



Architectural Review Board Agenda

February 5, 2025 – 3:00 P.M.

Public Comment

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

[Architectural Review Board - New](#) | [City of Mobile Build Mobile Department](#) OR

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

until 3:00 PM on Tuesday, February 4, 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

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

1. Roll Call

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

Members Present: Catarina Echols, Cartledge Blackwell, Stephen Howle, Cameron Pfeiffer-Traylor, and Jennifer Roselius

Members Absent: Abby Davis, Karrie Maurin, Stephen McNair, and Barja Wilson

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

2. Approval of Minutes from December 4, 2024

Cartledge Blackwell moved to approve the minutes from the January 15, 2025, meeting.

The motion was seconded by Stephen Howle and approved unanimously.

3. Approval of Mid-Month COAs granted by Staff

Jennifer Roselius moved to approve the mid-month COAs granted by Staff.

Mr. Blackwell seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.

MID-MONTH APPROVALS - APPROVED

1. **Applicant:** Randle Miller
Property Address: 904 Texas Street
Date of Approval: 01/07/2025
Project:
 1. Replace and/or repair all exterior siding, trim, and porch materials in kind. Replace in-kind wood siding on rear elevation.
 2. Level and stabilize foundation. Install foundation infill to match existing where missing.
 4. Reroof with architectural shingles. Color: Slate.
 3. Replace all windows with nine-over-nine aluminum-clad wood windows that match existing in dimension and profile. New windows will fit existing openings, with the exception of the window on the north end (rear) of the east elevation. The non-original window opening at this location will be enlarged to match the size of all other windows.
 4. Replace front and rear entry doors with pane-and-panel door to fit existing openings. Replace four-light transom above front entry door in-kind.
 5. Repaint exterior with Sherwin Williams paint in the following colors:
Body - Light Blue
Trim- Extra White

2. **Applicant:** Kelly Fowler
Property Address: 1005 Savannah St
Date of Approval: 01/09/2025
Project: Repaint exterior to match existing.

3. **Applicant:** Bernhart Roofing and Construction LLC
Property Address: 113 S Dearborn St

- Date of Approval:** 01/13/2025
Project: Reroof shingles. Color: Mojave Tan.
4. **Applicant:** Guy Brothers Roofing and Siding Inc.
Property Address: 209 Roper Street
Date of Approval: 01/13/2025
Project: Reroof rear portion of roof with shingles. Color: Weather wood
5. **Applicant:** Satya Acquisition Management, Inc. d/b/a SAM, Inc.
Property Address: 42 S Hamilton Street
Date of Approval: 01/14/2025
Project: Reroof rear portion of roof with shingles. Color: Weather wood
6. **Applicant:** Phillip Smith
Property Address: 603 Church Street
Date of Approval: 01/15/2025
Project: Replace existing deck along the east and south (rear) elevations of existing ancillary structure. Deck to match existing in materials and dimensions; and to be stained with Sherwin Williams Chestnut (DB 2316) exterior deck stain.
7. **Applicant:** Anthony Spencer
Property Address: 19 S Lafayette Street
Date of Approval: 01/15/2025
Project:
 1. Remove existing prefabricated ancillary structure from property.
 2. Construct a new single car garage structure.
 - a. Garage will sit to the east (rear) of the main structure.
 - b. Existing concrete slab will be removed. A new slab-on-grade foundation will be poured for the new garage.
 - c. Garage will measure 25'-0" wide by 22'-0" deep and will measure 9'-0" to top of plate.
 - d. Garage will be clad in wood lap siding, painted to match the existing dwelling in Sherwin Williams March Wind.
 - e. The structure will be topped with a gable roof clad in shingles.
 - f. Fenestration will be as follows: Garage door and entry door will be of insulated metal. Windows will be aluminum-clad wood.
 - g. Elevations will appear as follows:
West façade (from north to south) - One paneled garage door measuring 9'x7'; One paneled entry door measuring 3'0" x 6'-8"; one one-over-one window measuring 30' x 36".
East (rear) elevation - no fenestration on this elevation
North elevation- No fenestration on this elevation
South elevation (from west to east) - Two 30" x 36" one-over-one windows, equally spaced across the elevation.
8. **Applicant:** Rob Johnston
Property Address: 1723 Laurel Street

- Date of Approval:** 01/27/2025
- Project:** Reroof in-kind with shingles. Color: Weather Wood
- 9. **Applicant:** All Weather Contractors Inc.
- Property Address:** 951 Government Street
- Date of Approval:** 01/27/2025
- Project:** Reroof with TPO roofing system

APPLICATIONS

1. 2025-05-CA

Address: Lot 4 on N Claiborne Street (parcel # R022906400003036)
Historic District: DeTonti Square
Applicant/Agent: Maurin Architecture on behalf of Rashawn Figures and the City of Mobile
Project: Construct two-story single-family residence
APPLICATION TABLED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

2. 2025-06-CA

Address: 800 Monroe Street
Historic District: Church Street East
Applicant/Agent: Douglas Kearley on behalf of Taylor Atchison
Project: Repairs and alterations to existing commercial structure
APPROVED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

3. 2025-07-CA

Address: 509 St. Francis Street
Historic District: Lower Dauphin
Applicant/Agent: Royshanda Smith
Project: Demolish commercial structure
APPROVED - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

OTHER BUSINESS

The next ARB meeting is scheduled for February 19, 2025.



Agenda Item #1

Certified Record 2025-05-CA

DETAILS

Location:

N. Claiborne Street, Parcel Number
R022906400003036

Summary of Request:

Construct a two-story single-family dwelling

Applicant (as applicable):

Maurin Architecture on behalf of Rashawn Figures

Property Owner:

City of Mobile

Historic District:

DeTonti Square

Classification:

Vacant lot

Summary of Analysis:

- The proposed design is intended for Lot #4 on the west side of N. Claiborne Street, north of Congress Street.
- The proposed materials are appropriate for the district and approvable for new construction under the *Guidelines*.
- The submitted plans attempt to incorporate the traditional design elements seen in the surrounding district.
- The massing of the proposed structure is not compatible with surrounding historic structures.

Report Contents:

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

PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

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

According to Historic Development survey records and the City's Geographical Information System, the projected lot (lot #4) proposed for the subject project, along the west side of N. Claiborne Street, straddles what was once 305 and 307 N. Claiborne Street. The lot at 305 N. Claiborne was occupied by a c. 1894 five-bay raised cottage with Victorian features. A full-width front porch was supported by turned posts and decorated with spindle work and decorative brackets. Brick knee and cheek walls in the Craftsman style were later added to the porch. Pairs of full height six-over-nine windows flanked the centered paneled entry door. A two-story cross-gable addition was added to the south end of the rear elevation sometime after 1955.

The adjacent property to the north, 307 N. Claiborne, was a c. 1904 two-story double-gallery frame dwelling with Victorian detailing. The façade was accentuated by a broken pedimented gable, decorative trim, and spindle work. A paneled door topped by a two-light transom was located in the southernmost bay on the first and second floors. Two-over-four full length windows graced the first floor, with two-over-two windows on the second floor. The porch was supported by turned posts and enclosed on the second floor by a carved handrail and balusters.

Detailed plans to fully rehabilitate the houses at 305 and 307 N. Claiborne under the supervision of the Mobile Housing Board and the Architectural Review Board were drawn up in the early 1980s. Both houses were demolished, along with all remaining historic structures along the west side the block of N. Claiborne Street north of Congress Street.

This property has never previously appeared before the Architectural Review Board.

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Construct a two-story single-family dwelling.
 - a. The new structure would be oriented to the east with a 0'-0" setback. Side yard setbacks on the north and south sides are unknown.
 - b. The proposed two-story house would measure 36'-0" wide by 52'-7 3/8" deep.
 - c. An 11'-2" deep attached open carport would extend along the west (rear) elevation. The carport would be supported by 10x10 square posts and would be topped by a shingled hipped roof.
 - d. The structure would sit on a parged masonry foundation. Finished floor to first floor top-of-plate height would measure 12'-0". The second-floor plate height from finished floor would measure 23'-6".
 - e. The structure would sit under a hipped roof clad in shingles. Exterior walls would be clad in Hardie lapped siding. All trim would be Hardie board.
 - f. Fenestration would consist of aluminum-clad wood windows.
 - g. The east façade would feature a recessed entry, centered on the elevation. The recess would consist of a multi-light glazed door topped by a two-light transom. The door would be flanked by four-over-eight fixed windows. The recessed entry way would be accessed by three (3) masonry steps spanning the width of the recess and flanked by masonry cheek walls.
 - h. A second-floor open gallery would run along the south elevation and be open to the east façade. An iron balustrade would enclose the gallery.
 - i. Fenestration would appear as follows:
East façade (from south to north)

First floor: A grouping of three (3) four-over-eight fixed windows; one (1) four-over-eight fixed window; multi-light entry door with two-light transom; one (1) four-over-eight fixed window; one (1) eight-light fixed window

Second floor: Open gallery; three (3) eight-light fixed windows, evenly spaced across the elevation; one (1) smaller eight-light fixed window (matching dimensions of first-floor eight-light window below)

West elevation (from north to south)

First floor: two (2) eight-light fixed windows, equally spaced along the north half of the elevation; one (1) multi-light entry door with two-light transom, roughly centered on the south half of the elevation.

North elevation (from east to west)

Multi-light fixed windows of varying sizes, irregularly spaced along the elevation.

South elevation (from west to east)

First floor: one (1) smaller eight-light fixed window; A grouping of three (3) six-light fixed windows; two (2) four-over-eight fixed windows, evenly spaced along the easternmost third of the elevation.

Second floor: One (1) eight-light fixed window; opening along second-story gallery showing multi-light entry door accessing the second floor; multi-light door accessing the second floor from gallery on east end of elevation.

2. Site improvements would include the installation of a driveway along the north end of the lot.

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

1. **6.34** Maintain the visual line created by the fronts of buildings along a street.
 - Where front yard setbacks are uniform, place a new structure in general alignment with its neighbors.
 - Where front yard setbacks vary, place a new structure within the established range of front yard setbacks on a block.
2. **6.35** Maintain the side yard spacing pattern on the block.
 - Locate a structure to preserve the side yard spacing pattern on the block as seen from the street.
 - Provide sufficient side setbacks for property maintenance.
 - Provide sufficient side setbacks to allow needed parking to occur behind the front wall of the house.
3. **6.36** Design the massing of new construction to appear similar to that of historic buildings in the district.
 - Choose the massing and shape of the new structure to maintain a rhythm of massing along the street.
 - Match the proportions of the front elevations of a new structure with those in the surrounding district.
4. **6.37** Design the scale of new construction to appear similar to that of historic buildings in the district.
 - Use a building height in front that is compatible with adjacent contributing properties.
 - Size foundation and floor heights to appear similar to those of nearby historic buildings
 - Match the scale of a porch to the main building and reflect the scale of porches of nearby historic buildings.
5. **6.38** Design exterior building walls to reflect traditional development patterns of nearby historic buildings.
 - Use a ratio of solid to void that is similar in proportion to those of nearby historic buildings.
 - Reflect the rhythm of windows and doors in a similar fashion on all exterior building walls. The ARB will consider all building walls; however, building walls facing streets may face increased scrutiny.
 - Use steps and balustrades in a similar fashion as nearby historic structures.
 - Design building elements on exterior building walls to be compatible with those on nearby historic buildings. These elements include, but are not limited to:
 - Balconies
 - Chimneys

- Dormers

6. **6.39** Use exterior materials and finishes that complement the character of the surrounding district.

- Use material, ornamentation or a color scheme that blends with the historic district rather than making the building stand out.
- If an alternative material is used that represents an evolution of a traditional material, suggest the finish of the original historic material from which it evolved.
- Use a material with proven durability in the Mobile climate and that is similar in scale, character and finish to those used on nearby historic buildings.

ACCEPTABLE MATERIALS

Materials that are compatible in character, scale, and finish to those used on nearby historic buildings are acceptable. These often include:

- Stucco
- Brick
- Stone
- Wood (lap siding, shingles, board and batten)
- Concrete siding
- Cement fiber board siding
- Skim stucco coat

UNACCEPTABLE MATERIALS

Materials that are incompatible in character, scale and finish to those used on nearby historic buildings are unacceptable. These often include:

- Metal siding
- Vinyl siding
- Unfinished concrete block
- Plywood
- Masonite
- Vinyl coatings
- Ceramic coatings
- Exterior insulation and finishing system (EIFS) wall systems

7. **6.40** Design a roof on new construction to be compatible with those on adjacent historic buildings.

- Design the roof shape, height, pitch, and overall complexity to be similar to those on nearby historic buildings.
- Use materials that appear similar in character, scale, texture, and color range to those on nearby historic buildings.
- New materials that have proven durability may be used.

ACCEPTABLE ROOF MATERIALS

Materials that are similar in character, scale, texture, and color range to those used on nearby historic buildings are acceptable. These often include:

- Asphalt dimensional or multi-tab shingles
- Wood shake or shingle
- Standing seam metal
- Metal shingles
- 5-V crimp metal
- Clay tile
- Imitation clay tile or slate

8. **6.41** Design a new door and doorway on new construction to be compatible with the historic district.

- Place and size a door to establish a solid-to-void ratio similar to that of nearby historic buildings.

- Place a door in a fashion that contributes to the traditional rhythm of the district as seen in nearby historic buildings.
 - Incorporate a door casement and trim similar to those seen on nearby historic buildings.
 - Place and size a special feature, including a transom, sidelight or decorative framing element, to complement those seen in nearby historic buildings.
 - Use a door material that blends well with surrounding historic buildings. Wood is preferred. Paneled doors with or without glass are generally appropriate.
9. **6.42** Design a porch to be compatible with the neighborhood.
- Include a front porch as part of new construction if it is contextual and feasible.
 - When designing a porch, consider porch location, proportion, rhythm, roof form, supports, steps, balustrades and ornamentation relative to the main building and porches in the district.
 - Design the elements of a porch to be at a scale proportional to the main building.
 - Where a rhythm of porches exists on a street or block, design a porch that continues this historic rhythm.
 - Design a rear or side porch that is visible from the public right-of-way to be subordinate in character to the front porch.
10. **6.43** Design piers, a foundation and foundation infill to be compatible with those of nearby historic properties.
- Use raised, pier foundations.
 - If raised foundations are not feasible, use a simulated raised foundation.
 - Do not use slab-on-grade construction. This is not appropriate for Mobile's historic neighborhoods. If a raised slab is required, use water tables, exaggerated bases, faux piers or other methods to simulate a raised foundation.
 - Do not use raw concrete block or exposed slabs.
 - If foundation infill must be used, ensure that it is compatible with the neighborhood.
 - If solid infill is used, recess it and screen it with landscaping.
 - If lattice is used, hang it below the floor framing and between the piers. Finish it with trim.
 - Do not secure lattice to the face of the building or foundation.
 - Do not use landscaping to disguise inappropriate foundation design.

ACCEPTABLE FOUNDATION MATERIALS

Materials that are similar in character, texture and durability to those used on nearby historic buildings are acceptable. These often include:

- Brick piers
- Brick infill
- Wood (vertical pickets)
- Framed lattice infill

UNACCEPTABLE FOUNDATION MATERIALS

Materials that are not similar in character, texture, and durability to those used on nearby historic buildings are unacceptable. These often include:

Mineral board panels

Concrete block infill

- Metal infill
- Plywood panel infill
- Plastic sheeting infill
- Vinyl sheeting infill

11. **6.44** Use details and ornamentation that help new construction integrate with the historic buildings in the district.
- Use a decorative detail in a manner similar to those on nearby historic buildings. A modern interpretation of a historic detail or decoration is encouraged.
 - Do not use a decorative detail that overpowers or negatively impacts nearby historic buildings.
12. **6.45** Locate and design windows to be compatible with those in the district.

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

ACCEPTABLE WINDOW MATERIALS

Materials that are similar in character, profile, finish and durability to those used on nearby historic buildings are acceptable. These often include:

- Wood
- Vinyl-clad wood
- Aluminum-clad customized wood
- Extruded Aluminum

UNACCEPTABLE WINDOW MATERIALS

Materials that are not similar in character, profile, finish and durability to those used on nearby historic buildings are unacceptable. These often include:

- Mill finish metal windows
- Snap-in or artificial muntins
- Vinyl

13. 10.5 Visually connect the street and building.

- Maintain or install a walkway leading directly from the sidewalk to the main building entry.

14. 10.6 Install a new sidewalk to be compatible with historic ones in the area.

- Maintain the existing width of neighboring sidewalks.
- Use a traditional sidewalk material as seen in the district if permitted by the City Code. Consult Staff if necessary.

15. 10.7 Minimize the visual impact of parking.

- Locate a parking area at the rear or to the side of a site whenever possible.
- Use landscaping to screen a parking area.
- Minimize the widths of a paved area or a curb cut.
- If a curb cut is no longer in use, repair the curb. In some areas, granite curbs may be required.
- Do not use paving in the front yard for a parking area. Paving stones might be acceptable in certain instances. Do not create a new driveway or garage that opens onto a primary street.
- Do not create a new driveway or garage that opens onto a primary street.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The property under review is part of a vacant parcel located in the DeTonti Square Historic District. The application proposes the construction of a two-story single-family residence on what is currently proposed at Lot #4 along the west side of N. Claiborne Street, north of Congress Street.

The *Guidelines* direct that the placement of a new structure should maintain the established range of front setbacks along the street. Because there are no extant structures along the street, no setback range currently exists. Across the street, front setbacks range from approximately 3'-6" to 23'-0". The submitted plans show a front setback of approximately 0'-0", with the front steps connecting to the sidewalk. The proposed setback would not fall into the present range along this block of N. Claiborne Street. It should be noted that there are high occurrences of structures sitting close or nearly adjacent to the sidewalk in DeTonti Square in particular. The side yard setback measurements have not been provided. The Guidelines state that these setbacks should also follow the established pattern on the block and should provide room for yard maintenance and off-street parking. The proposed plan provides space for a driveway along the north end of the property, and a limited area of yard space on the south end. (6.34, 6.35)

The *Guidelines* state that the scale of new construction should be compatible with those of surrounding historic structures along the street. The scale of the proposed structure is slightly larger than most historic buildings on the street (except for 310 N Claiborne) but does fall into a range that would be in keeping with many structures in the district at large. The scale of the proposed porch along the south elevation does not match the main building, or the scale of porches in the district, as outlined in the *Guidelines*. Similarly, the foundation does not appear to reflect the height of those of surrounding structures. (6.37, 6.43)

The submitted design does not achieve the *Guidelines'* objective of compatibility regarding massing. The large block form with hipped roof is out of step with dwellings across the street and those further afield in the district. The plans convey an attempt to break up the massing by introducing recesses and projections with the inset entry surround and the second-floor side porch. While these features could certainly produce a more compatible arrangement, as submitted, they do not read as fully developed nor serve to produce a cohesive design. Adjustments to these features could help to bring the plan into compatibility with the surrounding district. (6.36, 6.38, 6.44, 6.42)

The proposed hipped roof design echoes the roof structures of many historic buildings in the district. However, the most hipped roofs in DeTonti are of a lower slope that are not as visually evident. The scale, ratio, and pattern of the proposed fenestration on the exterior walls do not appropriately reflect the building traditions seen in DeTonti Square. On the façade, the second-floor windows above the recessed entrance seem too small for the space. The same is the case for the two stacked eight-light windows used on the stair hall's façade. The result of the various sizes communicates a lack of a distinct style and consistency. (6.38, 6.40, 6.45)

The building traditions in DeTonti Square predominantly emphasize rectangular design with offset wings that feature front or side galleries; there are more symmetrical examples with centered entryways, which are at times recessed and accentuated with classical trim. These styles most often consist of a flat or low-sloping hipped roofs (some with parapet walls). There are irregular forms common in DeTonti Square, with complex roof forms, wrapped porches, and cross gables. Fenestration is consistently proportional to the main building. As stated above, the plans depict an attempt to implement some of these elements, which could be modified to appropriately reflect the above building patterns.

The chosen materials for siding, foundation, roof, windows, and trim are all compatible with the district and are approvable for new construction under the *Guidelines*. (6.39, 6.40)

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Robert Maurin, architect, and Mr. Ellis Foster, realtor, were present to represent the application. Mr. Maurin gave a brief overview of the project.

Ms. Johnna Rogers of DeTonti Square Neighborhood Association came forward to speak against the project. Ms. Rogers stated that the DeTonti Square Neighborhood Association met with the developer and were given an overview of the development that has since changed. The number of houses to be built has multiplied. She added

that the houses would be way too large for the lots and there is a lack of green space. She expressed disappointment that the developer made significant changes that were not divulged to the Association.

Mr. Taylor Imel, a resident of DeTonti Square Historic District, came forward to speak against the project. He stated that he lives across N. Claiborne Street from the subject lot and that he agrees with Ms. Rogers that the massing is wrong, with the house taking up the entire lot, and set too close to the street. He added that the driveway and carport are not usable as designed, and he would like to see major changes to the design. He noted that if subsequent houses were built on the other lots using the same massing and setbacks, this block of N. Clairborne would take on a lopsided appearance. He asked that the Board not approve the application.

Ms. Lee Weissinger, a resident of DeTonti Square Historic District, came forward to speak against the application. Ms. Weissinger stated that she was also concerned about the proposed building's setback, windows, and massive size. She stated that the carport, as designed, could only be used as a rear porch as there is no other outdoor space on the lot, and it is not practical for parking, as the turn of driveway is too sharp. She asked that the Board deny the application.

Ms. Gail Lee, president of the DeTonti Square Historic District Neighborhood Association, came forward to speak against the application. Ms. Lee stated that she is not opposed to new development in general, just this particular design. She applauded the new construction development undertaken along Jackson Street.

One written comment was received in opposition to the application

No one from the public came forward to speak for the application. No public comments were received in favor of the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Blackwell asked Staff if the project had acquired CRC approval. Ms. Allen responded that a CRC application had not yet been submitted for this project.

Ms. Roselius asked Mr. Maurin why the house is so close to the lot line.

Mr. Maurin replied that other homes in the district are set close to the street-facing lot line.

Mr. Blackwell asked if there was a timeframe for the construction on the other lots in the development. Mr. Maurin stated that he is not aware of the timeline.

Jennifer Roselius expressed her concern with the home being so close to the street, especially since the façade is so imposing.

Cameron Pfeiffer-Traylor stated that the placement of the windows was concerning and asked the applicant why the windows on the north side of the façade were smaller than the others. Mr. Maurin explained that these windows are bathroom windows.

Ms. Traylor was concerned with the symmetry of the façade.

Mr. Blackwell asked Mr. Maurin if his client would be amenable to adding blind windows in certain locations to create a more balanced rhythm of fenestration across the elevations and added that there is precedent for this practice in the district. Mr. Maurin replied that that he would be open to this option.

Ms. Roselius questioned why a hipped roof was used instead of a front gable design. Mr. Maurin replied that the hipped roof designed tends to reduce some of the blocky appearance of the façade.

Ms. Echols urged Mr. Maurin to add ornamentation to the façade to break up the front façade.

Ms. Roselius agreed with Ms. Echols, adding that the façade could use more visual interest.

Ms. Roselius asked if the property has been officially subdivided into lots. Ms. Allen responded that the subdivision had not yet been finalized.

Bruce McGowin injected the option of a Design Review Committee to iron out details of the design.

Ms. Roselius asked Mr. Maurin and Mr. Foster if the project had received approval from the Department of Planning and Zoning. Mr. Foster replied that it had not.

Ms. Allen interjected that an application had been submitted to the Planning Commission.

Ms. Roselius asked the applicants if there would be any restrictive covenants on the other houses. Mr. Foster's reply was unclear.

Ms. Echols stated that usually, the whole development is presented and approved at once, not case by case.

Mr. Blackwell noted that the board has, in times past, reviewed two approaches involving new infill construction of properties being subdivided in locally designated historic districts. He mentioned that more recently the board has reviewed large projects in which all the designs for individual lots were reviewed and approved as one project. Blackwell also allowed that the Board has reviewed and approved such applications on a case-by-case basis.

Ms. Roselius stated that she was not in favor of approving this application, adding that it should go to a Design Review Committee. Mr. Blackwell concurred.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Blackwell moved to table the application.

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



Agenda Item #2

CertifiedRecord2025-06-CA

DETAILS

Location:

800 Monroe Street

Summary of Request:

Alterations to existing commercial structure to include fenestration changes and a small addition to the rear.

Applicant (as applicable):

Douglas Kearley

Property Owner:

Taylor Atchison

Historic District:

Church Street East

Classification:

Non-Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The property under review is non-contributing, but should be designated contributing if resurveyed.
- The proposed fenestration changes are compatible with historic commercial buildings seen in the district.
- The proposed addition does not visual disrupt the massing and scale of the existing building.

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 1904 Sanborn map, the first year available for this location, shows that the property at 800 Monroe was originally occupied by two dwellings: a two-story frame dwelling with a one-story wing; and a narrow and deep one-story frame dwelling (likely a shotgun) towards the west end of the current property. By the 1924 survey, the two houses had disappeared. The 1955 update shows the brick structure currently occupying the property. Originally represented on the Sanborn map as comprising both a meat curing and auto repair business, the building is typical of early twentieth-century quasi-industrial/warehouse structures with its rectangular footprint, brick façade, corrugated tin cladding (walls and roof), outsize ridge vents, bifold garage doors, large multi-pane metal windows, and loading dock. This building is adjacent to the Crystal Ice building which was designed by C.L. Hutchisson Sr. in 1926

This property has appeared once before the Architectural Review Board. In 2018, a COA was granted to renovate the building and construct a rear addition. This project was not carried out.

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Remove later shed roof addition on north elevation.
2. Construct an addition to the north elevation.
 - a. The addition would extend off the east end of the north elevation and consist of two parts: a larger kitchen area (to the east) and a smaller adjacent area consisting of restrooms. The kitchen area would measure approximately 18'-4" wide by 20'-0" deep. The restroom addition would measure 16'-0" wide by 8'-0" deep.
 - b. The addition would be clad in Hardie clapboards.
 - c. The only fenestration could consist of a door on the west elevation of the larger portion which would provide access to the kitchen.
 - d. Both parts of the addition would be topped by low-sloping gable roofs with exposed rafters to match the existing building. The roofs would be clad in a single ply membrane.
3. Carry out fenestration alterations on the south and north elevations as follows:
 - a. South elevation: Remove existing three (3) solid wood folding doors across the elevation. Fill the center opening with a pair of 8'-0" high by 3'-0" glazed doors with wood panel (centered on the elevation), topped by a single-light transom. The doors would be flanked by a wood storefront system consisting of clear glass panels and transoms above a 2'-0" high beaded board wood bulkhead. This storefront system would be repeated to fill in the westernmost and easternmost openings.
 - b. North elevation: Remove one leaf of existing bifold doors. Replace with a single glazed door with panel and single storefront window and beaded board bulkhead, each topped by a single-light transom to match those on south elevation.
4. In-kind repairs to existing wood siding, metal roofing, and steel windows. Repaint existing brick and wood exterior and corrugated metal roof and ventilators

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

1. **7.29** Design changes to a non-historic commercial building to be compatible with the district.
 - Design an alteration to retain a placement and orientation that is compatible with the district.
 - Design an alteration to appear similar in massing and scale with historic commercial buildings in the district.

- Use building elements that are of a similar profile and durability to those seen on historic buildings in the district.
- Maintain a solid-to-void ratio on building walls that is similar to those seen on historic buildings in the district.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The property under review is a non-contributing structure in the Church Street East Historic District. However, this building has historic value and integrity as an early twentieth commercial warehouse structure and should be reclassified as contributing if the district is updated.

The application seeks approval for fenestration changes, a small addition to the rear elevation, and in-kind repairs which can be approved at the Staff level.

The *Guidelines* instruct that changes to a non-historic commercial building should be compatible with the district. The application proposed fenestration changes which include glaze and panel doors and a store front system to replace the existing garage style bi-fold doors. Although the proposed fenestration is a departure from the more industrial style doors original to the building, the glaze and panel doors, windows, and transoms set above a wood bulkhead echo the traditional arrangements seen on commercial facades of historic commercial buildings in the district along Government Street and further afield. This arrangement is also similar to that approved for the east elevation of the adjacent property at 806 Monroe.

The *Guidelines* also state that an alteration should appear similar in massing and scale with historic commercial buildings in the district. The scale of the proposed addition to the rear is inferior to the existing building and has minimal impact on its massing. The chosen materials and elements such as exposed rafters maintain compatibility with the existing building. (7.29)

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Taylor Atchison was present to represent the application. He gave a brief overview of the project.

No one from the public came forward to speak for or against the application. No public comments were received.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Blackwell complimented the proposed design.

Ms. Roselius asked if any site improvements were planned for the lot. Mr. Atchison stated that a parking area may be installed later, but that would follow the completion of the proposed project.

FINDING FACTS

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

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Blackwell 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. Traylor seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.



Agenda Item #3

Certified Record 2025-07-CA

DETAILS

Location:

509 St. Francis Street

Summary of Request:

Demolish commercial structure

Applicant (as applicable):

Royshanda Smith

Property Owner:

Same

Historic District:

Lower Dauphin

Classification:

Non-Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The structure is in poor condition.
- The property has been cited by Municipal Enforcement.
- The Consolidated Review Committee granted approval in November 2024 to demolish the subject structure.
- A submitted structural report recommends demolition.
- The applicant has submitted no plans for future use of the lot.

Report Contents:

Property and Application History 2

Scope of Work 2

Applicable Standards 2

Staff Analysis 3

Attachments 4

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 1885, 1891, and 1904 overlays of the Sanborn Insurance maps show a large lot on the southeast corner of St. Francis and N. Cedar Streets. The lot was occupied by a two-story frame structure with a full-width porch oriented toward St. Francis Street. A rear single-story wing was offset to the east with a porch running along its west elevation. A second two-story rectangular structure, with its long side oriented east-west, was connected to the larger structure by an open connecting element such as a frame covered walkway. On the 1885 and 1891 maps, the structure is designated 'female boarding'. By the 1904 survey, the structure is designated simply as a dwelling and has been altered to include various small additions. The 1924 overlay shows the addition of a large, connected frame garage on the south end of the property. These structures have disappeared by the 1955 update. At this time, the map records a single-story rectangular masonry structure stretching east-west along the north property line (St. Francis Street), designated as a store. A small, connected frame garage structure projects off the east end of the store's south elevation. A second single-story masonry structure sits to the south of the first, oriented towards N. Cedar Street. This structure is divided into three 'stores' and consists of a full-width frame porch along its west façade. According to aerial photographs, the masonry structure oriented toward St. Francis Street was deleted between 1997 and 2002. The second structure remains extant.

This property has never previously appeared before the Architectural Review Board (ARB).

SCOPE OF WORK

Demolish one-story commercial structure

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

1. 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.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The application seeks approval to demolish the one-story masonry structure at 509 St. Francis Street. The applicant received approval from the Consolidated Review Committee in November 2024 to demolish the subject structure.

The *Guidelines* state that when demolition is contemplated, the current significance of the structure should be considered. The property under review is a non-contributing structure in the Lower Dauphin Street Commercial District. While the construction date of c. 1950 certainly meets the age requirement for listing on the National Register, the structure’s loss of integrity and that of the lot as a whole may render the property ineligible.

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 considerable poor condition.” The subject property poor condition. There is no roof on the structure, and it appears that the building has been exposed to the elements for some time. All windows and doors have experienced significant rot or are no longer extant. The building appears as a shell and not a whole structure. All other buildings on the lot have been demolished or removed, leaving large expanses of exposed concrete slabs. Vegetation is growing on and through the building. The property was cited by municipal enforcement in September of 2024. A structural report undertaken by Gant Group & Associates, LLC., and submitted by the applicant reads the following:

“Based on our assessment of the structural integrity of the facility and recognition that it poses no real historic value or context to the neighborhood, it is GGA’s recommendation that the building be demolished.”

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. This commercial structure is one of many examples of single-story multi-tenant masonry commercial structures found throughout Mobile’s historic districts and in the Lower Dauphin District specifically. Many can be found along Dauphin Street and further afield throughout other districts such as Oakleigh Garden.

Another consideration required by the *Guidelines* is the impact that a demolition would have on surrounding structures. The immediate vicinity has historically been a mix of commercial and residential, consisting of small and larger commercial and multi-tenant structures, and smaller one- or two-story single-family and duplex cottage dwellings, mostly of frame construction. Since 1955, widespread demolition along adjacent properties and surrounding blocks has resulted in vacant lots and the construction of new, large commercial structures.

The *Guidelines* instruct that the future use of a cleared site should be considered. No plans for future development of the lot at 509 St. Francis were submitted with this application. Demolition alone, with no plan to rebuild or redevelop the lot, which already has experienced demolition, would further contribute to the gap-toothed and neglected appearance of the block and surrounding area. (12.0)

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Ms. Royshanda Smith was present to represent the application. She stated that the building was in dire shape and was a nuisance to the public.

No one from the public came forward to speak for or against the application. No public comments were received.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Echols asked Staff if the subject building is historically significant.

Ms. Allen replied no, that the extant building was constructed at a later phase of development on the lot.

Ms. Traylor asked the applicant about future use of the lot.

Ms. Smith replied that it would be converted into green space.

FINDING FACTS

Mr. 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 intent to convert the lot into green space.

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Blackwell moved that, based on the amended 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.

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

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:13pm