



Architectural Review Board Minutes

February 19, 2025 – 3:00 P.M.

ADMINISTRATIVE

The meeting was called to order by the Chair, Catarina Echols, at 3:02 pm.

1. Roll Call

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

Members Present: Catarina Echols, Cartledge Blackwell, Abby Davis, Stephen Howle, Karrie Maurin, Jennifer Roselius, and Barja Wilson

Members Absent: Stephen McNair and Cameron Pfeiffer-Traylor

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

2. Approval of Minutes from February 5, 2025

Stephen Howle moved to approve the minutes from the February 5th, 2025, meeting.

The motion was seconded by Cart Blackwell and approved unanimously.

3. Approval of Mid-Month COAs granted by Staff

Mr. Blackwell moved to approve the mid-month COAs granted by Staff.

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

MID-MONTH APPROVALS - APPROVED

- Applicant:** All Weather Roofing and Construction LLC
Property Address: 12 Lemoyne Place
Date of Approval: 01/28/2025
Project: Reroof with shingles. Color: Charcoal
- Applicant:** Roe Robertson Construction
Property Address: 153 S Jefferson St.
Date of Approval: 01/28/2025

- Project:** 1. Replace rotten lap siding in-kind where needed. Replace in-kind rotten porch decking, wood trim, and details where needed.
2. Repair windows in-kind where needed.
3. Repair existing fence. Replace rotten/missing pieces in-kind.
4. Reroof with shingles. Color: Weather wood
5. Repaint house in approved colors.
3. **Applicant:** Wilfred Hunter
Property Address: 458 Marine St
Date of Approval: 01/31/2025
Project: 1. Replace siding where needed to match existing (all elevations)
2. Repaint exterior walls, trim and porch railing in paint colors approved by Staff.
3. Replace front porch decking where needed to match existing.
4. Replace front porch railing with wood balustrade to include a top rail and bottom rail. Balusters will be topped by trim piece on handrail.
5. Install framed lattice panels between foundation piers.
4. **Applicant:** Hagan Storm Fence of Mobile Inc.
Property Address: 1400 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 01/31/2025
Project: Install 6'-0" high wood privacy fence to the rear of the property. Fence will project from east elevation and run 11'-0" to the east; then run 37'-0" north; and 39'-0" westward to abut the southeast corner of existing garage.
5. **Applicant:** Pigeons on the Roof LLC
Property Address: 1553 Church Street
Date of Approval: 02/03/2025
Project: Reroof with shingles Color: Teak
6. **Applicant:** WRICO Signs
Property Address: 1500 Government Street Unit G
Date of Approval: 02/04/2025
Project: Install wall sign
a. Sign will be centered on façade bulkhead above storefront.
b. Sign will consist of an acrylic business logo and a set of face-lit channel letters that read "DONUTS" set above an aluminum drop peel tag line which will read "BREAKFAST, KOLACHES & COFFEE".
b. Measurements:
Round Logo to be 36" high. Channel letters to be 23" high. Tag line to be 12" high. Total signage will measure 14'-0" wide for a total of approx. 55sf.
c. Sign will be flush mounted with studs.
7. **Applicant:** James Martin
Property Address: 260 Marine Street

- Date of Approval:** 02/05/2025
Project: Repaint exterior. Colors to be the following:
 Body- Revere Pewter
 Trim - White Dove
 Door- Palladian Blue
 Shutters- Hale Navy
8. **Applicant:** Poplar Home Waterproofing
Property Address: 61 N Reed Street
Date of Approval: 02/05/2025
Project: 1.Rebuild base for center paired columns to match existing.
 2.Replace in-kind tongue and groove front porch decking.
 3.Replace in-kind damaged siding on north elevation of main structure.
 4.Replace in-kind pencil trim on rear elevation.
 5.Install new 3/4" framed lattice panels at openings on left and right side of foundation.
 6.Caulk all newly installed materials as needed.
 7.Repaint all replacements to match existing.
9. **Applicant:** Franchise Management Services Inc
Property Address: 29 McPhillips Avenue
Date of Approval: 02/05/2025
Project: Reroof with shingles. Color: Weather Wood
10. **Applicant:** J M Company LLC dba Eastern Shore Roofing and Construction
Property Address: 1119 Montauk Ave
Date of Approval: 02/05/2025
Project: 1.Reroof with architectural shingles. Color: Weather Wood
 2.Replace soffit to match existing in areas with rot.
 3.Repaint to match existing.
11. **Applicant:** The KP Group
Property Address: 1459 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 02/06/2025
Project: 1.Repair exterior brickwork, including installing new brick infill as needed to repair holes and cracks.
 2.Repair existing steel casement windows using in-kind materials.
 3.Paint exterior brick (previous painted), windows, railings, and other trim in approved BLP colors

APPLICATIONS

1. 2025-08-CA

Address: 54 N. Cedar Street
Historic District: Lower Dauphin

Applicant/Agent: Lee Wilson on behalf of Janice Morrison
Project: Install 6ft chain link fence along west (front), north and south property lines

APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS - CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

OTHER BUSINESS

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



Agenda Item #1

Certified Record 2025-08-CA

DETAILS

Location:

54 N. Cedar Street

Summary of Request:

Install a chain link fence

Applicant (as applicable):

Lee Wilson on behalf of Janice Morrison

Property Owner:

Janice Morrison
Jaime Hobbs
Darnisha Boykin

Historic District:

Lower Dauphin Street Commercial

Classification:

Vacant Lot

Summary of Analysis:

- The height of the proposed fencing along the street-facing property line falls outside of the approved range stated in the Guidelines
- Chain link is listed in the Guidelines as an unapproved material for fences located in Mobile’s local historic districts
- The fencing proposed for the south portion of the property appears to cross onto the adjacent lot the south.

Report Contents:

Property and Application History 2

Scope of Work 2

Applicable Standards 2

Staff Analysis 3

Attachments..... 5

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 contributing dwelling at 54 N. Cedar is a wood-frame shotgun type house with a rear projection on its south elevation. The 1878 City Directory, along with the 1891, 1904, and 1924 Sanborn maps, depict a large brick commercial building at 54 N. Cedar. This east side of the block remained predominately comprised of commercial structures through 1924. The subsequent Sanborn overlay, which occurred in 1955, depicts a domestic structure at 54 N. Cedar in a form that appears to be that of the existing dwelling. According to one of the owners, Ms. Morrison, the subject structure was moved to its current location. The original location is unknown. Aerial photography reveals that the house may have been extant at 54 N. Cedar in 1952. The National Register Nomination dates the structure to c. 1900.

A rear porch and carport on the north elevation were added to the structure at an unknown date. These were demolished in 2017. The house was relocated in 2025 to a lot on N Dearborn Street and is currently being restored, with additions planned for the rear. No site improvements have been implemented at the vacant lot created by the relocation.

Historic Development Department records show that the property has appeared twice before the Architectural Review Board (ARB). In 2017 an application was approved to remove the roof of a collapsing carport and portions of later additions. In 2024, the ARB granted approval to relocate the historic structure to 265 N Dearborn Street.

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Install 111'-0" of chain link fence
 - a. The proposed new fence would begin at the northwest corner of the property and run 23'-0" along the north property line, where it would abut an existing fence.
 - b. The fence would run from the same northwest corner, 38'-0" southward along the west street-facing side of the lot to its southwest corner.
 - c. The fence would run from the southwest corner, 28'-0" northward along the south side of the lot. It would then turn and run to the south for 1'-0" where it would abut the rear northwest corner of the building on the adjacent lot to the south.
2. Install one (1) 10'-0" chain link double gate along the north end of the fence's west elevation.

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.
 - Install a painted wood picket fence.
 - Install a simple wood or wire fence. Heights of wooden picket fences are ordinarily restricted to 36". Consideration for up to 48," depending on the location of the fence, shall be given. A variance might be required. Staff can advise and assist applicants with regard to a variance. If combined with a wall, the total vertical dimension of the wall and fence collectively should not exceed 36," or in some cases 48".
 - For surface parking areas associated with commercial uses, size a perimeter parking area fence to not exceed 48" in height.
 - Install a cast-iron or other metal fence not exceeding 48" in height if located in the front yard.

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

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 under review is a vacant lot in the Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District. The application seeks approval to install a total of 111'-0" of 6'-0" high chain link fencing at the property along the north, west, and south ends of the lot. There is an existing chain link fence along the east lot line, with a portion of chain link fencing along the north property line.

The *Guidelines* state that heights of front yard fences (forward of the building's front plane) should range from 36" to a maximum of 48", with side fences (located behind the front building plane) not to exceed 72". The guidelines for fencing do not contain standards that specifically address unimproved/vacant lots. However, the proposed material of chain link is listed in *Guidelines* as an unacceptable material for fences within historic districts. (10.2)

It appears that the fencing proposed for the south end of the lot crosses the south property boundary, onto the lot at 506 St. Francis Street.

The subject lot is also located within the Downtown Development District (DDD), which requires review of this project by the Consolidated Review Committee (CRC). Although DDD regulations do allow for fences with a

maximum height of 72" (6ft) along any property line on an unimproved lot, they also do not permit chain link fences along frontages. (*Unified Development Code - Appendix A Downtown Development District*) Any project proposed for a property located within both a local historic district and the Downtown Development District must comply with both the *Design Review Guidelines* and DDD regulations.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Ms. Janice Morrison was present to represent the application. She gave a brief history of the area and stated her desire to secure her property which is a vacant lot.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Catarina Echols stated that chain link is not an approved material for fencing in local historic districts, adding that the proposed height for the fence along the street frontage property line is also out of compliance with the *Guidelines*. Ms. Morrison replied that a 6-foot fence is needed to keep criminals off the lot.

Mr. Blackwell supported Ms. Morrison's right to protect her property and asked if she would be amenable to moving the fence along the west property line eastward a few feet and using wood instead of chain link. Ms. Morrison stated that she would not be willing to amend the fence placement but would consider using aluminum fencing.

Jennifer Roselius asked if the application had gone to the CRC. Ms. Allen replied that it had not.

Marion McElroy added that the CRC would consider aluminum fencing but not chain link.

Abby Davis stated that an image of the proposed aluminum fencing would be necessary.

Ms. Allen asked if Staff could approve the design and material of the fence. Multiple Board members replied in the affirmative.

Ms. Roselius noted that the proposed location of the fence seems to encroach on the neighboring lot. Ms. McElroy stated that this is a civil matter which would have to be resolved between the property owners.

FINDING FACTS

Mr. Blackwell 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 install a 6'-0" aluminum fence that will be approved by Staff.

Ms. Roselius 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.

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

Ms. Allen informed the Board that a Design Review Committee for the new construction application on the lot on North Claiborne Street (reviewed at the February 5th meeting) would be scheduled after the applicant has had a chance to attend a pre-development meeting with other relevant departments in Build Mobile.

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:20pm.