12. Applicant: Guy Brothers Roofing and Siding Inc
Property Address: 1311 Brown Street
Date of Approval: 02/19/2025
Project: Reroof with shingles. Color: Hearthstone

13. Applicant: Kelly Fowler
Property Address: 1005 Savannah Street
Date of Approval: 02/19/2025
Project: Install a 3'-0" high picket fence painted white.
a. The fence will enclose the front yard.
b. Two 3'-0" wide picket gates will be installed along the north and west elevations of the fence.

14. Applicant: Rellim Contracting LLC
Property Address: 1626 Springhill Avenue
Date of Approval: 02/19/2025
Project: Reroof with shingles. Color: Weather Wood

15. Applicant: Royshunda Smith
Property Address: 500 St Francis Street
Date of Approval: 02/24/2025

Project: Demolish one story masonry structure
Convert subsequent vacant lot into greenspace

16. Applicant: Chad E. Foster (BLD)
Property Address: 361 George Street
Date of Approval: 02/25/2025
Project: Reroof with shingles Color: Shakewood

17. Applicant: Pigeons on the Roof LLC
Property Address: 1210 Government Street
Date of Approval: 02/25/2025

Project: Reroof with Shingles. Color: Charcoal
18. Applicant: Adel Enkerche
Property Address: 1168 Elmira Street
Date of Approval: 02/25/2025

- Project:** Install a gutter system on the existing structure.
a.The system will consist of 104'-0" of gutters and leaf guards, and 3 downspouts.
b.The gutters will be located on the west, north (rear), and east elevations.
- 19. Applicant:** Chad E Foster LLC
Property Address: 1121 Palmetto Street
Date of Approval: 02/26/2025
Project: Reroof with Shingles. Color Charcoal
- 20. Applicant:** Stormy Rutledge
Property Address: 1550 Government Street
Date of Approval: 02/27/2025
Project: Amendment to previously approved SOW on previously issued COA MHDC-136365-2024 to include Staff approved lighting method and materials.
1. Install a wall sign on the east-facing façade of the building.
a. The proposed sign will consist of the company’s logo and name and will measure 7’- 3 13/16” wide by 4’-3 15/16” high, for a total of approximately 74.97 square feet.
b. The sign will be mounted on the oversized panel above the storefront towards the north end of the elevation.
c. The sign consists of individually internally lit channel letters and logo mounted to a pack panel.
d. The sign material will include aluminum back panel and aluminum letters with digitally printed plastic facing.
- 21. Applicant:** Andrew Browning
Property Address: 1314 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 03/05/2025
Project: Install 36” wood picket fence
- 22. Applicant:** Fortified Exteriors
Property Address: 10 Homer Street
Date of Approval: 03/06/2025
Project: Reroof with shingles. Color: Weather Wood
- 23. Applicant:** Fortified Exteriors
Property Address: 1406 Old Shell Road
Date of Approval: 03/06/2025
Project: Reroof with shingles. Color: Pewter
- 24. Applicant:** Gregory Ball
Property Address: 1221 Selma Street
Date of Approval: 03/10/2025

Project: Replace rotten wood on porches, siding, and deck with matching wood product. Repaint to match existing historic colors on file.

25. Applicant: Harzo, Inc.

Property Address: 351 Michigan Ave

Date of Approval: 03/12/2025

Project: Reroof with shingles. Color: Desert Sand

26. Applicant: Thomas Industries Inc (BLD)

Property Address: 1707 Government Street

Date of Approval: 03/12/2025

Project: Reroof with shingles. Color: Antique Gray.

27. Applicant: Marlon Wade

Property Address: 164 St Emanuel Street

Date of Approval: 03/13/2025

Project: Reroof with shingles. Color: Thunder Gray

28. Applicant: Deas Millwork

Property Address: 360 Dauphin Street

Date of Approval: 03/14/2025

Project:

- Install powder-coated aluminum single-lamp light fixtures on either side of main entry.
- Lime-wash exterior brick along sidewalk
- Install salvaged wood windows in blind opening in south face of masonry column along sidewalk
- Install decorative ceramic tiles on portions of courtyard walls (see facade renderings)
- Paint exterior in following scheme using BLP paint colors:
 - Back (south) wall of courtyard area: Dauphin Street Light Gold
 - Exterior windows, doors, and trim on back (south) wall courtyard area: Black Licorice BLP 0529
 - Ceiling over courtyard area: Savannah Street Dark Brown
- Provide exterior metal frame and composite slat (Trex) planters (movable) around the dining area in courtyard

29. Applicant: Flippin' Renovations LLC

Property Address: 1350 Old Shell Road

Date of Approval: 03/14/2025

Project: Remove wood siding on side and rear elevations. Replace with hardie lap siding to match original. Repair wood siding on the front elevation, replacing in kind as necessary to match original.

Replace tongue and groove boards on front porch in-kind to match original. Replicate historic wood porch columns

as seen in photo submitted with application. Install new wood columns.

Paint exterior with following scheme using Sherwin Williams colors:

Body: Grizzle Gray SW 7068

Trim: Iron Ore SW 7069

Door: Black, emerald SW 2936

Steps and porch decking: Gray shingle SW 7670

Southern Bay Construction

30. Applicant:

Property Address:

1559 Fearway

Date of Approval:

03/19/2025

Project:

Reroof with shingles. Color: Weather Wood

31. Applicant

Fortified Exteriors LLC

Property Address:

162 S Georgia Street

Date of Approval:

03/20/2025

Project:

Reroof with shingles. Color: Driftwood

32. Applicant

DBK Incorporated

Property Address:

911 Government Street

Date of Approval:

03/20/2025

Project:

ALL ELEVATIONS

1. Repair, scrape, prime and paint existing wood siding and shingles where possible.

2. Restore wood cornice and metal gutter.

FACADE

1. Restore and reinstall original entry door.

2. Replace missing brick foundation infill to match where needed.

3. Repaint existing masonry steps accessing the front porch.

EAST ELEVATION

1. Remove later-added door, concrete steps, and shed hood at the bay window on east elevation.

a. Replace the door opening with relocated salvaged wood one-over-one wood window to match existing in bay window.

b. Install new wood siding to match existing to infill later door opening.

2. Install new Hardie sides on the south end of east elevation (later addition)

3. Remove two later-added second floor windows on the south end of east elevation. Infill openings with Hardie siding to match existing siding in profile.

SOUTH ELEVATION

1. Remove the rotten siding on rear elevation and replace with Hardie siding to match existing wood siding in profile.
2. Remove the existing door and window on the first floor of east end of south elevation (enclosed porch). Replace with relocated wood window and door/transom from east elevation.
3. Remove later added doors and windows on second floor of east end of south elevation (enclosed porch). Replace with four (4) salvaged wood sash windows with decorative lights in the upper sashes.
4. Remove later-added irregular fenestration arrangement on second floor of west end of south elevation. Close openings with Hardie siding and install one six-over-one relocated wood window.
5. Install pretreated wood deck on east end of the rear elevation. Deck would measure 24'-0" wide by 14'-0" deep. Its height would match the dwelling's foundation height. It would be accessed by four (4) wood steps centered on its south side. An 18" high continuous wood bench would flank the top step on the south side and continue along the perimeter to enclose the deck on its east and west sides.

WEST ELEVATION

From north to south:

1. Reinstall one-over-one window in the existing opening on the north end of the second floor.
2. Install salvaged decorative light window on first floor porch. Install new wood siding to match existing.
3. Remove the existing later-added window on the south end of the second floor. Fill opening with siding to match existing.

33.Applicant:

Damian Tullis

Property Address:

950 Elmira Street

Date of Approval:

03/20/2025

Project:

1. Remove existing rear enclosed porch. Construct a new bath and laundry addition that encompasses the footprint of the removed rear porch, and a new rear porch.
 - a. The proposed one-story addition will measure 323 sf, including the rear porch, and will be located to the rear of the original structure. The east and west side setbacks will remain the same as that of the original structure. The setback from the rear property line to the new projecting rear porch will be 8'-2".
 - b. The proposed addition will be topped by an extension of the existing rear roof line and small projecting gable on the west side which will run perpendicular to the

dwelling's main gable. This gable will sit subordinate to the rest of the roof structure. All proposed new roof portions will be clad in shingles to match the existing.

c. The exterior wall heights of the of the addition will match the original structure at 12'-0".

d. The new addition will be clad in wood horizontal siding to match existing.

e. The proposed addition will sit on a foundation of masonry piers to match existing.

f. The existing window on the east end of the rear elevation will be removed. New horizontal siding will be installed.

g. A paneled door will be installed at the west end of the elevation.

h. The proposed gable roof porch on the west end of the elevation will measure 9'-3" wide by 8'-0" deep and will be supported by two (2) 8 x 8 square posts with base and caps.

34. Applicant: Sign Pro

Property Address 216 St Francis Street

Date of Approval: 03/24/2025

Project: Install a double-faced aluminum suspended sign from under the second-floor gallery.

a. Sign will hang perpendicular to ROW, suspended by metal chains.

b. Sign will measure 3'-0" wide by 1'-6" high

c. Signs will read " Firehouse Wine Bar" and include a wine glass graphic. The design will include a red digitally printed background with cut gold text.

APPLICATIONS

1. 2025-10-CA

Address: 66 S. Georgia Avenue
Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Applicant/Agent: Stephen Weiss
Project: After-the -fact: Construct addition to rear elevation of dwelling
APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

2. 2025-11-CA

Address: 58 S. Hallett Street
Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Applicant/Agent: Paul Davis on behalf of Marc Jackson
Project: Construct new ancillary guesthouse structure
APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

3. 2025-12-CA

Address: 159 S. Jefferson Street
Historic District: Church Street East
Applicant/Agent: Taylor Atchison
Project: After-the-fact: Construct a 7' high wood privacy fence
APPROVED - **CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

4. 2025-13-CA

Address: 1550 Government Street
Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Applicant/Agent: Jennifer Jacksons/Wrico Signs
Project: Install new signage on existing monument sign
APPROVED - **CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

OTHER BUSINESS

The next ARB meeting is scheduled for April 16, 2025.



Agenda Item #1

Certified Record 2025-10-CA

DETAILS

Location:66 S. Georgia Street

Summary of Request:

After-the-fact approval of a rear addition

Applicant (as applicable):

Stephen Weiss

Property Owner:

Same

Historic District:

Old Dauphin Way

Classification:

Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The addition is subordinate to and appropriately differentiated from the historic structure.
- The cladding, foundation, and roofing materials are approvable under the *Guidelines* and are compatible with the historic dwelling.
- The vinyl fenestration is not an approvable material for additions to historic residences in historic districts.

Report Contents:

Property and Application History 2

Scope of Work 2

Applicable Standards 2

Staff Analysis 4

Attachments 5

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 subject property is a c. 1901 one-story frame cottage with restrained Queen Anne design features such as the irregular roof lines, asymmetrical façade, curved front porch, decorative corner brackets, and fish scale shingles. Historic Development records and photographs show that the original porch balusters were turned. These were replaced with squared spindles c. 1920s/1930s when the porch was screened in. The screening was later removed.

According to Historic Development Department records, this property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board (ARB).

SCOPE OF WORK

After-the-fact

1. Construct a rear addition.
 - a. The addition projects from the south end of the west (rear) elevation and would measure 7'-0" wide by 14'-0" deep.
 - b. The addition is clad in wood lap siding to match existing.
 - c. The addition is topped by a gable roof, a continuation of the existing gable over the existing rear projection. Exposed rafter tails match those on the existing projection.
 - d. The addition's raised foundation sits on masonry piers at a height that matches the existing structure.
 - e. All fenestration is located on the north elevation, and includes one (1) single-pane entry door and two one-over-one vinyl windows.

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 subject property is a contributing structure to the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The application under review seeks after-the-fact approval of a small rear addition which extends an existing rear projection on the south end of the west (rear) elevation.

The *Guidelines* call for an addition to an existing historic structure to be subordinate to and compatible with the main structure in placement, massing, scale and rhythm. This application achieves these objectives with the placement of the one-story addition to the rear of the property, which does not disrupt the existing massing and scale of the property. The footprint, which measures approximately 98 square feet, is less than 5% of the 2234sf footprint of the historic mass of the house. The roof proposed for the addition also sits subordinate to the height of the main roof. Foundation and ceiling heights proposed for the addition match those of the existing house. (6.9 - 6.11, 6.14, 6.15)

As directed by the *Guidelines*, the proposed addition is differentiated the retention of and existing corner board on the south elevation. (6.12)

The horizontal wood siding, masonry piers, and roof shingles are approvable materials under the guidelines for additions to historic residences; and match the materials on the existing structure. The use of vinyl fenestration is not approvable under the *Guidelines*. Additionally, the spacing of fenestration along the addition's north elevation is somewhat of a departure from the established pattern along the historic structure's original elevations. It should be noted that all fenestration is on the north elevation of the rear addition, which is minimally visible and cannot be seen from the street. (6.13, 6.19, 6.21)

Correction – a follow-up site visit revealed that foundation piers are not masonry, but are wood posts, which is not a structurally sound material for foundation piers.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Stephen Weiss was present to represent the application. He gave an overview of the project, stating that his understanding was that his contractor was pulling all necessary permits.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Allen alerted the Board to a correction to the Staff report, noting that the addition's foundation piers are not masonry, as stated in the report, but are wood posts, which may be a structural hazard.

Ms. Roselius questioned the unfinished window on the west elevation.

Mr. Weiss stated that the opening is temporarily filled with plywood, as work was not completed.

Ms. Davis asked if the windows on the addition are vinyl. Mr. Weiss responded that they are vinyl.

Ms. Traylor inquired about the work being done to ancillary structures on the property.

Meredith Wilson stated that Staff is currently reviewing these projects on a midmonth level.

Ms. Echols asked staff about the safety of the structure sitting on wood post piers.

Ms. Allen stated that the permitting department and inspection services will evaluate the addition after ARB review.

Ms. Roselius asked the applicant if he would be amenable to replace the vinyl windows with those of a two-over-two configuration in an approvable material. Mr. Weiss replied that he would.

Ms. Roselius asked if the wood piers could be covered with another material. Ms. Davis stated that the piers are so low that a surround would not be practical.

Board members further discussed the fenestration trim, noting that it does not match that on the original portion of the structure.

FINDING FACTS

Ms. Roselius moved that, based on the evidence presented in the application, the Board find the facts in the Staff's report, amended to include the applicant's agreement to replace the vinyl windows with two-over-two windows of an approvable material, and to fill the window opening on the west elevation with the same.

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Ms. Davis moved that, based on the amended facts approved by the Board, and on the condition that the requested alterations are made, 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.



Agenda Item #2

Certified Record 2025-11-CA

DETAILS

Location: 58 S. Hallett Street

Summary of Request:

Construct a new ancillary guesthouse

Applicant (as applicable):

Paul Davis

Property Owner:

Marc Jackson

Historic District:

Old Dauphin Way

Classification:

Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The placement and size of the proposed new structure are compatible with other nearby historic accessory structures.
- The proposed structure’s size is inferior to the primary dwelling, in accordance with the *Guidelines*.
- All materials are approvable for new construction and do not impair the historic integrity of the main dwelling.

Report Contents:

Property and Application History 2

Scope of Work 2

Applicable Standards 2

Staff Analysis 3

Attachments 4

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 subject property is a one-story frame bungalow with Craftsman detailing. Although the National Register nomination for the Old Dauphin Way Historic District gives the dwelling a construction date of c. 1920, a structure of very similar form appears on the 1904 Sanborn map. The same form is represented on the subsequent 1925 overlay. This form is slightly different from its present configuration. City directories place a Mr. Torrey living at the address in 1900. Given that the house presently features architectural elements such as a deep front porch supported by squared battered columns resting on brick plinths, it can be concluded that the house was constructed between 1895 and 1900 and was then altered to express the popular Craftsman style sometime shortly after 1925.

According to Historic Development Department records, this property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board (ARB).

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Construct a new one-story ancillary guesthouse.
 - a. The proposed structure would be rectangular in shape and would sit on the west end of the lot, orientated to the east, directly behind the main dwelling.
 - b. The proposed structure would measure 22'-4" wide by 31'-4" deep and would be topped by a gable roof with exposed rafter tails. The roof would be clad in asphalt shingles.
 - c. The structure would measure 15'-7" high from finished floor to the ridge vent. Exterior walls would measure 10'-0" to top of plate.
 - d. The foundation would be slab on grade.
 - e. A full-width front porch would span the west façade, supported by four (4) equally spaced round fiber cement wrapped columns, each with cap and base.
 - f. Fenestration would consist of two entry doors and four two-over-two windows.
 - g. Windows would be vinyl clad wood and would measure 3'-0" wide by 5'-0" high.
 - h. The two doors would consist one main entry door on the façade, which would be an eight-pane fiberglass door measuring 3'-0" wide by 7'-0" high. The second door would be located on the west end of the north elevation. This door would be of solid engineered wood and would measure 3'-0" wide by 6'-8" high.
 - i. The exterior walls would be clad in fiber cement lap siding.
 - j. 4" fiber cement trim would surround all doors and windows.
 - k. Fenestration would appear as follows:
 - East façade
One (1) entry door centered on the elevation, flanked by two (2) windows.
 - West elevation
One (1) window centered on the elevation.
 - North elevation
One (1) entry door located at the west end of the elevation.
 - South elevation
One (1) window centered on the elevation.

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.
 - 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.

STAFF ANALYSIS

58 S. Hallett Street is a contributing property in the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The application under review seeks approval to construct a one-story guesthouse structure at the property.

The proposed new structure would sit at the rear of the lot, behind the main historic dwelling, which would limit its visibility from the street, and would be in keeping with the location of most historic accessory structures in the immediate vicinity. The approximately 700sf structure with a total height of 15'-7" is considerably inferior to the primary dwelling. Its placement and size align with the guidelines for accessory structures. Additionally, all materials are approvable under the guidelines for new construction, and do not impair the historic integrity of the primary historic dwelling. (9.1, 9.2)

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Paul Davis, architect of the project, was present to discuss the application. He gave a brief overview of the design, stating that the owners wanted more room for guests.

The owner of adjacent lot at 1104 Montauk came forward to speak about the application. He stated that he had concerns about privacy and requested that the applicant/owner construct a privacy fence. Ms. Traylor informed the speaker that the ARB cannot mandate that a property owner construct a privacy fence, that this may be a discussion to have directly with the property owner.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Roselius inquired about plans for additional parking. Mr. Davis stated that there were not plans to create an additional parking area on the property.

Ms. Traylor noted that the windows on the plan did not seem compatible with the windows on the original dwelling. Mr. Davis responded that the window design could be changed to match the main house.

Ms. Maurin suggested that the slope of the roof match the main house as well.

Ms. Maurin and Ms. Davis asked the applicant if the owner would be open to using a raised foundation, which would be more appropriate than a slab-one-grade. Mr. Davis replied that he would inquire with the owners but thought they would be amenable.

Ms. Davis also requested that the gable vent be lowered.

FINDING FACTS

Ms. Traylor moved that, based on the evidence presented in the application, the Board find the facts in the Staff's report, amended to include the applicant's agreement to match the window configuration and trim to that of the main dwelling; lower the gable vent slightly; alter the foundation from slab-on-grade to raised; and to match the roof slope to the main dwelling.

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Ms. Davis moved that, based on the amended facts approved by the Board, and on the condition that the requested alterations are made, 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. Traylor seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.



Agenda Item #3

Certified Record 2025-12-CA

DETAILS

Location: 159 S. Jefferson

Summary of Request:

After-the-fact approval of a 7'-0" privacy fence

Applicant (as applicable):

Taylor Atchison

Property Owner:

same

Historic District:

Church Street East

Classification:

Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The placement and materials of the fence are compliant with the *Guidelines*.
- The height of the fence falls outside of the *Guidelines'* height allowances for fencing.
- The fence falls within CRC height regulations.

Report Contents:

Property and Application History 2

Scope of Work 2

Applicable Standards 2

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 property at 159 S. Jefferson Street is a one-story frame vernacular bungalow topped by a gable roof. The three-bay façade is articulated by a gable roofed front porch. A small cross-gable projection extends from the south elevation. It is unclear when the existing house was constructed, but historic Sanborn Insurance Maps and aerial photographs reveal that it was either constructed on-site or moved to the subject lot between 1925 and 1952. Its form and features suggest a construction date around the 1930s or 1940s. A one-story duplex dwelling is represented on the 1904 and 1924 Sanborn map. Its long narrow form implies a shotgun typology. This structure had been replaced by the current building by the time of the 1955 overlay. Both the front and side projecting porches were screened at some point. The screening has now been removed.

According to Historic Development records, this property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board.

SCOPE OF WORK

After-the-fact

Construct a 7'-0" high wood privacy fence.

- a. The fence would sit behind the dwelling's front plane, beginning in line with the side projection on the south elevation.
- b. The fence would run along the south property line for approximately 75'- 0", abutting an existing fence rear fence on the east property line.
- c. Additional fencing would adjoin the southeast corner of the neighboring dwelling (to the north) and run eastward to the extant rear fence. This portion of privacy fence would begin on the west end at 6'-0" high and taper upward to 7'-0" on the east end.

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

1. **10.2** Design a fence to be compatible with the architectural style of the house and existing fences in the neighborhood.

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.

ACCEPTABLE FENCE MATERIALS

Materials that have a similar character, durability and finish to those of fences of historic properties in the district are acceptable.

These often include:

- » Wood picket
- » Wood slat
- » Wood lattice
- » Iron or steel
- » Historically appropriate wire fences

- » Aluminum that appears similar to iron

UNACCEPTABLE FENCE MATERIALS

Materials that do not have a similar character, durability and finish to those of fences of historic properties in the district are unacceptable.

These often include:

- » Chain link
- » Stockade
- » Post and rail
- » Masonite
- » PVC
- » Plywood or asbestos paneling
- » Razor wire
- » Barbed wire

STAFF ANALYSIS

The property at 159 S. Jefferson is a contributing property to the Church Street East Historic District. The application under review requests after-the-fact approval for a 7'-0" fence which runs along the south and north property lines.

The subject fence is compliant with the *Guidelines'* directives regarding placement and materials. The fence exceeds the *Guidelines'* height restriction of 72" (6ft). It adjoins a previously existing 96" fence which runs along the east (rear) property line. The height of this rear fence is compliant with the *Guidelines'* allowance for fences up to 96" when a commercial property abuts a residential lot. (10.2)

Of note, the 7'-0" height is allowed under CRC regulations.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Taylor Atchison was present to discuss the application. He stated that he consulted the DDD regulations when planning the fence and was not aware that the DDD regulations for fencing differed from those in the Design Review Guidelines.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Roselius asked if the project had received CRC approval. Ms. Allen responded that it had.

Ms. Davis asked Mr. Atchison if there is a gate on the front face of the fence. Mr. Atchison replied that there is a walking gate that matches the height of the fence, with perforations to create more visibility.

Ms. Roselius asked if the existing deck was the reason for the height of the fence. Mr. Atchison replied that it was an effort to create privacy for neighbors.

The Board discussed the height of the fence and whether the west elevation should be pushed eastward. Mr. Atchison supplied a clearer photo of the west elevation which determined that it was appropriate to leave the placement as it is.

FINDING FACTS

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

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Ms. Davis moved that, based on 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. Traylor seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.



Agenda Item #4

Certified Record 2025-13-CA

DETAILS

Location:

1550 Government Street

Summary of Request:

Install 64 square foot double-faced monument signage.

Applicant (as applicable):

Wrico Signs on behalf of Aldi, Inc.

Property Owner:

AXGNL 1 MOBILE AL LP

Historic District:

Old Dauphin Way

Classification:

Non-contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- In addition to existing signage at the property, the proposed new monument signage would exceed the permitted tenant signage area.
- The property owner has received a zoning variance for wall signage to exceed the 64sf maximum outlined in the Unified Development Code (UDC).

Report Contents:

Property and Application History 2

Scope of Work 2

Applicable Standards 2

Staff Analysis 3

Attachments 4

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 1550 Government is a contemporary masonry grocery store constructed in the 1986. The property has been occupied by commercial pursuits since at least 1904, when the Sanborn Fire Insurance Map shows a one-story frame saloon and grocery store at the northwest corner of Government and Catherine streets and a two-story frame store building to the immediate west. By the time of a 1952 aerial photograph, the saloon/grocery store building appears to have expanded to the north along Catherine Street, and another larger building had been constructed to the northwest. The 1956 overlay of the 1925 Sanborn map notes the larger building was concrete block and brick and housed a warehouse and store. The large parcel accommodated vehicle parking. The parcel was expanded in the 1980s with the demolition of residential properties to the west along Macy Place, and the existing grocery store building appeared in aerial photographs between 1985 and 1997, thus confirming the Mobile County tax assessor’s construction date of 1986.

According to Historic Development Department files, this property has previously appeared four times before the Architectural Review Board (ARB). An application for alterations to the east and south elevations of the existing building was approved in January 2009. In May 2010, the ARB approved an application to install three signs with a total square footage of 195.665 on the east elevation of the building, in addition to the existing pole-mounted sign then in existence along Government Street; this decision was based partially on a 1995 Board of Zoning Adjustment variance allowing up to 200 square feet of signage on the property. An application to install additional signage on the pole-mounted sign was denied by the ARB in September 2012. The property last appeared before the ARB in February 2020, when the ARB approved the installation two wall signs with a total area of 184 square feet, bringing the total square footage of signage on the property to 280 square feet including the previously approved 96 square foot monument sign along Government Street. In October 2024, an application was approved for Aldi, Inc. which allowed for a new 74.97 square foot wall sign on the east façade.

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Install signage on an existing monument sign located on the south boundary of the lot along Government Street.
 - a. The proposed sign would be double-faced, with each face consisting of the company’s logo and name.
 - b. Each face would measure 8’-0” wide by 4’-2” high, for a total of approximately 64 square feet of monument signage.
 - c. The signs would be fastened to the monument panel with counter sunk screws.
 - d. The sign would consist of individually lit aluminum channel letters fixed to an aluminum face.

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

1. **11.3** Design a new sign to be compatible with the character of a building and the district.
2. **11.5** New signs are restricted to a maximum of 64 square feet.
3. **11.6** Place a sign to be compatible with those in the district.
 - When placing a new sign on a historic building, locate a sign to emphasize design elements of the historic building façade.
 - Mount a sign to fit within existing architectural features.
4. **11.7** Use a sign material that is compatible with the materials of the building on which it is placed and the district. New materials that achieve the effect of traditional materials and lighting solutions will be considered on a case by case basis.

- Do not use highly reflective materials for a sign. All plastic faced box signs are not allowed.
 - Design a sign to be subordinate to the building façade.
5. **11.8** Where necessary, use a compatible, shielded light source to illuminate a sign.
- Consider direct lighting toward a sign from an external, shielded lamp when possible.
 - Use a warm colored light to illuminate a sign when possible.
 - If halo lighting is used to accentuate a sign or building, locate the light source so that it is not visible.
 - If a back-lit sign is used, illuminate each individual letter or element separately.
6. **11.9** When possible design a monument sign to be compatible with the building it serves and the historic district.
- Limit the area of a monument sign to 50 square feet (maximum of 25 square feet on each side).
 - Limit the height of a monument sign to 8 feet. A monument sign should be visible, but clearly subordinate to the building.
 - Where possible, design a monument sign to be compatible with the architecture of the associated building.
 - Use lighting that is shielded and directed toward the sign. This lighting can be installed in the ground adjacent to a monument sign.
 - Do not use an internally illuminated monument sign.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The property under review is a non-contributing structure in the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. This application involves the installation of double-faced monument signage which would be fixed to an existing monument along Government Street.

The proposed sign would be composed of aluminum channel letters fixed to an aluminum facing. The *Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts (Guidelines)* direct that new signage in historic districts be "compatible with the character of a building and the district." (11.3, 11.6, 11.7, 11.8) The proposed sign materials would be consistent with the non-historic and non-contributing nature of the existing building.

The proposed monument sign area would be approximately 64 sf. Existing wall signage at the property totals 74.97sf. The combined total of 138.97sf exceeds the maximum permitted sign area for tenants of commercial properties in historic districts by 74.97 square feet. This maximum square footage is a stipulation listed in both the *Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts*, and in the Unified Development Code (UDC). (11.5) In February 2025, the Board of Zoning Adjustment granted a variance to allow wall signage exceeding 64 square feet at the subject property.

Guideline 11.9 instructs that monument signs should not be internally illuminated. According to the applicant, the top panel on the monument was previously illuminated. There is existing power at the sign location, and the proposed internal illumination would be a dim light which would be compatible with the signage on the building.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Ms. Jennifer Jackson from Wrico Signs was present to discuss the application. She explained that the existing monument sign board was previously illuminated and currently has power running to it. She stated that the proposed sign would be much dimmer than the previous sign.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Echols asked the applicant how the sign would be treated if a new tenant moved into the available space at the property. Ms. Jackson stated that Aldi would return to the Board to obtain approval for any new signage.

Ms. Traylor asked about obtained zoning variances. Ms. McElroy from Build Mobile explained that the appropriate variances had been issued.

FINDING FACTS

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

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

OTHER BUSINESS

Ms. Wilson, Historic Development Staff, gave the Board an update on the status of the Design Review Guidelines update project.

With no other business, the meeting adjourned at 4:49pm.