



Architectural Review Board Minutes

March 4, 2026 – 3:00 P.M.

ADMINISTRATIVE

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

1. Roll Call

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

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

Members Absent: Stephen McNair, Catarina Echols, Cartledge Blackwell, and Abby Davis

Staff Members Present: Annie Sawyer Allen, Meredith Wilson, Douglas McCoy, Kimberly Thomas, Hannon Falls, Matthew Sanford

2. Approval of Minutes from February 4, 2026

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor moved to approve the minutes from the February 4, 2026, meeting.

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

3. Approval of Mid-Month COAs granted by Staff

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

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

MID-MONTH APPROVALS

- 1. Applicant:** Sataya Acquisition Management Inc. d/b/a SAM Inc
Property Address: 853 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 01/26/2026
Project: Temporary cell on wheels (COW) for Verizon Wireless to be placed for Mardi Gras parades in downtown Mobile.
COW will be in parking lot at rear of property.
Temporary COA
- 2. Applicant:** Hargrove Engineers & Constructors
Property Address: 210 Government St
Date of Approval: 01/30/2026
Project:
 1. Remove existing metal mesh panels from the handrails on 134' of the balconies on the south facade.
-existing metal top and lower rails, support plates, and columns will remain.
 2. Install vertical metal bars between the existing top and lower rails.

-design to match the handrails on neighboring building, 206 Government Street.

- 3. Applicant:** Wells Builders Inc.
Property Address: 201 N Jackson Street
Date of Approval: 02/02/2026
Project:
-Repair railings, column wraps, and tongue-and-groove flooring that have wood rot on the south elevation of the second story.
-Column wraps and railing will be KDAT pine
-Balcony flooring will be 5/4 x 4" tongue and groove coumarou wood
-Paint new materials using Sherwin Williams paint to match existing
- 4. Applicant:** Ervin & Melissa Nordmann
Property Address: 100 Hannon Ave
Date of Approval: 02/02/2026
Project:
Replace siding in-kind where needed.
Replace rear non-original window on rear elevation with one-over-one wood window to fit existing window opening.
Repaint exterior to match existing.
Replace three rear windows on rear elevation (inside screen porch) with a pair of multi-light wood French doors to access rear screened porch.
- 5. Applicant:** Robert Dueitt Construction LLC
Property Address: 263 N Conception Street
Date of Approval: 01/06/2026
Project:
-Repair and replace in kind water damaged materials on the exterior around the north elevation entrance.
-Paint using Sherwin Williams paint to match existing.
- 6. Applicant:** Guy Brothers Roofing and Siding Inc
Property Address: 612 Dauphin St
Date of Approval: 02/02/26
Project:
-Remove existing non-original roof system.
-Install mechanically fastened, white 60 MIL TPO roof system. Paint exterior using Sherwin Williams products:
- 7. Applicant:** Mid-Western Commercial Properties Inc.
Property Address: 1050 Government St
Date of Approval: 02/02/26
Project:
-Remove existing roof system
-Reroof with a new Duro-Last Roof system.
- 8. Applicant:** Tough Shed Inc
Property Address: 310 S Monterey Street
Date of Approval: 02/02/26
Project:
-Install 16' W x 6' D prefabricated wooden shed clad in T1-11 side.

-Shed will be secured by augured ties on grade.
-Shed will be located west of existing residence and north of existing accessory structure.

9. Applicant: The City of Mobile
Property Address: 470 Dauphin St
Date of Approval: 02/05/26
Project: Emergency securing of structure:
Install 12 sheets of plywood to secure 16 x 20 storefront and front door on east corner of south façade

10. Applicant: The City of Mobile
Property Address: 661 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 02/05/26
Project: Emergency securing of structure:
Install two sheets of plywood to secure front entry doors along north façade.

11. Applicant: Specialty Repair and Remodeling
Property Address: 304 S Georgia Street
Date of Approval: 02/06/26
Project: Reroof with architectural shingles Color: Weathered Wood. Replacing existing asbestos shingled roof and tiled ridge.

12. Applicant: Lucy Bar Designs
Property Address: 1120 Palmetto Street
Date of Approval: 02/10/26
Project: Construct a small rear second-story addition (not visible from the street) which will use the existing footprint of existing second-story porch on north (rear) elevation.
- Addition will sit under the existing porch roof.
Exterior walls of addition will be clad in wood siding to match existing.
- Existing porch columns, caps, and bases will remain intact, maintaining the original rhythm of the three-bay porch along the rear elevation.
- Fenestration will be as follows:
North elevation- A two-over-two wood sash windows measuring 2'-6" W x 6'-0" H will be centered on both the east and west bays created by existing columns; one blind window with wood louvered shutters will be centered on the center bay.
East and west elevations- a pair of two-over-two wood sash windows measuring 2'-6" W x 6'-0" H will be centered on each elevation.

13. Applicant: Michael Cox
Property Address: 510 S. Jefferson Street
Date of Approval: 02/11/26

Project: Rebuild front porch to match existing.
 - Existing turned posts will be repaired in-kind with bases rebuilt to match existing.
 - Repair and/or replace railing in-kind
 - Repair and/or replace porch foundation piers to match existing (brick).
 Install wood or hardie framed lattice in-fill panels.
 -Install tongue-and-groove (mix of salvaged and new to match) decking
 Replace front door with metal or wood pane-and-panel door
 Rebuild rear exterior wall and cover it with wood lap siding to match existing.
 Replace rear door with paneled steel or wood door. Door to be in same location as original
 Repaint exterior to match existing

14. Applicant: Franchise Management Services Inc.
Property Address: 1564 Eslava Street
Date of Approval: 02/11/26
Project: Reroof in kind with CertainTeed Landmark shingles. Color: Charcoal

15. Applicant: Michelle Harbin
Property Address: 312 North Jackson Street
Date of Approval: 02/12/26
Project: Replace existing wood lattice foundation infill with cased trex lattice foundation infill to match existing pattern and color.

APPLICATIONS

1. 2026-14-CA

Address: 555 Government Street
Historic District: Church Street East
Applicant/Agent: Paul Davis/PCDA
Project: alterations to existing fenestration, construction of new galleries, and stucco veneered brick on the he existing lobby addition on north façade

APPROVED - **CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

2. 2026-15-CA

Address: 14 S Franklin Street
Historic District: Church Street East
Applicant/Agent: Ben Cummings/Cummings Architecture
Project: Replacement of existing brick veneer and windows

APPROVED - **CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

3. 2026-16-CA

Address: 1308 Old Shell Road/150 N. Ann Street
Historic District: Old Dauphin Way

Applicant/Agent Hunter Whidden
Project: Demolish two one-story commercial structures on shared lot
APPROVED - **CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

4. 2026-17-CA

Address: 108 Ryan Avenue
Historic District: Ashland Place
Applicant/Agent Ben Cummings/ Cummings Architecture
Project: Construct addition and covered porch
APPROVED - **CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

5. 2026-18-CA

Address: 920 Conti Street
Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Applicant/Agent Kevin Muscat
Project: After-the-fact front door replacement
APPROVED - **CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

6. 2026-19-CA

Address: 1557 Eslava Street
Historic District: Leinkauf
Applicant/Agent John Stephens
Project: After-the-fact alterations to footprint, exterior walls, and building footprint
APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS - **CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED**

OTHER BUSINESS

The next ARB meeting is scheduled for March 18, 2026.



Architectural Review Board
March 4, 2026

Agenda Item #1

Certified Record 2026-14-CA

DETAILS

Location:

555 Government Street

Summary of Request:

Alterations to existing fenestration, construction of new galleries, and stucco brick on the existing lobby addition on north facade

Applicant (as applicable):

Paul Davis/PCDA

Property Owner:

Varsha Patel

Historic District:

Church Street East

Classification:

Non-Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- Fenestration changes mainly concentrated along the north façade use approvable materials and seek to retain the character of the façade”
- Proposed new galleries along north façade do not disrupt the existing cornice line and reflect the style of existing railings along the inner court.
- This project has been reviewed by the CRC

Report Contents:

Property and Application History2
 Scope of Work.....3
 Applicable Standards.....4
 Staff Analysis.....6
 Attachments.....9

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 building at 555 Government street is a concrete-block commercial building faced with brick. The building is primarily a two-story U-shaped motor court hotel with a later one-story wing partially closing off the entrance to the central parking area. The building is typical of the mid-20th Century Colonial Revival style that grew out of increasing national feelings of nostalgia and patriotism during and immediately after World War II. The red facing brick, half-pedimented gable ends, classical entablature, and multi-lite sash and picture windows are highly indicative of the Colonial Revival style.

first appears in the 1941 City Directory as Terry Moore Apartments. Based on the numbering of the apartment units from 9 to 18, it appears that the complex was only partially completed at this time. On the 1955 Sanborn Map, it appears as a 35-unit motel called the Downtown Hotel Court. At the time, the property consisted of two two-story concrete-block buildings faced with brick. The buildings ran parallel to Cedar Street with a motor court between them. Each building featured a two-story gallery overlooking the central motor court. The single-story north and two-story wings did not exist at this time. Post cards dating to about 1958 and 1960 show a U-shaped structure with the iconic Colonial Revival north gable ends and the two-story south wing completed. Two construction dates are therefore appropriate: c. 1940 for the principal east and west wings, and c. 1958 for the south wing.

Survey photos indicate that the one-story north wing was constructed prior to 1979. Sometime between 1979 and 1993, the gable end entryways were infilled with brick and the picture windows on the eastern gable end were shortened. The picture windows at the western gable end are in their original configuration. In 2025, a commercial vehicle collided with the canopy over the vehicular entrance at the west end of the north wing. Significant structural damage resulted in the emergency removal of the canopy.

The building at 555 Government Street would not have met the 50-year benchmark required to mark it as contributing when the Church Street Historic District was first nominated in 1971, expanded in 1985, or updated in 2007. If the district were resurveyed today, the structure would meet the age requirement. As a largely intact example of mid-20th Century the Colonial Revival style, and one of Mobile's last surviving motor court hotels, it is staff's opinion that the structure would be considered contributing to the historic district today.

According to Historic Development Department Records, this property appeared before the Architectural Review Board once before on November 19, 2025, with an earlier iteration of this project.

SCOPE OF WORK

All Elevations:

1. Reroof with new gray architectural shingle roof.

Lobby/Sunroom:

1. Repair damaged brick parapet wall and wood entablature., wall and trim to be replicated around side and back.
2. Apply true stucco in sand color on the existing brick lobby addition.
3. North elevation will read as follows (from east to west): 3 sets of fixed/inoperable aluminum clad 8/8 French doors that will measure 4'0" W x 6'8" H with four-lite transoms that will measure 4'0" W x 1'0" H; 1 aluminum clad 8/8 French doors that will measure 4'0" W x 6'8" H that will have the left door fixed and the right door operable with a four-lite transom that will measure 4'0" W x 1'0" H
4. West elevation: 3 sets of fixed/inoperable aluminum clad 8/8 French doors that will measure 5'0" W x 6'8" H with five-lite transoms that will measure 5'0" W x 1'0" H.
5. South elevation will read as follows (from west to east): wood boxed column with base and capital that will measure 1'0" W x 8'6" H; aluminum clad single-lite picture window that will measure 2'0" W x 4'8" H with a two-lite aluminum clad transom above that will measure 2'0" W x 1'0" H and a 2'0" W x 1'8" H wood panel below; aluminum clad partial-lite French doors that will measure 6'0" W x 6'8" H with a six-lite aluminum clad transom above that will measure 6'0" W x 1'0" H; aluminum clad single-lite picture window that will measure 2'0" W x 4'8" H with a two-lite aluminum clad transom above that will measure 2'0" W x 1'0" H and a 2'0" W x 1'8" H wood panel below ; wood boxed column with base and capital that will measure 1'0" W x 8'6" H, aluminum transaction window that will measure 3'0" W x 4'0" H.

Gabled end blocks:

1. North facade:
 - a. First floor (from west to east): There will be no changes to fenestrations.
 - b. Second floor (from west to east): Two sets of operable aluminum-clad 8/8 French doors equally spaced across the elevation hat will measure 4'0" W x 6'8" H with four-lite transoms that will measure 4'0" W x 1'0" H. French door will be flanked by full length louvered shutters
2. Install a balcony on each gabled block at second floor level. Balconies will measure 20'4" W x 7'0"D.
 - a. A single 5" round metal column with articulated capital and base will support the gallery at either end.
 - b. Each balcony will feature composite decking sitting behind the cornice portion of existing entablature that would be extended forward to create balcony/gallery
 - c. Each balcony will have cast aluminum lace panel railings by "King Metals" using the "oak" design similar to existing pattern seen in the courtyard.
 - d. Install a retractable fabric privacy screen on each balcony.

West Elevation

1. Remove two existing windows from the north end of the west elevation. Remove existing faux door.
2. Infill resulting openings with brick.

APPLICABLE STANDARDS

- 5.1 Preserve the building's original placement and orientation.
 - Maintain the original orientation of a building to the street and neighborhood.
 - Maintain a property such that the historic setting of a building remains intact.
 - Retain the pattern of front setbacks and building spacing that reflect those of adjacent historic structures.
 - Design alterations so that the resulting building placement does not alter these established patterns.
- 5.3 Preserve the key historic walls of a building.
 - Maintain significant historic facades in their original form.
 - Maintain historic façade elements.
 - Pay special attention to maintaining the historic appearance of building walls of corner buildings.
- 5.5 Preserve and restore the visibility of original historic materials.
 - Do not cover or obscure original building materials.
- 5.14 Preserve the decorative and functional features of a primary door.
 - Original doors and openings, including their dimensions, should be retained along with any moldings, transoms or sidelights.
 - Maintain the original position and proportions of a historically significant door.
- 5.15 Repair or replace a damaged historic door to maintain its general historic appearance.
 - Replacements should reflect the age and style of the building.
 - Use materials that are visually comparable to that of the original.
 - Do not use solid core or flush doors.
- 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.
- 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.
- 7.1 Preserve the key character-defining features of a historic commercial façade
- 7.7 Preserve and repair original materials on a historic commercial building whenever possible.
 - Do not paint over exposed brick.

- Strive to preserve materials on the sides and rear of a historic commercial building where possible.
- Brick is the most common façade material, but in some cases stucco has been applied to an original brick façade.
- If brick repair is required, match the mortar color, consistency and strike to the original as closely as possible.
- 7.8 If replacement of some material is required, use a material that is similar to that of the original.
 - Use replacement mortar that is as soft as or softer than the original. Type O mortar is required for historic soft brick.
 - Use true stucco instead of an imitation material.
 - Do not use a rustic finish on masonry that will simulate aged masonry.
- 7.10 Preserve and repair doors and doorways of a historic commercial building.
 - Preserve historic doorways in their original location and configuration.
 - Retain original recessed entries and other key features defining a historic entrance.
 - Maintain an original doorway to emphasize the commercial entrance.
- 7.11 If necessary, replace a door in a fashion that is sensitive to the historic commercial character of the building.
 - Use doors with high proportions of transparent glass.
 - If a modern doorway is created, use metal with anodized or painted finish or varnished or painted wood.
 - If a doorway was originally recessed, use a recessed doorway for the replacement.
 - Consider using a transom in a replacement storefront where appropriate.
 - Design a replacement doorway to emphasize the commercial entrance.
 - Do not use a residential door for a commercial building.
- 7.14 Where replacement of a balcony or gallery is required, replace it in a fashion that preserves the key character-defining features of a historic building.
 - Replace a historic balcony or gallery where documentation exists of its previous existence.
 - Design a replacement balcony or gallery to reflect the design of the original building. The ARB will consider modern balconies.
- 7.18 Preserve and repair an original detail or ornamentation on a historic commercial building.
 - Maintain the original space patterns and location of windows. Most display windows have a bulkhead below and a transom above.
 - Preserve the size and shape of an upper story window.
 - Consider maintaining a Carrara glass or glass block storefront if it has attained historic significance as an alteration.
- 7.19 If required, replace original historic windows to be compatible with the windows on the original historic building.
 - Use large panes of glass that fit the original opening for a display window. Where a display window is no longer required, the ARB will consider an alternative design.

- Do not use opaque treatments for a window, including black plexiglass. Do not paint a window.
- Do not use reflective mirror glass for a window.
- Unless evidence exists from existing buildings or historic photographs, do not use a multi-pane design that divides the storefront window into smaller components.
- Use a tempered glass window if required by the building code.
- Reopen an upper story window if it is blocked.
- If reopening an upper story window is not feasible, use a fixed shutter to define the original proportion of the window opening.

STAFF ANALYSIS 03/04/2026

The application proposes significant changes to the one-story lobby north wing addition that was constructed sometime between 1979 and 1993. This will include applying stucco to the wing and removing all existing windows and doors and replacing them with aluminum-clad French doors, transoms, and windows which will imitate the wood existing panel design consistent on the façade.. Additionally, the application includes installing two balconies/galleries on the north façade of each gabled block. The balconies would feature cast aluminum lace panel railings by “King Metals” using the “oak” design similar to existing pattern seen in the courtyard. Two window openings and a doorway on the west elevation will be removed and infilled with brick.

The first of the *Design Guidelines* instruct that the primary goal of any building treatment should be to “maintain the original orientation of a building to the street and neighborhood.” The application proposes removing the one remaining door on the north facade of the one-story wing as well as framing around the infilled entryways on the two gabled blocks. The remaining door would be replaced with 4 aluminum-clad French doors, 3 of which are inoperable. The French door on the west end of the lobby wing would have the left door fixed and the right door operable, allowing access to Government Street (7.31). Moreover, the *Guidelines* dictate that the “the decorative and functional features of a primary door” should be preserved. There will be 4 French doors on the north façade and from the plans submitted there is no indication which door is the primary door. It should be noted that the primary doors on the gabled blocks have not been present for a significant amount of time.

The *Guidelines* allow for adding galleries and balconies to existing buildings as long as they reflect the design of the original building and retain visibility of the cornice from the public right-of-way (7.14, 7.15) The proposed galleries would retain visibility of the cornice and would replicate the existing entablature to maintain the original appearance across the north façade of the gabled blocks. The simple design of the proposed gallery columns is traditional enough to blend with the Colonial Revival details of the property. The proposed balcony railings would imitate the decorative iron galleries that overlook the central motor court.

The *Guidelines* state that original windows should be preserved and restored where possible. If replacement is necessary, the replacement windows should match the historic fenestration in location,

framing, and light configuration (5.20, 5.21). The application proposes removing all existing windows on the lobby wing and the second floor of the gabled block's north façade. The proposed French doors would imitate the existing wood paneling design on the first-floor windows of the north façade. The application also proposes removing two original windows from the west elevation and infilling the openings with brick. This minor alteration would be less disruptive to the image of the building, as it is located on a secondary elevation. However, this portion of the west elevation is still easily visible from Government Street.

The application of true stucco on the lobby wing addition that was constructed sometime between 1979 and 1993 would be appropriate with the *Guidelines* and would be reflective of some of the surrounding historic buildings (7.8). This existing addition sustained significant damage to the parapet wall which would require brick replacement and repair.

STAFF ANALYSIS 11/19/25

The application seeks to make significant changes to the fenestration of the north wing and gable ends. This will include removing all existing windows and doors and replacing them with aluminum and glass doors and storefront windows. Two metal galleries would be constructed across the two north gable ends. The project would also involve removal of the brick parapet over the one-story north wing to create a rooftop deck. Both the galleries and the rooftop deck would feature horizontal wire railings. Two window openings and doorway on the west elevation will be removed and infilled with brick. The application also proposes painting all exterior brick white.

The first of the Design Guidelines instruct that the primary goal of any building treatment should be to "maintain the original orientation of a building to the street and neighborhood." The application proposes removing the one remaining door on the north facade of the one-story wing as well as framing around the infilled entryways on the two gable ends. This would remove any suggestion of a primary façade entryway, essentially altering how the building interacts with the public right-of-way along Government Street. Moreover, the Guidelines dictate that the "the decorative and functional features of a primary door" should be preserved. Even in new commercial construction in the historic districts, the Guidelines require that primary building entries be oriented toward the public street (7.31). The proposed removal of all existing primary entryways on the primary façade with no provision for new entryways does not comply with these directives.

The Guidelines state that original windows should be preserved and restored where possible. If replacement is necessary, the replacement windows should match the historic fenestration in location, framing, and light configuration (5.20, 5.21). The application proposes removing all existing windows from the principal façade and replacing them with aluminum-and-glass storefronts that are significantly larger than the existing windows. The proposed plate-glass windows would lack the characteristic moldings of the original and would be at odds with the Colonial Revival moldings and entablature that would be retained elsewhere on the building. The application also proposes removing two original windows from the west elevation and infilling the openings with brick. This comparatively minor alteration would be less disruptive to the character of the building, as it is located on a secondary elevation. However, this portion of the west elevation is still easily visible from Government Street.

The *Guidelines* allow for adding galleries and balconies to existing buildings as long as they reflect the design of the original building and retain visibility of the cornice from the public right-of-way (7.14, 7.15). While the proposed galleries would retain visibility of the cornice, they would require removing the molded entablature over first-floor windows on the north gable ends. The simple design of the proposed gallery columns is traditional enough to blend with the Colonial Revival details of the property. The contemporary horizontal balcony railings would be a stylistic departure from the building as a whole and specifically the decorative iron galleries that overlook the central motor court.

The *Guidelines* dictate that key character-defining features of historic commercial facades should be preserved and that original materials should be preserved and repaired whenever possible (7.1, 7.7). Specifically, the Guidelines state “do not paint over exposed brick”. The proposed project includes painting all exterior brick white, which would not be compliant with this directive. Moreover, painting the red facing brick would remove a significant character defining feature of the mid-20th Century Colonial Revival style. Moreover, since the structure is of load-bearing concrete block constructed in the 1940s, it cannot be assumed that there is a vertical wall cavity between the facing brick and the masonry behind. If the entire wall is through-body masonry, any moisture that enters the wall system will need to evaporate through the face of the brick. If painting is allowed, it is recommended that the applicant uses an appropriate vapor permeable paint or stain to prevent moisture being trapped in the wall, which could cause significant material damage over time.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Paul Davis, architect, presented the project to the Board.

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Karrie Maurin asked about the French doors that are facing Government Street and whether they will be functional.

Mr. Davis replied that the door closest to the western corner of the lobby would be operable.

Ms. Maurin asked how the door would be identified as operable.

Mr. Davis replied that signs have been considered but have not been finalized yet.

Ms. Jennifer Roselius asked about the panels underneath the windows on the western portion of the north façade and whether consideration was given to remove them to match the eastern portion.

Mr. Davis responded that removal of the panels could be considered depending on the condition of the windows and privacy concerns.

Mr. Stephen Howle said that he participated in the Design Review Committee and that he appreciated the notes taken by the applicant and the changes applied to the project.

FINDING FACTS

Ms. Barja Wilson moved to find the facts as written

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Ms. Cameron Pfeiffer Traylor moved that based upon the facts found by the Board the application does not impair the historic integrity of the property or the district and that a COA should be issued.

Ms. Wilson seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously.



Agenda Item #2

Certified Record 2025-15-CA

DETAILS

Location:

14 S. Franklin Street

Summary of Request:

Remove and replace exterior brick veneer and all windows

Applicant (as applicable):

Ben Cummings/Cummings Architecture

Property Owner:

Archdiocese of Mobile

Historic District:

Church Street East

Classification:

Non-contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The exterior veneer and windows have deteriorated due to structural deficiencies
- The proposed replacement brick is a slight departure in texture from the existing glazed brick
- Proposed replacement windows will match existing in size, material, and profile. The color will be a darker bronze finish.
- All proposed materials comply with the *Guidelines* for use in Mobile’s historic districts
- This project has been reviewed by the CRC

Report Contents:

Property and Application History 2

Scope of Work 2

Applicable Standards 2

Staff Analysis 2

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 three-story brick commercial building at 14 S. Franklin Street was constructed c. 1970. The building expresses the minimalist design and rectilinear form consistent with the International Style, which became popular in the 20th century. Sanborn Insurance maps from 1885 show two one-story frame dwellings with full-width front porches sitting on the current parcel. The larger of the two faced Franklin Street, with the smaller sitting to the west, facing Conti Street. These houses were still extant at the time of the 1891 Sanborn survey. By the time of the 1904 overlay however, they had been replaced by two two-story frame dwellings fronting Franklin Street. These two dwellings matched in form with full-width front porches, a bay window on the south side of the east façade, and rear projecting wings. These matching homes were extant through the 1955 Sanborn overlay. According to aerial photographs, they were deleted by 1960.

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

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Remove existing glazed brick veneer and replace with modular brick.
Replacement brick will be Henry Brick "Avondale".
2. Remove all existing aluminum storefront windows and replace with aluminum storefront to match existing.
Replacement windows will fit existing openings.

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

1. **5.6** Use original materials to replace damaged materials on primary surfaces where possible.
 - Use original materials to replace damaged building materials on a primary façade if possible. If the original material is wood clapboard, for example, then the replacement material should be a material that matches the original in finish, size and the amount of exposed lap. If the original material is not available from the site, use a replacement material that is visually comparable with the original material.
 - Replace only the amount of material required. If a few boards are damaged beyond repair, for example, then only they should be replaced, rather than the entire wall.
 - Do not replace building materials on the primary façade, such as wood siding and masonry, with alternative or imitation materials unless it cannot be avoided.
 - Wholesale replacement of exterior finishes is generally not allowed.
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.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The subject property is a non-contributing structure in the Church Street East Historic District. The application under review involves the removal of the existing brick veneer which has deteriorated significantly due to structural deficiencies. The application also includes the replacement of all aluminum storefront windows (also deteriorated) with replacement windows which would match the existing size, material, and profile. The replacement window color would be a darker bronze, in contrast to the existing lighter beige color.

The *Guidelines* call for use of an original material as replacement on a primary façade. They further stipulate that wholesale replacement of exterior finishes is “generally not allowed” (5.6). The original material used on the exterior walls of all four elevations of the subject structure is a glazed brick of a light beige, almost white, color with a darker mortar. The proposed replacement brick would be an “Avondale” modular brick in a white finish, and light mortar. The more rusticated finish of the replacement brick (as compared to the existing smooth glazed brick), along with the lighter mortar color would create a slight dissimilar effect along exterior walls. The applicant has attempted to mitigate this visual difference with the use of a light-colored brick with light mortar. Then, the proposed darker color replacement windows would contribute a visible contrast that echoes that of the current walls created by the light brick and darker mortar joints. The total effect attempts to minimize the change in appearance with the slight variation in material.

The applicant’s original intent was to replace the brick veneer with an exact match. Research for an exact product revealed that the cost of a glazed brick replacement renders the much-needed repair unviable. Additionally, the condition of the existing brick veneer and the windows along the elevations appears to be in a state beyond partial replacement. The proposed scope of work is the result of an attempt to minimally disrupt the stylistic expression of the structure. There are examples in the near vicinity of 20th century buildings which convey features of the International and Modern style which feature more textured masonry walls. Examples include 918 Government Street, 1557 Spring Hill Avenue, along with earlier examples such as the Mobile Seaman’s Club Building (1949) and the more high-style Waterman Building (1947).

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Ben Cummings, architect, presented the project to the Board.

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Karrie Maurin expressed concerns about the brick selection and asked the applicant why an in-kind replacement of glazed brick was not proposed in the application.

Mr. Cummings responded that glazed brick was priced, however exceeded the budget for the project.

Ms. Maurin suggested possibly selecting a smoother brick to more closely match the texture of the existing brick.

Mr. Cummings replied that wire cut bricks were considered, however the color of the wire-cut brick options were more brown in tone than the Avondale brick that was selected.

Ms. Maurin asked if concrete or cement bricks were considered.

Mr. Cummings answered that the only concrete brick he was aware of was CMU blocks that would be too large.

Ms. Maurin replied that she was having trouble with the finish changes to structure.

Mr. Cummings said that in addition to price, a softer brick was chosen to be more in keeping with the older structures adjacent to the subject building.

Ms. Jennifer Roselius stated that the Board prefers to replace like with like, however it appeared that the applicant appears to have done their due diligence and that the difference between the existing glazed brick and the selected brick would not be visible on the building to the general public.

Ms. Maurin asked the applicant if t painting the brick could be considered as a cost-effective way to produce a smoother texture.

Mr. Cummings responded that he felt uncomfortable with painting brick, which creates a maintenance issue for the owner of the property.

Ms. Maurin replied that she was likely not to vote in favor of the application as it is currently.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor asked the applicant to explain further the deteriorated condition of the structure.

Mr. Cummings explained that there are two non-galvanized steel shelf angles that act as structural support which show extensive rust over 60 years of exposure to the elements.

Ms. Maurin asked if there were any changes proposed for the base of the building.

Mr. Cummings replied that the focus is on the brick and the windows above but that the ribbon windows on the first floor will be replaced in-kind.

Mr. Stephen Howle agreed with Ms. Roselius that the applicant did a decent job exploring replacement brick options. He encouraged the applicant to explore smoother brick options or paint the brick.

FINDING FACTS

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor moved that based upon the evidence presented in the application, staff report, and during the public hearing to find the facts as stated in the staff report to also note the deterioration of the structure.

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Ms. Pfeiffer Traylor moved that based upon the facts found by the Board the application does not impair the historic integrity of the property or the district and that a COA be issued.

Mr. Howle seconded the motion. The motion passed on a 4-1 vote.



Agenda Item #3

Certified Record 2026-16-CA

DETAILS

Location:

1308 Old Shell Road and 107 N Ann Street

Summary of Request:

Demolish two commercial buildings on a shared lot

Applicant (as applicable):

Hunter Whidden

Property Owner:

Same

Historic District:

Old Dauphin Way

Classification:

Non-Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The subject commercial buildings do not appear to be in a state of advanced deterioration
- A conceptual plan for the subdivision and development of the parcel has been submitted

Report Contents:

Property and Application History..... 2
 Scope of Work..... 2
 Applicable Standards 2
 Staff Analysis 2
 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 two one-story c. 1970 contemporary commercial structures at 1308 Old Shell Road and 107 N Ann Street sit on a shared lot. Both are slab on grade wood frame structures with brick veneer. They display flat roofs, plate glass windows set in aluminum, and modern doors with stoop entrances. The 1956 Sanborn map shows that the parcel is vacant and was separate lots. The 1925 Sanborn Map shows that the location of 1308 Old Shell Road did have a one-story single-family residence but the location of 107 N Ann Street was vacant. and are considered non-contributing to the local historic district.

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

SCOPE OF WORK

Demolish two historic commercial buildings.

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

1. 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.
2. 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)
3. The physical condition of the historic structure should be considered when determining whether or not a structure may be demolished.
 - Consider the condition of the structure in question. Demolition may be more appropriate when a building is deteriorated or in poor condition.
4. Nature of Proposed Development
 - Consider the future utilization of the site. (12.0)

STAFF ANALYSIS

The significance of the structures

The two commercial buildings on 1308 Old Shell and 107 N Ann Street are listed as non-contributing properties in the Old Dauphin Way Historical District. They have recently become historic by age as they were constructed circa 1970; however, the age of the buildings sits outside of the period of significance for the Old Dauphin Way District which is from 1827 to 1941.

Impact on the Street and District

The *Guidelines* state to, “consider the impact of removing the historic structure relative to its context.” The case for these two commercial buildings is that they are unique to the context they are in. As infill structures, they do not stylistically conform to the surrounding buildings, which are largely craftsman and revival single-family residences. Regardless, their removal will create a large vacancy along Old Shell Road at the west end of the block

between Bush Avenue and N. Ann Street, and again along N. Ann at the south end of the block between Spring Hill Avenue and Old Shell Road.

Additionally, the *Guidelines* say to, “consider whether the building is part of an ensemble of historic buildings that create a neighborhood.” The buildings at 1308 Old Shell Road and 107 N Ann Street are at odds with the rhythm of the surrounding homes, largely due to the flat roof and more contemporary large plate glass windows on the façade. The placement of the structures on the combined parcel and the large parking lot that connects the two structures also creates a visible departure from the placement of structures on the surrounding lots.

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 applicant has conveyed that the two buildings have presented a nuisance to the surrounding neighborhood and has received a letter of support from the Old Dauphin Way Association recognizing that the structures are non-contributing to the district and present a blight to the surrounding properties.

Condition of the Structures

The *Guidelines* provide that the condition of the structures should be taken into account when considering demolition. The two commercial buildings do display signs of disrepair; however, they do not currently appear to be in a severely deteriorated state.

Nature of proposed development at the origination property

The *Guidelines* instruct that the future use of a cleared site should be considered. A three-stage plan has been discussed to include: the demolition of the two subject structures; maintenance of grounds; redevelopment to include the subdivision of the subject parcel into 10 lots and the subsequent construction of multiple single-family residences. The conceptual plan includes design inspiration photos that show two-story single-family residences that have hipped roofs with dentil molding and appear to be more suited for the De Tonti Historic District. However, a home similar in massing to what was proposed can be seen at 1310 Old Shell Road. The gable roof and more Victorian detailing that is featured on the neighboring structure would appear more appropriate to the district.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Evan Burdette, owner of the property, presented the project to the Board.

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Jennifer Roselius asked about the projected timeline for redevelopment.

Mr. Burdette responded that the plan is for builders to start construction by the end of 2026.

Ms. Karrie Maurin asked if the applicant has a set of plans for redevelopment or will each future builder submit applications independently.

Mr. Burdette answered that each builder would come before the Board to present their individual redevelopment plans.

Ms. Cameron Pfeiffer-Traylor asked if the intention of the applicant is for the current parcel to be divided into 10 lots.

Mr. Burdette replied that 10 lots would be the hope, but that would be dependent on the planning commission.

Ms. Maurin asked if the proposed lots are comparable to the surrounding lots within the district.

Mr. Burdette responded that the proposed lots are close to the size of the surrounding existing lots and would have rear parking. He added that the lot sizes would be similar to developments on Marine Street.

Ms. Roselius stated that the subject application was difficult for the Board. The *Guidelines* state that demolition COA's are typically not approved without a redevelopment plan included. She continued to say that she is inclined to allow the application to go forward because of the safety concerns, the condition of the subject buildings, and that the buildings date of construction are outside of the period of significance for the district.

Ms. Cameron Pfeiffer-Traylor agreed with Ms. Roselius and said that this was not a situation where demolition would break up an ensemble of historic buildings. She stated that she had concerns about post-demolition redevelopment plans and wanted to clarify that the subject application did not include subdividing the parcel into 10 lots.

Ms. Roselius asked staff to clarify that the subject application was only for the demolition of the structures.

Ms. Annie Sawyer Allen clarified that yes, the application only included approving the demolition of the subject structures.

Mr. Stephen Howle asked if the Board has oversight on subdividing lots or if it is the planning commission.

Ms. Allen clarified that it would be the planning commission.

Mr. Howle encouraged the applicant to come back before the board to present a cohesive plan of redevelopment to help both prospective builders and buyers.

FINDING FACTS

Ms. Wilson moved to find the facts as written

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Karrie Maurin made the motion that the approval of the demolition of these two structures on the property does not impair the district noting the comments made by the board to justify the demolition of the structures and that the Demolition COA should be issued.

Mr. Stephen Howle seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously.



Architectural Review Board
March 4, 2026

Agenda Item # 4

Certified Record 2026-17-CA

DETAILS

Location:

108 Ryan Avenue

Summary of Request:

- Construct addition on southeast corner of home.
- Construct covered porch on east elevation.
- Roof for addition and covered porch will have a hipped roof.

Applicant (as applicable):

Ben Cummings

Property Owner:

Richard and Carolyn Jeffers

Historic District:

Ashland Place

Classification:

Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The proposed addition is in conformance with the *Guidelines'* standards for compatibility in placement, massing, scale, and materials.
- The light configuration of new windows differs from the existing.

Report Contents:

Property and Application History2
 Scope of Work.....2
 Applicable Standards.....3
 Staff Analysis.....6
 Attachments.....7

PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

Ashland Place Historic District was listed in the National Register in 1987 under Criteria A (community planning) and C (architectural significance). The neighborhood initially was platted in 1907 and centered around land once occupied by the Augusta Evans Wilson homestead. The neighborhood was an early streetcar suburb along the Springhill Avenue trolley line. The district is significant for its concentration of architectural types and styles popular between 1900 and 1955, including Georgian and Federal Revivals, Colonial and Classical Revivals, Craftsman, Mission Revival, and Tudor Revival.

The property at 108 Ryan Avenue is a circa 1928 two-story home that expresses Spanish Revival influences. These influences are seen in the low-pitch hipped roof, the arched entry on the west façade, the stucco wall surface, and the arches above the 1st floor balconies on the west façade. The home first appears on the updated 1956 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map and shows that the massing has changed little since then.

According to Historic Development Department Records, this property has not appeared before the Architectural Review Board.

SCOPE OF WORK

Construct addition on southeast corner of home measuring 12'0" W x 20'1" D.

1. Two windows located on the east elevation will be removed to accommodate the kitchen addition.
2. Finished floor height will match existing.
3. Addition will be clad in a painted brick veneer
4. South elevation of addition will read as follows (from west to east): Two consistently spaced 1'8" W x 4'4" H aluminum-clad one-over-one double hung windows; below the windows just above grade there will be three evenly spaced foundation vents.
5. East elevation of addition will read as follows (from south to north): 2'8" W x 4'4" H aluminum-clad casement window.

Construct covered porch on east elevation that measuring 25'4" W x 12'8" D.

1. Remove existing utility room, patio, and stairs on east elevation.
2. Finished floor height to match existing.
 - a. Flooring will be quarry tile with concrete border
3. Foundation infill will be true stucco finish over CMU.
4. Porch will be supported by 4 wood columns on east side and 2 wood pilasters on west side.
 - a. Columns and pilasters will match the columns on the existing sunroom.
 - b. Copper insect screening on wood framing will infill between the columns.
 - c. A wood paneled door with insect screen measuring 2'4" W x 7'0" H will be located on the south elevation of screened-in porch.
 - d. A pair of wood paneled doors with insect screen measuring 4'8" W x 7'0" H located on the east elevation of screened-in porch.
5. The covered porch will be accessed by a set of brick steps measuring 7'4" W, which will be centered on the east elevation. The steps will be flanked by metal handrails.
6. An uncovered grilling porch measuring 6'0" W x 7'4" D will be constructed on the south side of the covered porch. The grilling porch will be accessed by a set of 3 brick steps measuring 3'8" W with adjacent single metal handrail.

Fenestration changes to existing east elevation.

East elevation of existing house (east end wall) will read as follows (from south to north): 4'0" W x 7'0" H pair of stile and rail wood 12 x 12 true-divided-lite doors; 2'8" W x 4'4" H aluminum clad casement window.

Roofing for addition and covered porch

Addition and covered porch will have a hipped TPO membrane roof with a 12/2 pitch and exposed rafter tails to match existing sunroom.

Site improvements

Install new concrete patio measuring 22'0" W x 15'0" D will be located adjacent to the new covered porch.

APPLICABLE STANDARDS

- 5.16 Use a screen door that is visually compatible with the period and style of the building.
 - Use wood screen doors that are backed with screening.
 - Metal storm or metal screen doors should have an appearance similar to painted wood (not unfinished metal).
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 6.14 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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
- 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

STAFF ANALYSIS

The subject property is a contributing structure to the Ashland Place Historic District. The application under review includes constructing an addition that will measure 12'0" W x 20'1" D on the southeast corner of the existing residence, behind the existing sunroom; a covered porch on the east elevation that will measure 25'4" W x 12'8" D, and the installation of a small grilling porch and larger concrete patio.

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. The proposed addition sits behind the existing sunroom and to the side of the main massing of the residence. Additionally, the size of the addition would be subordinate to the existing structure and would echo some design elements seen on the main dwelling. The addition would retain the rhythm of the existing structure, while also differentiating new construction from the historic structure. This continued rhythm is seen with the continuation of exposed rafter tails along the roof line extending from the sunroom to the addition. (6.9–6.11). The *Guidelines* state to, "use a material with a similar appearance in profile texture and composition to those on the original building" (6.13). The use of the brick veneer clearly differentiates the addition from the existing while maintaining the masonry appearance established by the use of stucco on the existing residence (6.12).

The *Guidelines* say to design the roof of an addition to be compatible with the existing historic building and subordinate to the historic building in the historic district (6.12-6.15). The low pitch hipped roof that will extend from portions of the existing residence over the covered porch and addition would be in compliance.

The use of brick veneer extending to grade would imitate the existing structure as called for in the *Guidelines* (6.19). Additionally, the replication of columns from the existing sunroom for use on the covered porch would incorporate details similar in character to those on the historic structure (6.20). The aluminum-clad windows proposed are an approvable material for use in historic districts (6.21); however, they differ in light configuration from the six-over-one or three-over-one windows seen throughout the rest of the home.

The proposed covered porch would be on the rear elevation, situated behind the existing residence (6.42). The porch would feature stucco finish over CMU that would serve as the foundation infill, this would also match the applique of the existing structure (6.43).

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Ben Cummings, architect, presented the project to the Board.

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Karrie Maurin asked if the bricks on the addition will be painted.

Mr. Cummings replied yes, the brick would be painted.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor asked about the proposed windows on the addition that differ from the lite design of the windows on the existing residence.

Mr. Cummings explained that the windows on the addition were chosen because of the interior space, but the applicant and homeowner are flexible to change the proposed one-over-one windows to four-over-one windows.

Ms. Jennifer Roselius asked about the windows in the existing sunroom.

Mr. Cummings replied that the windows on the sunroom are single-pane fixed glass.

Ms. Roselius responded that she did not have a problem with the proposed new windows as the lite design is sympathetic to the windows on the existing sunroom.

FINDING FACTS

Mr. Stephen Howle moved to find the facts as written

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Ms. Barja Wilson moved that based upon the facts found by the Board the application does not impair the historic integrity of the property or the district and that a COA should be issued.

Ms. Maurin seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously.



Agenda Item #5

Certified Record 2026-18-CA

DETAILS

Location:

920 Conti Street

Summary of Request:

After-the-fact replacement of existing wood front entry door with new wood entry door

Applicant (as applicable):

Kevin Muscat

Property Owner:

Kevin Muscat

Historic District:

Old Dauphin Way Historic District

Classification:

Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- An historic door was removed and the existing opening altered to accommodate a shorter replacement door. The *Design Guidelines* state that a replacement door should fit the original opening.
- The light and panel configuration of the replacement door are not entirely consistent with the period and style of the subject property.
- The replacement door is of an approvable material, and the applicant has taken efforts to ensure the alteration to the historic door surround is reversible.

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 Criteria A for community planning and C for significant architecture. 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.”

Based on historic tax records, the one-story, wood-frame cottage at 920 Conti Street was constructed in 1903. The 1904, 1925, and 1956 Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps show the cottage as it existed as late as June 2024. Since then, the current owner has constructed a rear porch addition. The main block of the house remains largely unchanged.

This property has appeared twice before the Architectural Review Board (ARB). In August 2023, the ARB denied an application to relocate 920 Conti and the neighboring residence at 918 Conti to a vacant lot on Hickory Street. The current owner acquired the property in June 2024 and received multiple staff-level approvals for exterior stabilization and repairs. In September 2024, the ARB approved an application to construct a rear porch addition.

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Remove and replace a wood exterior entry door with a new wood entry door that does not fit the opening.
 - a. The wood replacement door features 3 glass lights over 2 recessed panels.
 - b. The wood door will be stained and sealed.
2. Alter the existing door surround to accommodate a shorter replacement door.
 - a. A plain board measuring has been installed over the existing decorative wood lintel to lower the door opening height to meet the replacement door.
3. The replacement door would be finished with stain if allowed to remain.

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

1. **5.14** Preserve the decorative and functional features of a primary door.
 - Original doors and openings, including their dimensions, should be retained along with any moldings, transoms or sidelights.
 - Maintain the original position and proportions of a historically significant door.
2. **5.15** Repair or replace a damaged historic door to maintain its general historic appearance.
 - Replacements should reflect the age and style of the building.
 - Use materials that are visually comparable to that of the original.
 - Do not use solid core or flush doors.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application seeks after-the-fact approval of the removal and replacement of a non-original wood paneled door with a new wood paneled door.

The *Design Review Guidelines* require property owners retain and preserve any original doors and openings, including any “moldings, transoms or sidelights.” If an original door is missing or damaged beyond the possibility of repair, the *Guidelines* advise that a replacement door should reflect the age and style of the subject property and use materials that are “visually comparable” to the original. The *Guidelines* stress that any replacement of an original door should maintain the “original position and proportions of a historically significant door.”

The historic paneled wood door with three lights over three horizontal panels was highly typical of the period from 1900 to 1910. Unless there is photographic evidence of a different front door at this property, it is appropriate to assume that the door was original to the property. According to the *Design Guidelines*, replacement of an original door is inappropriate unless the door has deteriorated beyond the point of repair. It is difficult to ascertain from available photos if the door had or had not deteriorated to this point.

If an original door has deteriorated to the point that repair is impossible, the *Guidelines* require that a replacement door reflect the age and style of the subject property. Paneled wood doors with glass lights were common in the period between 1900 and 1910. However, the specific configuration of the replacement door – a two-over-two light above a single rectangular panel – would have been atypical when the house was constructed in 1903. At that time, the most common lighted door configurations featured one large light or two paired lights over a variety of wood panel configurations. Doors with two-over-two lights set above two or three wood panels were commercially available, but they are rarely depicted as front entry doors in the house design books of the period. This door type was uncommon and primarily used for accessory structures, such as ice houses. Staff were able to find one house design catalogue from 1900 that shows a front entry door with a two-over-two light. Instead of a single wood panel, the light is set above three horizontal panels, similar to the configuration of the door removed from the subject property.

The head height of the existing opening has been lowered to accommodate the replacement door, which is shorter than the door that was removed. In discussions with staff, the property owner stated that the existing opening was so out of plumb that it would not be possible to install a new door that was both plumb and large enough to fit the opening. To fit the new smaller door within the opening, the owner installed a flat trim board over the decorative carved lintel. This brought down the head height without requiring removal of the original lintel. In other words, the decorative lintel remains *in situ* and could be restored at a later date.

If allowed to remain, the replacement door would be finished with stain.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Kevin Muscat, owner, presented the project to the Board.

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Karrie Maurin stated her approval of the chosen door as it matches the muntins of the existing windows.

Ms. Cameron Pfeiffer-Traylor stated her concern about the visual impact of the selected door. She continued that the selected door has some echoes of historic doors but that the size of the door jam above and the amount of light changes the front door entrance. She asked the applicant if there was consideration to change the visual impact of the jam.

Mr. Muscat replied that the door was selected to imitate the existing windows as closely as possible. He continued that in order to minimize anything above the door, the existing jam would have to be torn out.

Ms. Maurin asked if the applicant would consider adding the address numbers of the residence on the jam.

Ms. Jennifer Roselius stated that she thought it was great that the applicant kept as much of the original door frame as possible and that the modification made is removable. She then asked if the door has been stained.

Mr. Muskat replied that the door had not been stained yet but will be stained a color similar to the previous door.

Ms. Roselius replied that the stain will help mitigate the visual impact and acknowledged that the change in doors related to safety as the previous door was a hollow interior door. She then recommended the applicant consider some of the minor interventions recommended by the Board.

Mr. Stephen Howle agreed with Ms. Roselius.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Maurin said that the minor changes suggested by the Board could be approved by Staff.

FINDING FACTS

Ms. Maurin moved to find the facts as written.

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Ms. Maurin moved that the improvements that have been done do not impair the district and a COA should be granted and the applicant should consider some the recommendations made by the Board.

Ms. Barja Wilson seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously.



Agenda Item #6

Certified Record 2026-19-CA

DETAILS

Location:

1557 Eslava Street

Summary of Request:

After-the-fact alterations to footprint, exterior walls, and building footprint

Applicant (as applicable):

John Stephens

Property Owner:

same

Historic District:

Leinkauf

Classification:

Non-Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The condition of the original windows (now removed) is unknown, as the work was performed without an issued COA or building permit.
- The window material (vinyl) does not conform to the *Guidelines*.
- The removal of the siding on the W, S, and E elevations was done without a COA and is counter to the *Guidelines*.

Report Contents:

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

PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

Leinkauf Historic District was initially listed in the National Register in 1987 under Criteria A and C for significant architecture and community planning; the district was expanded in 2009. The neighborhood was settled in the early 20th century as a streetcar suburb adjacent to Government Street and surrounding Leinkauf School (1904). Housing forms and styles in the district reflect the range of styles and forms popular from 1900 through 1955.

The property at 1557 Eslava Street is a non-contributing duplex that was constructed around 1924 and first appears on the Sanborn Fire Insurance Map in 1925. This original iteration was a single-family residence that featured a prominent front porch and two rear porches. The updated 1956 Sanborn Map shows that the residence has now been sub-divided into a duplex and the front porch on the north facade appears to have been enclosed. This is also where the bay windows appear on the west and east elevations. The 1956 Sanborn Map is also when the rear protrusions appear where portions of the porch were enclosed. These modifications show the changes that the building has undergone.

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

SCOPE OF WORK

After the fact exterior repair and alteration work

1. Construct a front porch to include the two non-contiguous porches that sit to either side of the main entrances on the north façade.
2. Remove all existing vinyl windows to repair framing and water intrusion issues and reinstall windows in the repaired openings.
3. Install two fixed double pane vinyl windows on north elevation that will each measure 4'0" W x 3'0" H.
4. Replace existing exterior siding with fiber cement lap siding to match existing appearance.

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

1. **5.4** Preserve original building materials.
 - Repair deteriorated building materials by patching, piecing-in, consolidating or otherwise reinforcing the materials.
 - Remove only those materials which are deteriorated and beyond reasonable repair.
2. **5.6** Use original materials to replace damaged materials on primary surfaces where possible.
 - Use original materials to replace damaged building materials on a primary façade if possible. If the original material is wood clapboard, for example, then the replacement material should be a material that matches the original in finish, size and the amount of exposed lap. If the original material is not available from the site, use a replacement material that is visually comparable with the original material.
 - Replace only the amount of material required. If a few boards are damaged beyond repair, for example, then only they should be replaced, rather than the entire wall.
 - Do not replace building materials on the primary façade, such as wood siding and masonry, with alternative or imitation materials unless it cannot be avoided.
 - Wholesale replacement of exterior finishes is generally not allowed.
3. **5.7** When replacing materials on a non-primary façade or elevation, match the original material in composition, scale and finish.
 - Use original materials to replace damaged materials on a non-primary façade when possible.
 - The ARB will consider the use of green building materials, such as those made with renewable and local resources to replace damaged materials on a non-primary façade if they do not impact the integrity of the building or its key features.
 - Use alternative or imitation materials that match the style and detail of the original material to

- replace damaged non-primary building materials.
 - Replace exterior finishes to match original in profile, dimension and materials.
4. **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.
5. **5.22**
- 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 Service
- UNACCEPTABLE 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)
6. **6.6** If replacement is required, design it to reflect the time period of the historic structure.
- Replace a historic porch element to match the original.
 - Use replacement materials and elements that are appropriate to the style, texture, finish, composition, and proportion of the historic structure.
 - Match the balustrade of a house to the design and materials of the porch.
 - Do not completely replace an entire porch or element unless absolutely necessary. Only replace the element or portion of an element that requires replacement.
7. **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
8. **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.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The house at 1557 Eslava Street is a non-contributing resource within the Leinkauf Historic District. The application under review seeks after-the-fact approval for porch addition, siding replacement, window replacement, and window frame repair.

In January 2026, the Historic Development office received a 311-call reporting that the windows at the subject property were being replaced without the issuance of a COA. Upon visiting the property, staff discovered that, in addition to window removal, the siding had been removed revealing new plywood and moisture barrier wrapping. The work in question was not authorized by a building permit. A Stop Work Order was issued, and the homeowner was instructed to apply for a COA.

The *Guidelines* state to, “replace exterior finishes to match original in profile, dimension and materials” (5.7). The removed siding material and profile is unknown as it was removed prior to the 311-call. The *Guidelines* also say that “wholesale replacement of exterior finishes is generally not allowed” (5.6). Though the proposed material, fiber cement boar, is an approvable material for use on non-primary elevations.

The *Guidelines* also instruct that unrepairable historic windows should only be replaced with windows that match the design of the originals (5.21), and historic materials in general, should match the original in profile, dimension, and material. (5.19) “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.” Vinyl windows are expressly considered unacceptable in Mobile’s historic districts (5.22). According to listing photos posted online in November 2025, some or all the removed vinyl windows were extant in the structure prior to the current owner’s purchase of the property. The windows shown in the photos never received a COA.

Additionally, the photos from the 2025 property listing show the north façade without the shed roof and gable projection and without the unconnected porches. The *Guidelines* instruct to “replace a historic porch element to match the original” (6.6). The original porch is still existing; it is the enclosed area with the brick columns and fixed picture windows on the north façade. The new porch is a departure from the original in both material and proportion. The *Guidelines* also state that the porch should be designed to be compatible with the neighborhood (6.42). The centered gable with the shed roof projections of the new porch is a unique feature that is not seen on the surrounding homes. There has not been a submitted elevation drawing or plan that shows what the finishes will be for the porch. The current appearance of the elevated portion of the porch does not comply with the *Guideline* to not use raw concrete block or exposed slabs (6.43).

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. John Stephens, owner, presented the project to the Board.

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Karrie Maurin asked if the applicant is asking the Board to accept vinyl windows.

Mr. Stephens replied that he would like to return the existing vinyl windows to the existing openings.

Ms. Cameron Pfeiffer-Traylor asked the applicant why he did not come to the Board for a COA.

Mr. Stephens responded that he did not realize he needed a COA for renovations to the duplex.

Ms. Jennifer Roselius asked about the material of the proposed windows.

Mr. Stephens replied that the windows would be the existing white vinyl windows.

Ms. Maurin asked about windows for the addition.

Mr. Stephens said that there were corrections made to the existing structure but there were no additions.

Ms. Maurin asked if the projections on the rear of the property, bath 1 and 2, were existing prior to the applicant purchasing the property.

Mr. Stephens responded that the layout of the duplex has not changed.

Ms. Maurin asked about the porches.

Mr. Stephens responded that there were structures in place when the property was purchased. He stated that when he acquired the property the left side of the structure had been demolished and rebuilt, and modifications had been made to the right side.

Ms. Maurin asked for clarification from the applicant if he had added the porches.

Mr. Stephens replied that the property was acquired in 2023 by a real-estate investment group who did a lot of repairs before the applicant purchased the property in 2025.

Ms. Maurin asked if the photo from 2025 property listing was the condition that the applicant purchased the property.

Mr. Stephens responded that the condition of the property shown in the image from the 2025 property listing is not representative of the property's condition when he purchased the property in 2025.

Ms. Maurin asked if the porches were framed when the applicant purchased the property.

Mr. Stephens replied that the left side porch was framed but was beginning to fall. The applicant continued that the porch was torn down, the brick was replaced, and then the porch was rebuilt.

Ms. Cameron Pfeiffer-Traylor noted that the newly built porch appears to be an addition to a previously enclosed porch on the façade.

Ms. Annie Sawyer Allen replied that the original porch from the 1956 Sanborn has been removed, and the existing front porch has been added.

Mr. Stephen Howle added that it was unclear what the Board is being asked to approve as the porch is unfinished.

Ms. Allen replied that the evidence available to determine what work should be reviewed includes the picture from realtor.com from 2025, the condition of the property when staff went to the property to issue the stop work order, and what Mr. Stephens has explained. She continued that it is difficult to construct a timeline of what work occurred when.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor asked if the changes made from the picture of the façade from the listing from 2025 to the current condition of the porch was subject to review.

Ms. Allen replied that the current owner cannot be held responsible for work done by a previous homeowner.

Mr. Stephens replied that when he purchased the property corrections were needed for the porch.

Mr. Howle responded that there appears to be a discrepancy between the plans submitted and what is existing. He continued that the porch doesn't look finished and it is unclear if the Board is expected to approve the porch as is.

Ms. Allen replied that the information presented to the Board was the entirety of the information submitted.

Ms. Roselius provided that the Board needs to understand what is being built, not just what has been done. She asked the applicant about the windows. She finished by stating that she felt she did not have enough information to understand what was done to the primary elevation, and when it was done.

Ms. Maurin said that she does not find fault with the additions made, but what is less defined by the applicant is what the Board needs to review for approval.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor said that the finishes for the porches need to be provided to the Board.

Ms. Roselius provided that the bottom line is that it is unclear what the Board is looking at. She encouraged the applicant to withdraw the application and go to a Design Review Committee.

Mr. Stephens asked for clarification about the windows, framing for the windows, and the siding.

Ms. Roselius asked the applicant if the windows were currently removed from the building and if the window openings are open to the elements.

Mr. Stephens replied that the windows are removed and noted that some had been broken while during removal.

Ms. Roselius said that the Hardie siding needs to echo the depth and profile of the original wood cladding. She clarified everything the applicant is doing on the building: reinstalling the existing windows; installing Hardie siding and painting it white; and finishing the porch.

Mr. Stephens replied that in his eyes there is not much to do with the porch.

Ms. Roselius disagreed with that, and said there were still many details needed for the porch, she then presented the idea of a modified COA, noting that plans are needed for the porch, however the vinyl windows were already

in place, and that she did not have a problem with the Hardie board if it matches the profile of the original siding.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor agreed with Ms. Roselius regarding a modified COA to include windows and siding. She encouraged the applicant to table the changes to the façade.

Mr. Howle agreed with Ms. Roselius and Pfeiffer-Traylor about the windows and in concept with the siding approval, pending staff approval of profile.

Ms. Roselius asked the applicant for clarification on whether the brick would stay on the façade and the Hardie would only be on the non-primary surfaces.

Mr. Stephens replied that the brick would stay on the façade.

Ms. Allen clarified that the Board was asking for elevation drawings of the front porch and is considering a modified COA to include windows and siding.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor replied that this was correct.

FINDING FACTS

Ms. Roselius asked to have a motion to find the facts as written, amended specifically to note that the applicant has agreed to remove the front porch and related improvements from the COA application. The Board has determined that the Hardie board siding will only be installed in places that were formally wood cladding, specifically not covering any existing brick. Also, finding that the existing windows are being reinstalled in existing openings and replaced in-kind if an existing window is broken. Additionally, noting that the siding will be painted white.

Ms. Pfeiffer-Traylor so moved.

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Ms. Cameron Pfeiffer Traylor moved that based upon the facts as modified and amended by the Board, the application does not impair the historic integrity of the property or the district, considering that the applicant is not responsible for the existing vinyl windows, and that a COA should be issued strictly for the siding and windows on secondary elevations, and on the basis that the applicant will confer with staff about profiles and elevations for trim and that the Hardie plank siding will be painted white.

Ms. Barja Wilson seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:23pm.