



Architectural Review Board Minutes

Sept 2, 2026 – 3:00 P.M.

ADMINISTRATIVE

The meeting was called to order by the Chair, Ms. Jennifer Roselius, at 3:02 pm.

1. Roll Call

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

Members Present: Cartledge Blackwell, Barja Wilson, Cameron Pfeiffer-Traylor, Jennifer Roselius, and Steve Stone

Members Absent: Abby Davis, Stephen McNair, Karrie Maurin, and Stephen Howle

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

2. Approval of Minutes from August 19, 2026

Mr. Cartledge Blackwell moved to approve the minutes of the August 19, 2026 meeting.

Mr. Steve Stone seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.

3. Approval of Mid-Month COAs granted by Staff

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

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

MID-MONTH APPROVALS - APPROVED

1. **Applicant:** Robert/Helen Chapelle
Property Address: 1254 Selma Street
Date of Approval: 08/11/2026
Project: Construct a 6-ft wood privacy fence along west, north, south, and east property lines of rear and side yard as shown on submitted site plan on file and described below:
 - West line: Beginning at NW corner, running south along property line approximately 51' - 6"
 - North line: Beginning at NW corner, running east along property line approximately 120'
 - South line: Beginning at SW corner of old Lot 7, running east along property line approximately 79'
 - East line: Beginning at SW corner of old Lot 7, running south along property line approximately 77'

All portions of 6-foot fencing to sit behind the front building plain of dwellings at 1254 Selma Street and neighboring properties at 166 and 170 S Georgia.

2. **Applicant:** Chad E Foster (BLD)
Property Address: 116 N Lafayette Street
Date of Approval: 08/11/2026
Project: Re-roof with GAF Timberline Shingles. Color: Charcoal
3. **Applicant:** Lori Pino
Property Address: 1223 Selma Street
Date of: 08/13/2026
Project: Construct a 12' x 24' Gunitite pool in south (rear) yard, per site plan on file.
Pool surface: White base plaster
Pool coping: Travertine tile
Pool deck: Concrete pavers from Peacock Pavers
4. **Applicant:** Eric Jones E&J Concrete
Property Address: 1223 Selma Street
Date of Approval: 08/13/2026
Project: Demo existing concrete driveway and repour within existing footprint (2170 SF)
Construct a 12' x 24' Gunitite pool in south (rear) yard, per site plan on file.
5. **Applicant:** Fortified Exteriors LLC
Property Address: 1562 Blair Ave
Date of Approval: 08/14/2026
Project: Re-roof with CertainTeed Landmark shingles. Color: Silver Birch
6. **Applicant:** Franchise Management Services Inc
Property Address: 153 Houston Street
Date of Approval: 08/14/2026
Project: Reroof with Certainteed Landmark Shingles. Color: Moire Black
7. **Applicant:** Timber Ridge Services Inc
Property Address: 128 Macy Place
Date of Approval: 08/18/2026
Project:
 1. Demo and replace in existing footprint driveway, section of sidewalk, section of curb (per plans on file) at south side at Laurel St.
 2. Demo and replace 3' dog-ear wood picket fence around south side yard (per plans on file) to match existing.
 3. Demo and replace short block retaining walls at south side and east side only (per plans on file). Mortar / stucco surface to match existing.
 4. Remove window AC on east facade. Installed wood frame picture window.
 5. Repair /install wood window stools at various crawlspace access/vent holes.

(All paint to be completed under separate approval).
8. **Applicant:** Keven Shaw
Property Address: 1254 Selma Street
Date of Approval: 08/19/2026

- Project:** Reroof with architectural shingles to match existing. Color: Charcoal Gray.
9. **Applicant:** Derek Thomas
- Property Address:** 103 Houston Street
- Date of Approval:** 08/20/2026
- Project:** Reroof with GAF HDZ timberline shingles. Color: Charcoal

APPLICATIONS

1. 2026-47-CA

Address: 155 Houston Street
Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Application/Agent: Mike Anderson/Anderson Cabinet company LLC
Project: Window Replacement
APPLICATION TABLED – CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

2. 2026-48-CA

Address: 257 St. Anthony
Historic District: DeTonti Square
Application/Agent: Maynard Nexsen PC
Project: Demolition and site improvements
APPROVED – CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

OTHER BUSINESS

- Design Review Committee: 411-417 Dauphin Street
- The next ARB meeting is scheduled for September 16, 2026.



Agenda Item #1

Certified Record 2026-47-CA

DETAILS

Location:

155 Houston Street

Summary of Request:

Replace thirteen existing wood windows with aluminum-clad wood windows

Applicant (as applicable):

Mike Anderson (Anderson Cabinet Company LLC)

Property Owner:

Kad Henderson

Historic District:

Old Dauphin Way

Classification:

Non-Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The windows proposed for removal appear to be in excellent condition and to require minimal if any repairs.
- The proposed replacement windows are an approvable material and match the existing windows in dimensions and light configuration.
- The c. 1925 structure is listed as non-contributing to the Old Dauphin Way Historic District but would likely be considered contributing if the nomination were updated today.

Report Contents:

Property and Application History	2
Scope of Work	2
Applicable Standards	2
Staff Analysis	3
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 one-story wood-frame cottage constructed c. 1925. The National Register nomination for Old Dauphin Way Historic District give the dwelling an incorrect construction date of c. 1950. The incorrect date explains why the property is currently listed as non-contributing, since a construction date of c. 1950 puts it outside the period of significance for the district, which is listed as 1827 to 1941. However, given the property’s actual construction date of c. 1925 and its relatively high degree of architectural integrity, the property would easily be listed as contributing if the National Register nomination were updated today.

Staff determined the earlier date of construction using Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps and Mobile City Directories from the period. The property is depicted on the 1925 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map, when the lot was numbered 163 instead of 155 Houston Street. The exact same footprint is shown on the 1956 Sanborn Map, when the property is numbered both 155 and 163 Houston Street. The property underwent substantial alterations between 1956 and 1984. A survey photograph dated 1984 shows a rear addition and an attached carport that are not visible on the 1956 Sanborn Map. At this time, both the porch and the attached carport featured identical metalwork supports and railings. The carport, rear addition, and porch renovation likely date to some time in the 1960s, when this style of railing was popular. A previous owner replaced the mid-20th-Century metalwork with the existing wood square posts and railing sometime between December 2023 and March 2025. This work was completed without building permits prior to the current owner purchasing the property.

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

SCOPE OF WORK

Remove thirteen wood windows and replace them with aluminum-clad wood windows that fit the existing openings. Replacement windows to be 6-over-6 to match existing with simulated divided lights including exterior muntins and internal spacer bars.

1. Remove two (2) wood windows from the west primary façade.
 - a. Replacement windows #12 & 13:
 - i. #12 & 13 Dimensions: 33 ¾" W x 61 ½" H
2. Remove three (3) wood windows from the south elevation.
 - a. Replacement windows #1, 2, & 3:
 - i. #1 Dimensions: 33 ¼" W x 62" H
 - ii. #2 Dimensions: 32" W x 62" H
 - iii. #3 Dimensions: 43 ¾" W x 52 ½" H
3. Remove three (3) wood windows from the east (rear) elevation
 - a. Replacement windows #4 & 5:
 - i. #4 & 5 Dimensions: 33 ¾" W x 53 ¾" H
4. Remove six (6) wood windows from the north elevation
 - a. Replacement windows #6, 7, 8, 9, 10, & 11
 - i. #6 & 7 Dimensions: 33 ½" W x 53 ¼" H
 - ii. #8 Dimensions: 33 ½" W x 53 ½" H
 - iii. #9 & 10 Dimensions: 31 ¾" W x 61 ½" H
 - iv. #11 Dimensions: 27 ¾" W x 37 ¾" H
 - v. #12 & 13 Dimensions: 31 ¾" W x 61 ½" H

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

1. 5.20 Preserve the functional historic and decorative features of a historic window.
 - Where historic (wooden or metal) windows are intact and in repairable condition, retain and repair them to match the existing as per location, light configuration, detail and material.
 - Preserve historic window features, including the frame, sash, muntins, mullions, glazing, sills, heads, jambs, moldings, operation, and groupings of windows.
 - Repair, rather than replace, frames and sashes, wherever possible.
 - For repair of window components, epoxies and related products may serve as effective solutions to material deterioration and operational malfunction.
2. 5.21 When historic windows are not in a repairable condition, match the replacement window design to the original.
 - In instances where there is a request to replace a building's windows, the new windows shall match the existing as per location, framing, and light configuration.
 - Use any salvageable window components on a primary elevation.
3. ACCEPTABLE WINDOW MATERIALS
Materials that are the same as the original, or that appear similar in texture, profile and finish to the original are acceptable. These often include:
 - Wood sash
 - Steel, if original to structure
 - Custom extruded aluminum
 - Aluminum clad wood
 - Windows approved by the National Park ServiceUNACCEPTABLE WINDOW MATERIALS Materials that do not appear similar to the original in texture, profile and finish are unacceptable. These often include:
 - Vinyl
 - Mill-finished aluminum
 - Interior snap-in muntins (except when used in concert with exterior muntins and intervening dividers)

STAFF ANALYSIS

The subject property is listed as non-contributing in the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The application under review seeks approval for the replacement of thirteen double-hung wood windows with aluminum-clad wood windows to match the existing in overall dimension and light configuration. The double-hung wood windows on the original c. 1925 match those on the c. 1960 addition, suggesting the windows date to the later period.

The *Guidelines* recommend that historic windows that are intact and in repairable condition be retained and repaired, and those that are not repairable be replaced with new windows that are consistent with the existing in location, framing, and light configuration. (5.20, 5.21)

The proposed six-over-six aluminum-clad wood replacement windows would have the same light configuration as eight of the existing windows. The *Guidelines* list aluminum-clad wood windows as approvable, and double-pane windows are considered appropriate as long as they feature simulated divided lights with an internal spacer bar. (5.21) The proposed windows are therefore acceptable as replacement windows according to the *Guidelines*.

Assessment of Window Condition

The *Guidelines* stipulate that historic wood windows should only be replaced if they have deteriorated beyond the point of repair. The window survey and photos submitted as part of the application indicate that the windows are

in repairable condition. Photographs do not depict any obvious signs of rot or termite damage to the wood sash and muntins. The glazing putty – which frequently is loose, cracked, or entirely missing on poorly maintained wood windows – is intact and well-adhered. This suggests that the windows have been reglazed fairly recently and otherwise well maintained. The glazing putty has blackened on nearly all windows. This commonly occurs if fresh window putty is painted over before it is allowed to dry fully. Excess moisture escapes from the putty as it cures, causing the paint surface to mildew. This can be removed with by washing the windows with a dilute dish soap solution. A small amount of bleach may be added to the water for stubborn staining. Once the mildew is removed, a fresh coat of paint treated with a mildewcide should prevent the blackening of the putty in future.

Windows and Energy Efficiency

A common claim to support replacing historic wood windows is the savings on energy costs, with many window companies claiming that the owner will eventually recover the initial installation cost in savings on their heating and cooling bills. The US Department of Energy estimates that, on average, homeowners in Mobile, Alabama who replace all existing single-pane windows with ENERGY STAR rated windows may save \$120 on their annual heating and cooling costs (Energy Star, “Cost and Energy Savings,” 2005). Assuming a window replacement cost of approximately \$1,500 per window, total replacement of windows in a house with 12 windows would cost \$18,000. With a savings of \$120 per year, the homeowner could expect to earn back the \$18,000 installation cost in 150 years. Even assuming higher energy saving claims made by some window manufacturers of 12% a year (which on average would equal approximately \$350 in Mobile), it would take 50 years to earn back the cost of window replacement. Given the typical window warranty does not exceed 20 years, it is unlikely that the homeowner will see a return on investment greater than 40% before needing to replace their replacement windows.

In contrast, installation of interior or exterior storm windows over existing single-pane windows sees a significantly quicker return on initial investment than total window replacement. The US Department of Energy (DOE) states that Low-e Storm Windows achieve “similar energy savings as full window replacement, but at about one-third the cost” (“Storm Windows” and “Do-It-Yourself Savings Project,” *U.S. Department of Energy*, energy.gov). Specifically, a 2015 study by the DOE found that installation of a low-E storm window over a single-pane wood window in climate zone 2 (where Mobile, AL, is located) resulted in energy savings of 24%. Given an estimated per-window installation cost between \$60 and \$200 per window, the DOE report estimates that homeowners will earn back the initial installation costs in 14 years on average.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

No one was present to represent the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no discussion.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Ms. Pfieffer-Traylor moved to table the application.

Mr. Blackwell seconded the motion, and all approved.



Agenda Item #2

Certified Record 2026-48-CA

DETAILS

Location:

257 St. Anthony Street

Summary of Request:

Demolish non-contributing commercial building

Applicant (as applicable):

Maynard Nexsen PC

Property Owner:

James F. Watkins

Historic District:

De Tonti Square

Classification:

Non-Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The commercial building was constructed in 1979 and is listed as non-contributing to the De Tonti Square Historic District.
- If demolition is allowed, the applicant proposes creating a landscaped lawn on the vacant lot. All proposed site improvements are in keeping with the *Guidelines*.

Report Contents:

Property and Application History.....	2
Scope of Work.....	2
Applicable Standards	3
Staff Analysis	3
Attachments	5

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.

The subject property is a one-story masonry commercial building constructed in 1979. The current building replaced a historic two-story apartment building that was constructed in 1907 and destroyed by fire in January 1979. The current building is rectangular in plan with a low-sloped hip roof. It features an imitation stone water table and regularly-spaced stuccoed pilasters that reference the early 20th-Century apartment building that previously occupied the lot. Given its construction date of 1979, the subject building does not meet the 50-year age requirement for National Register eligibility. It is therefore listed as non-contributing to the De Tonti Square Historic District.

According to Historic Development records, this property has previously appeared twice before the Architectural Review Board. The Board approved construction of a handicap-accessible ramp and installation of a replacement front entry door in 2011 and 2012, respectively.

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Demolish non-contributing commercial building and metal accessory structure.
 - a. Remove existing concrete sidewalks, handicap ramp, and associated paving.
 - b. Remove all demolition debris.
2. Create a landscaped lawn space for occasional use.
 - a. Turf and landscape the vacant lot.
 - b. Plant two (2) 12-foot live oak trees in median between St. Anthony Street and existing sidewalk
 - c. Plant four (4) 8-foot holly trees – one at each of the four corners of the lawn space
 - d. Plant one (1) 16-foot live oak tree in new planter at southeast corner of existing asphalt paving
3. Install ornamental cast-iron fence along north property line, enclosing north end of existing asphalt paving and new lawn area.
 - a. Fence and gate height: 4 feet
 - b. Material: ornamental cast-iron panels
 - c. Install a pair of sliding cast-iron gates across 8-foot-wide opening at existing curb cut at north end of existing asphalt paving.
 - d. Install a pair of hinged cast-iron gates across 5-foot-wide opening at pedestrian entrance at north end of new lawn area.
 - e. Install a 10-foot by 8-foot brick pad at north pedestrian entrance
4. Construct brick wall at north end of new lawn area, delineating transition between lawn and existing asphalt paving
 - a. Wall height: 4 feet
 - b. Materials: Concrete masonry unit with brick facing
 - c. Wall to have 5-foot wide opening to allow pedestrian access between lawn and existing asphalt paving
 - d. Construct 30-inch-high brick planters along wall on either side of opening
 - e. Install brick paving at opening between planters at pedestrian entrance

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.
 - a. Heights of wooden picket fences are ordinarily restricted to 36". Consideration for up to 48", depending on the location of the fences, shall be given. If combined with a wall, the total vertical dimension of the wall and fence collectively should not exceed 36", or in some cases 48".
 - b. Install a cast-iron or other metal fence not exceeding 36" in height if located in the front yard. 48" shall be considered under certain circumstances. Coping walls located below cast-iron fencing may be appropriate in certain locations and do not count toward the total height.
 - c. Install a cast-iron or other metal fence not exceeding 48" in height if located in the front yard.
2. Consider the current significance of a structure previously determined to be historic.
 - An analysis should be undertaken to determine if the historic structure retains its integrity. In some cases, a property previously identified as a contributing historic structure may no longer retain its integrity due to changes to the structure since the time it was originally determined to be historic.
3. Impact on the Street and District
 - Consider the impact of removing the historic structure relative to its context.
 - Consider whether the building is part of an ensemble of historic buildings that create a neighborhood. (12.0)
4. Nature of Proposed Development
 - Consider the future utilization of the site. (12.0)

STAFF ANALYSIS

The significance of the structure

The *Guidelines* state that the first point of consideration in a demolition application should be the significance of the subject property. The existing structure dates to 1979 and is therefore non-contributing to the De Tonti Square historic district. The one-story structure is out of scale with the contributing buildings on this block of St. Anthony Street. Its nearest neighbor, 253 St. Anthony Street, is a 2-story Queen Anne style sidehall house on a raised pier foundation. The brick sidehall houses with wings at 250 and 254 St. Anthony are three and two stories, respectively. The subject property is of a much smaller scale than its neighbors, and it has a zero-lot-line setback that is not typical of the street. The demolition of the structure would therefore not result in the loss of a contributing structure.

Condition

According to the *Guidelines*, "demolition may be more appropriate when a building is deteriorated or in poor condition." The applicant has submitted a termite damage assessment and structural engineering report for the property. The structural engineer's report concludes as follows:

"Based on our inspection, it is CGL's opinion that significant structural repairs are necessary to the roof framing system and floor framing system for the existing structure to meet current wind loads. In addition, in order to rectify the noted issues, significant demolition and rebuild will be necessary to upgrade the existing structure."

Impact on the Street and District

The *Guidelines* further instruct that the impact of a structure's demolition on surrounding structures, including neighboring properties, properties on the same block or across the street, or properties throughout the individual historic district should be considered. The loss of this structure would in itself have little impact on the overall integrity of the district. However, demolition will create an additional vacant lot on this block of St. Anthony Street.

Nature of proposed development at the origination property

The *Guidelines* instruct that the future use of a cleared site should be considered. The applicant proposes creating a fenced and landscaped lawn that would provide space for occasional outdoor events. The proposed site improvements – which include decorative iron railings, brick planters, and landscaping with shade tree varieties – comply with the *Guidelines*.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

J. Watkins, property owner, was present to represent the application. He gave a summary of the project.

Gail Lea, resident of the DeTonti Square neighborhood, was present to speak in favor of demolition and creation of a green space.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Blackwell stated that he has been inside the building and seen that the interior has suffered extreme damage.

Mr. Stone asked if the proposed green space would be open to the public. Mr. Watkins replied that the green space will not always be open to the public but may be open for specific public events in the future.

Mr. Stone stated that he is against demolition.

Mr. Blackwell, Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor, and Ms. Roselius agreed that the building's state of disrepair is extensive and that a green space would be an appropriate use of the lot.

FINDING FACTS

Mr. Blackwell moved that the Board find facts as written by staff.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor seconded the motion, and all approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Blackwell moved that the application would not impair the architectural or historic character of the property or the district and should be granted a COA.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor seconded the motion.

The motion passed on a 4:1 vote, with Mr. Stone voting to deny.

Prior to the meeting being adjourned at 3:37 p.m., Bruce McGowin, attorney for the ARB, stated that he needed to call the Board into Executive Session to discuss pending litigation. Thereupon, the Chair moved that the Board go into Executive Session based upon Mr. McGowin's statement, which motion was duly seconded and passed unanimously. The Chair then stated that the Board would not reconvene following the Executive Session.