



Architectural Review Board Minutes

May 6, 2026 – 3:00 P.M.

ADMINISTRATIVE

The meeting was called to order by the Vice-Chair, Cartledge Blackwell at 3:02 pm.

1. Roll Call

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

Members Present: Catarina Echols, Abby Davis, Barja Wilson, Cartledge Blackwell, and Stephen McNair.
Jennifer Roselius (arrived at 3:04)

Members Absent: Cameron Pfeiffer-Traylor, Stephen Howle, and Karrie Maurin

Staff Members Present: Meredith Wilson, Douglas McCoy, Kimberly Thomas, Hannon Falls, and Matthew Sanford

2. Approval of Minutes from April 15, 2026

Ms. Catarina Echols moved to approve the minutes from the April 15, 2026, meeting.
Mr. Stephen McNair seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.

3. Approval of Mid-Month COAs granted by Staff

Ms. Barja Wilson moved to approve the mid-month COAs granted by Staff.
Mr. Stephen McNair seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.

MID-MONTH APPROVALS

1. **Applicant:** Bill Webb
Property Address: 950 Palmetto Street
Date of Approval: 04/07/2026
Project: Paint the ceiling of the first and second story front porches on the south facade of residence SW 6505 "atmospheric".
2. **Applicant:** Kim Hall
Property Address: 45 S Hallett Street
Date of Approval: 04/08/2026
Project:
 1. Repair and replace porch decking with in-kind materials.
 2. Repair and replace (where necessary) brick front porch steps.
 3. Paint exterior to match existing.
 4. Repair window in-kind on the north elevation of the residence.
3. **Applicant:** Southern Bay Construction
Property Address: 211 Lanier Ave
Date of Approval: 04/08/2026

- Project:** -Repair in-kind and extend existing concrete driveway 15' west.
 -Install walking path leading from the north edge of the driveway west.
 -The walking path will measure 3' W x 40' D and will either be constructed from pavers or poured concrete.
4. **Applicant:** City of Mobile
Property Address: 155 Church Street
Date of Approval: 04/09/2026
Project: 1. Remove existing pole and parking signage located at the entrance to Church Street parking lot.
 2. Install Standard City of Mobile Black Decorative Downtown Signpost with single sided metal sign measuring 5.2 SQFT to say "PARKING" and "CITY OF MOBILE".
5. **Applicant:** Cogburn Construction Company Inc.
Property Address: 1306 Chamberlain Ave
Date of Approval: 04/09/2026
Project: Remove existing deck on the north/rear elevation of residence.
 Build new covered porch measuring 23'4" W x 12'0" D on the north/rear elevation of the residence.
 -The new covered porch will be a replica of the existing covered porch on the south facade to include:
 -Finished floor height to match existing residence.
 -Foundation infill to match existing front porch.
 -Six 8"x8" boxed columns to match existing columns on the front porch.
 -Three wood steps north of the newly covered porch.
 -Porch decking, metal roof, and handrail to match existing front porch.
 -Paint to match existing front porch.
 -Outdoor cabinetry with sink to abut the north/rear elevation of residence (would not be visible from ROW)
6. **Applicant:** RyeCo Enterprises LLC
Property Address: 1255 Texas Street
Date of Approval: 04/09/26
Project: 1. Repair in kind chimney cap, window trim, wood siding.
 2. Replace in kind any siding that is beyond repair.
 3. Reroof in-kind the detached garage located to the south of the residence using black architectural shingles.
7. **Applicant:** Michael Cox
Property Address: 510 S Jefferson Street
Date of Approval: 04/09/26
Project: -Repair in-kind four windows on the north elevation of the building, and three windows on the south elevation of the building.
 -Build and install three wood windows on the south elevation to match the dimensions and profile of the original windows on the east facade.
8. **Applicant:** DS Squared Interest LLC
Property Address: 119 Selma St
Date of Approval: 04/09/26

- Project:** Reroof in kind with TAMKO® Titan XT® shingles. Color: Rustic Black
9. **Applicant:** Travell Williams
- Property Address:** 107 N Hallett Street
- Date of Approval:** 04/10/26
- Project:**
1. Repair in-kind or replace in-kind any existing siding to match existing in material and profile.
 2. Remove non-original iron porch posts on the east facade and install four wood columns to match the profile of the columns seen on 103 N Hallett Street.
 3. Construct a deck measuring 18'3" W x 9'8" D on the west/rear elevation of the existing residence. Deck will be constructed from wood composite materials and will have:
 - Finished floor height to match existing residence.
 - Tongue and groove decking boards.
 - Vertical handrails using wood composite materials.
 - Three stairs to abut the west portion of the deck.
 - Pour a concrete landing at the base of deck stairs measuring approximately 6' W x 5' D.
 4. Paint exterior (BLP Mobile Paints) as follows:
 - Main Body Color: Chatham Street Blue
 - Trim or Decorative Feature Colors: Church Street East Gray
 - Porch Deck Color: Church Street East Gray
 - Accent Area Colors: Church Street East Gray
 - Other Area Colors: Church Street East Gray
10. **Applicant:** Hugh Sovik
- Property Address:** 113 S Dearborn Street
- Date of Approval:** 04/13/26
- Project:** Repaint exterior to match existing. Paint front door on west facade Claiborne St. Red.
11. **Applicant:** Pro Roofing Solutions Inc
- Property Address:** 256 N Joachim Street
- Date of Approval:** 04/13/26
- Project:** Reroof DAR carriage house in-kind using Modified Bitumen roofing system.
12. **Applicant:** CNA Construction
- Property Address:** 806 Government Street
- Date of Approval:** 04/13/26
- Project:**
1. Reroof in-kind replacing existing shingles with charcoal architectural shingles on the sanctuary building.
 2. Coat existing TPO flat roof with Everest systems roof coating on building north of the sanctuary.
13. **Applicant:** Rudy Auebach
- Property Address:** 1752 Dauphin Street
- Date of Approval:** 04/16/26
- Project:** Install 6' wood privacy fence along the west and north property line running 185'.

14. **Applicant:** Johnathan Twilley
Property Address: 1059 Augusta Street
Date of Approval: 04/20/26
Project: Replace the deck boards on the front and rear porches using treated wood tongue and groove deck boards.

APPLICATIONS

1. 2026-22-CA

Address: 313 George Street
Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Applicant/Agent: Laura Keys
Project: After-the-fact Installation of 8' privacy fence along the north and east property Lines
Approved with Amendment - **Certified Record Attached**

2. 2026-23-CA

Address: 407 Regina Avenue
Historic District: Oakleigh Garden (Local Only)
Applicant/Agent: Jacqueline Brown
Project: Demolish single-family dwelling
Approved - **Certified Record Attached**

3. 2026-24-CA

Address: 605 St. Francis Street
Historic District: Lower Dauphin
Applicant/Agent: Douglas Kearley
Project: Construct a port-cochere; enlarge an existing dormer on south (rear) elevation
Approved - **Certified Record Attached**

4. 2026-25-CA

Address: 853 Dauphin Street
Historic District: Lower Dauphin
Applicant/Agent: Keith and Alison Jones
Project: After-the-fact approval of paint color change from previously approved color
Approved with Amendment - **Certified Record Attached**

5. 2026-26-CA

Address: 120 Michael Donald Avenue
Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Applicant/Agent: Kelvin Brown
Project: Fenestration replacement and alterations
Approved - **Certified Record Attached**

OTHER BUSINESS

The next ARB meeting is scheduled for May 20, 2026.



Agenda Item #1

Certified Record 2026-22-CA

DETAILS

Location:

313 George Street

Summary of Request:

After the fact Installation of 8' privacy fence along the north and east property lines.

Applicant (as applicable):

Laura Keys

Property Owner:

Laura Keys

Historic District:

Oakleigh Garden District

Classification:

Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The house at 313 George Street is a contributing structure to the Oakleigh Garden Historic District.
- The lots surrounding the home are all classified as having single-family residences, for which the *Guidelines* allow fences up to 6'
- The installed 8' fence is not compliant with the *Guidelines*. The fence extends beyond the front building plane.

Report Contents:

Property and Application History.....2

Scope of Work.....2

Applicable Standards.....3

Staff Analysis.....3

Attachments.....4

PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

Oakleigh Garden Historic District was initially listed in the National Register in 1972 under Criteria A (historic significance) and C (architectural significance) for its local significance in the areas of architecture, landscape architecture, and planning and development. The district is significant for its high concentration of 19th- and 20th-century architectural types and styles and significant in the area of landscape architecture for its canopies of live oaks planted from 1850 to 1910. The district is significant in the area of planning and development as the location of Washington Square, one of only two antebellum public parks remaining in Mobile. The district was expanded in 1984, and an updated nomination was approved in 2016.

The subject property is a one-story wood frame two bay shotgun with a north addition and a full-width porch. Originally built in 1890 by Barbara Muntz, the home features a gabled roof, six-over-six windows, wood door with transom, and a recessed front porch supported by chamfered posts with brackets, balustrade and box cornice. The dwelling first appears on the 1904 Sanborn Fire Insurance map and shows the original shotgun design of the home. According to the property file records, the north addition was approved in November of 1996.

The property at 313 George Street appeared before the Board in 2013 resulting in the approval of a full renovation of the residence.

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Install 8' section of fence along the north and east (rear) property lines.
 - The northern portion of the fence tapers down beginning at the front plane of the residence.

APPLICABLE STANDARDS

- 10.2 Design a fence to be compatible with the architectural style of the house and existing fences in the neighborhood.
 - Install a painted wood picket fence.
 - Install a simple wood or wire fence. Heights of wooden picket fences are ordinarily restricted to 36". Consideration for up to 48," depending on the location of the fence, shall be given. A variance might be required. Staff can advise and assist applicants with regard to a variance. If combined with a wall, the total vertical dimension of the wall and fence collectively should not exceed 36," or in some cases 48".
 - For surface parking areas associated with commercial uses, size a perimeter parking area fence to not exceed 48" in height.
 - Install a cast-iron or other metal fence not exceeding 48" in height if located in the front yard.
 - Install a fence that uses alternative materials that have a very similar look and feel to wood, proven durability, matte finish and an accurate scale and proportion of components.
 - Face the finished side of a fence toward the public right-of-way.
 - Based on the chosen fence material, use proportions, heights, elements and levels of opacity similar to those of similar material and style seen in the historic district.

- REAR AND NON-CORNER SIDE FENCES (LOCATED BEHIND THE FRONT BUILDING PLANE)
 - Design a fence located behind the front building plane to not exceed 72” in height. If the subject property abuts a multi-family residential or commercial property, a fence up to 96” will be considered.
 - An alternative fence material with proven durability, matte finish and an accurate scale and proportion of components is acceptable. A simple wood-and-wire fence is acceptable provided it is appropriate to the style of the house.
- ACCEPTABLE FENCE MATERIALS
 - Materials that have a similar character, durability and finish to those of fences of historic properties in the district are acceptable. These often include:
 - Wood picket
 - Wood slat
 - Wood lattice
 - Iron or steel
 - Historically appropriate wire fences
 - Aluminum that appears similar to iron
- UNACCEPTABLE FENCE MATERIALS
 - Materials that do not have a similar character, durability and finish to those of fences of historic properties in the district are unacceptable. These often include:
 - Chain link
 - Stockade
 - Post and rail
 - Masonite
 - PVC
 - Plywood or asbestos paneling
 - Razor wire
 - Barbed wire

STAFF ANALYSIS

The property, 313 George Street, is a contributing structure in the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. The subject application is for an after-the-fact COA for the installation of a 96” high fence located along the north and east property lines, with the north section ending beyond the front plane of the west façade.

Section 10.2 of the *Design Guidelines* state, “Design a fence located behind the front building plane to not exceed 72” in height. If the subject property abuts a multi-family residential or commercial property, a fence up to 96” will be considered.” The subject property does not abut a commercial or multi-family property. The subject fence is of wood construction, which is an accepted fence material per the *Guidelines*, but it exceeds the height stipulated by the *Guidelines*. There is also a tapered section of the privacy fence extends past the front plane of the residence. While the privacy fence does extend beyond the front plane, the tapered nature of this section diminishes the appearance of the taller fence. The applicant has stated that the fence was installed due to ongoing privacy concerns related to construction that was occurring to the east of 313 George Street, Additionally, while the subject property does not abut a commercial property, a commercial property is located directly across Savannah Street, to the south of 313 George Street.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Ms. Laura Keys, 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

Mr. Stephen McNair asked staff about the tapered section of the fence.

Ms. Annie Sawyer Allen provided the *Guidelines* say that fences beyond the front plane of the home are not to exceed 3' in height.

Ms. Jennifer Roselius asked the height of the fence at the end of the taper.

Ms. Keys responded that it was 3'.

Ms. Allen clarified that if the 8' section of the fence projects beyond the front plane, that would be out of compliance.

Ms. Abby Davis asked if the section on Savannah Street goes all the way to the sidewalk.

Ms. Meredith Wilson replied that it does.

Ms. Roselius said that she does not have an issue with the 8' portion of the fence and asked the board their opinion about the tapered section.

Mr. McNair replied that he had no issue with the 8' portion but the tapered section of the fence changes the character of how one interacts with the structure from the street and he would support lowering the tapered portion to 3'.

Ms. Abby Davis agreed with the idea to bring the tapered portion down to 3'

Mr. Cartledge Blackwell concurred.

Ms. Roselius asked the applicant if they would be amenable to that change.

Ms. Keys replied with concerns about the structural integrity of the fence that abuts the tree.

Ms. Roselius responded that it is understood that the applicant can't speak to the structure of the fence and if an adjustment is needed to accommodate bracing that could be addressed in the future.

FINDING FACTS

Mr. Stephen McNair moved to find the facts as written amending to state that the tapered portion be reduced to a 3' uniform height and working with staff on said details.

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Cartledge Blackwell moved that the application as amended does not impair the architectural or historic character of the property or the district, and that the application should be granted a COA.

Mr. Stephen McNair seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.



Agenda Item #2

Certified Record 2026-23-CA

DETAILS

Location:

407 Regina Avenue

Summary of Request:

Demolish historic dwelling

Applicant (as applicable):

Jacqueline Brown

Property Owner:

Jacqueline Brown

Historic District:

Oakleigh Garden (Local Only)

Classification:

Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The subject dwelling sustained damage during a 2020 fire.
- The property has been cited by Municipal Enforcement
- The application includes a proposed redevelopment plan to use the cleared space as an additional garden for 409 Regina Avenue.

Report Contents:

Property and Application History..... 2

Scope of Work..... 2

Applicable Standards 2

Staff Analysis 2

Attachments 4

PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

Oakleigh Garden Historic District was initially listed in the National Register in 1972 under Criteria A (historic significance) and C (architectural significance) for its local significance in the areas of architecture, landscape architecture, and planning and development. The district is significant for its high concentration of 19th and 20th-century architectural types and styles and significant in the area of landscape architecture for its canopies of live oaks planted from 1850 to 1910. The district is significant in the area of planning and development as the location of Washington Square, one of only two antebellum public parks remaining in Mobile. The district was expanded in 1984, and an updated nomination was approved in 2016.

The property at 407 Regina Avenue does not appear on the updated 1955 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map; however, the 1955 historic aerial shows that the location surveyed had multiple dwellings. The dwelling is a c. 1940 one-story raised frame craftsman with a gabled roof and a full-width front porch. A small side wing projects off the south elevation. The property was sited in 2024 by municipal enforcement regarding unaddressed damage sustained by a fire that occurred around 2020.

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

SCOPE OF WORK

Demolish historic dwelling.

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. Nature of Proposed Development
 - Consider the future utilization of the site. (12.0)

STAFF ANALYSIS

The significance of the structure

The house at 407 Regina Avenue is listed as a contributing property in the local only portion of the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. The modest craftsman with full-width front porch and small side projection represents a form common throughout Mobile's historic districts. However, the previously full width porch was previously enclosed altering the integrity of the original restrained craftsman detailing. Permit history documents that the property sustained damage due to a 2020 fire. The property was cited by Municipal Enforcement as a public nuisance in 2024.

Impact on the Street and District

The *Guidelines* state that whether the building in question is "one of the last remaining positive examples of its kind in the neighborhood, county, or region" should be factored into any decision involving the removal of a structure within a historic district. As stated above, the form expressed at 407 Regina Avenue, is common to the local area.

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 rhythm of development along the east side of Regina Avenue remains mostly intact, with few vacant lots seen. The deletion of the dwelling at 407 Regina Avenue would disrupt the historic rhythm of homes along the street. The subject property appears to sit on a double lot with 405 Regina, which available documentation could not determine when the structure at that address was demolished. The deletion of the one primary structure on the lot would result in a substantial vacancy along the east side of this small block.

Nature of proposed development at the origination property

The *Guidelines* instruct that the future use of a cleared site should be considered. The applicant resides at 409 Regina Avenue and proposed development includes maintaining the existing shed at 407 Regina Avenue and utilizing the cleared space for additional gardens.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Ms. Jacqueline Brown, 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

Mr. Stephen McNair asked if there was a fire.

Ms. Annie Sawyer Allen responded that there was a fire at the property in 2020 and has been cited by Municipal Enforcement.

Mr. McNair asked if the property is currently on the City's blight list.

Ms. Allen replied that it was unknown if the property was currently on the blight list.

Ms. Jennifer Roselius asked if the property is currently habitable.

Ms. Brown replied that she felt that the home was habitable.

Mr. McNair asked about the plans for the use of the cleared lot.

Ms. Allen responded that the cleared lot will be used as a side yard for 409 Regina.

Mr. Blackwell asked if the house was covered by later siding.

Mr. Sanford replied that it does appear that the siding is more recent.

Mr. Blackwell provided that the integrity of the house has already been altered.

Mr. McNair asked staff if it is their opinion that the porch has been altered.

Ms. Allen replied that it was altered.

FINDING FACTS

Mr. Stephen McNair moved to find the facts as written

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Cartledge Blackwell made the motion that the application as submitted does not impair the architectural or historical character of the district - noting fire damage and heavy alterations to the exterior - and that the Demolition COA should be issued.

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



Agenda Item #3

Certified Record 2026-24-CA

DETAILS

Location:

605 St Francis Street

Summary of Request:

Construct a Port Cochere and enlarge an existing dormer on the south elevation.

Applicant (as applicable):

Douglas Kearley

Property Owner:

Amory Wilson & Mary Ann Wilson

Historic District:

Lower Dauphin Commercial District

Classification:

Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The Mobile Historic Development Commission holds an easement on the property; the proposed changes were found to be acceptable by the MHDC Properties Committee.
- The property is within the Downtown Development District. An application has been submitted for Review by Consolidated Review Committee

Report Contents:

Property and Application History 2
 Scope of Work 2
 Applicable Standards 2
 Staff Analysis 3
 Attachments 4

PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District was initially listed in the National Register in 1979 under Criteria A (historic significance) and C (architectural significance) for its local significance in the areas of commerce and architecture. The district is significant for its unique character stemming from the high concentration of closely spaced two- and three-story brick buildings and as Mobile's nineteenth century commercial thoroughfare. The district boundaries were expanded in 1982, 1995, 1998, and 2019.

The subject property is a 1 ½ story wood frame Queen Anne cottage that features a clipped gable roof, a gabled bay with wood shingles, recessed porch supported by Tuscan columns, and a gabled dormer above. A residence first appears on the property in the 1885 Sanborn Fire Insurance map. The dwelling seen on the map is a 1 ½ story wood frame square structure with a full-width porch. The subject dwelling first appears on the 1904 Sanborn Map and largely displays the layout seen today, except the rear porch on the east elevation was enclosed sometime after 2000.

Historic Development records show that the property has previously appeared before the ARB once in January 2001 to approve renovating the residence for use as a law office.

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Remove existing shed roof projection and steps from southeast elevation.
2. Construct a porte cochere that will measure 20'6" W x 23'6" Dx 11'0"H on the east elevation.
 - a. The porte cochere will be supported by five Tuscan columns that will be post construction with Hardie trim and wrap.
 - b. New wood steps and handrail will be installed on the east elevation leading to the existing door.
 - c. The roof of the Porte Cochere will steeply pitched hipped roof with shingles to match existing and a roof cricket.
 - d. Cornice will match existing design.
3. Enlarge existing dormer on south elevation to measure 6'0" D x 5'0" W.
 - a. Cornice, roofing, and siding to match existing.
 - b. Existing window will remain in place.
4. Install metal handrails flanking the existing brick steps on the north façade.

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

1. 5.5 Preserve and restore the visibility of original historic materials.
 - Consider removing later covering materials that have not achieved historic significance.
 - Once a non-historic siding is removed, repair the original, underlying material.
 - Do not cover or obscure original building materials
2. 6.10 Design an addition to be compatible in massing and scale with the original historic structure.
 - a. Design the massing of an addition to appear subordinate to the historic building.
 - b. Where feasible, use a lower-scale connecting element to join an addition to a historic structure.
 - c. Where possible, match the foundation and floor heights of an addition to those of the historic building.
3. 6.11 Design the exterior walls of an addition to be compatible in scale and rhythm with the original historic structure.
 - a. Design the height of an addition to be proportionate with the historic building, paying particular attention to the foundation and other horizontal elements.
 - b. Design the addition to express floor heights on the exterior of the addition in a fashion that reflects floor heights of the original historic building.
4. 6.12 Clearly differentiate the exterior walls of an addition from the original historic structure.

- a. Use a physical break or setback from the original exterior wall to visually separate the old from new.
 - b. Use an alteration in the roofline to create a visual break between the original and new, but ensure that the pitches generally match.
5. 6.13 Use exterior materials and finishes that are comparable to those of the original historic residential structure in profile, dimension and composition. Modern building materials will be evaluated for appropriateness or compatibility with the original historic structure on an individual basis, with the objective of ensuring the materials are similar in their profile, dimension, and composition to those of the original historic structure.
- a. 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.
 - b. Use a material with proven durability.
 - c. Use a material with a similar appearance in profile, texture and composition to those on the original building.
 - d. Choose a color and finish that matches or blends with those of the historic building.
 - e. Do not use a material with a composition that will impair the structural integrity and visual character of the building.
 - f. Do not use a faux stucco application.
6. 6.14 Design a roof of an addition to be compatible with the existing historic building.
- a. Design a roof shape, pitch, material and level of complexity to be similar to those of the existing historic building.
 - b. 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.
 - c. Use a roofing material for an addition that matches or is compatible with the original historic building and the district.
7. 6.15 Design roofs such that the addition remains subordinate to the existing historic buildings in the district.
- a. Where possible, locate a dormer or skylight on a new addition in an inconspicuous location.
 - b. In most cases, match a roof and window on a dormer to those of the original building.
8. 6.20 Use details that are similar in character to those on the historic structure.
- a. Match a detail on an addition to match the original historic structure in profile, dimension and material.
 - b. Use ornamentation on an addition that is less elaborate than that on the original structure.
 - c. Use a material for details on an addition that match those of the original in quality and feel.
 - d. Match the proportions of details on an addition to match the proportions used on the original historic structure.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The subject application proposes removing a non-original shed roof projection and staircase on the east secondary elevation and constructing a porte cochere in its place. Aerials show that the projection was added sometime between 2000 and 2015. Additionally, the application includes enlarging the existing dormer on the south elevation. There is an easement on the property held by the Mobile Historic Development Commission, staff contacted the MHDC property committee and received their approval of the application. The property is also located within the Downtown Development District and has submitted an application to the Consolidated Review Committee.

The *Guidelines* allow for removal of exterior materials that are not original and “have not achieved historic significance (5.5).” This applies to both the shed roof and stairs that were added sometime after 2000. The proposed porte cochere would project from the east elevation and cover the existing concrete parking area. The *Guidelines* provide that additions should be subordinate to and compatible with the historic structure, but the exterior wall should be differentiated from the historic structure (6.10-6.12). The porte cochere will sit

subordinate to the historic home and will be minimally visible from the ROW. The design of the Tuscan columns of the porte cochere would match the design of the existing columns on the north façade (6.20). The columns will be wrapped and trimmed with Hardie and match the existing columns in dimensions and profile(6.13).

The existing roof line will be modified to accommodate the enlarged dormer and the addition of the porte cochere. The design of the roof for the addition will be compatible with the existing roof (6.14); however, the hipped design and cricket will serve to distinguish the new from the historic (6.12). The dormer is on the south elevation, and its roof will match existing. The projection of the roof for the addition will be partially concealed from the ROW as it will sit behind the mass of the historic home (6.15).

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Douglas Kearley, Architect, presented the project to the Board.

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Stephen McNair provided that, as a façade easement exists on the property, the subject has been reviewed and approved by the properties committee of the Mobile Historic Development Commission (easement grantee).

FINDING FACTS

Mr. Cartledge Blackwell moved to find the facts as submitted.

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Cartledge Blackwell moved that the application as submitted does not impair the architectural or historic character of the property or the district, and that the application should be granted a COA.

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



Agenda Item #4

Certified Record 2026-25-CA

DETAILS

Location:

853 Dauphin Street

Summary of Request:

Change of previously approved paint color, Sandy Ridge, to new paint color, City Loft.

Applicant (as applicable):

Keith and Alison Jones

Property Owner:

Keith and Alison Jones

Historic District:

Lower Dauphin Commercial District

Classification:

Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The applicant commenced painting with an unapproved color and seeks approval to continue

Report Contents:

Property and Application History 2

Scope of Work 2

Applicable Standards 2

Staff Analysis 11/19 3

Staff Analysis 1/7 3

Attachments 4

PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

Lower Dauphin Street Commercial Historic District was initially listed in the National Register in 1979 under Criteria A (historic significance) and C (architectural significance) for its local significance in the areas of commerce and architecture. The district is significant for its unique character stemming from the high concentration of closely spaced two- and three-story brick buildings and as Mobile's nineteenth century commercial thoroughfare. The district boundaries were expanded in 1982, 1995, 1998, and 2019.

853 Dauphin Street is a one-story commercial building clad in brick and structural tile. Constructed in the late 1940s, the structure was originally known as the Delaney building, an auto sales and service business. The north and west elevations facing Dauphin and Broad streets express the Art Moderne or Streamline Moderne style with its flat roof, curved wall surfaces, and prominent long, horizontal lines and grooves along the exterior walls created by the brick and tile work.

The subject parcel consists of what was previously 5 and 7 Broad Street, along with 811 and 813 Dauphin Street. According to the 1924 Sanborn Insurance Map, all these lots consisted of frame single-family homes with the exception 5 Broad (on the corner of S. Broad and Dauphin) which was a masonry auto repair shop. The current structure is represented on the subsequent Sanborn survey from 1955. In 2018, permits were issued from the city of Mobile approving a renovation to convert the building into an event space and loft apartments. This renovation consisted of significant alterations to the fenestration along the façade.

According to Historic Development records, this property appeared before the Board on November 19, 2026, seeking approval for alterations to the west entrance and to paint the historic exterior brick. The application received partial approval to paint the exterior brick only. The property appeared again on January 7, 2026, with updated plans for the west entrance and with a paint color, Sandy Ridge. The application was approved and a COA was issued.

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Paint brick exterior along the existing west and north elevations and tile of parapet wall of southwest elevation in following colors and materials (stone accent bands to remain unpainted)
 - a. Color: City Loft
 - b. Material: Mineral Paint

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

1. **7.1** Preserve the key character-defining features of a historic commercial façade.
2. **7.2** Repair an altered storefront to its original design.
 - Use historic photographs when determining the original character of a storefront design.
 - Where evidence does not exist, use a contemporary interpretation of a traditional storefront. Consider retaining a non-original storefront where it has achieved historic importance as an option.
3. **5.8** Preserve and repair original masonry materials
 - Preserve masonry features that define the overall historic character, such as walls, cornices, pediments, steps and foundations.
 - Unpainted 19th Century imported Philadelphia and locally manufactured brick may not be painted. In cases where historic brick has been previously painted, the paint color should be of a suitable color to match the age and architectural style of the structure.

STAFF ANALYSIS 11/19/25

The subject property is a contributing structure to the Lower Dauphin Commercial District. The application under review proposes painting the brick exterior on the west and north elevations, along with alterations to the

entrance on Broad Street.

The *Guidelines* call for the preservation of character-defining components of a commercial façade; and further direct that an altered storefront should be repaired to express its original design. (7.1, 7.2) The existing entry at 853 Dauphin along its Broad Street elevation is an integral element to the overall historic design of the structure. Recessed entryways with a vertical parapet wall rising above a flat roofline were common design elements used in Art Moderne which offer a sense of depth and architectural interest, contrasting with the smooth, horizontal and curved exterior walls of the main structure. The existing entryway on the west elevation of 853 Dauphin demonstrates this core principle of the style and would be considered a character-defining element. Over time, this entryway has become a secondary entrance. The applicant wishes to recreate a prominent entry way at this location to make the west elevation more accessible to pedestrian traffic, and the building more approachable. Additionally, the current configuration of the entrance does not meet ADA standards. The proposed lowering of the parapet wall would further modify the historic design.

Painting unpainted historic brick is not generally supported by the *Guidelines*. (5.8) On a recent site visit, staff identified multiple areas of damaged and poorly repaired brickwork, along with large spans of infill along both the north and west elevations that likely occurred during the c. 2018 renovation. These repairs and alterations have created areas of visibly unmatched brick and brickwork along the exterior wall. The proposed grey paint color may diminish the effect of the horizontal banding created by the contrast of materials between the brick and tile. This emphasis on the linear is an integral design feature, the preservation of which must be carefully considered when proposing the application any treatment to the exterior walls.

STAFF ANALYSIS 1/7/25

The original proposed project was presented to the ARB on November 19th where the painting of the brick was approved with the Board suggesting the use of mineral paint for the brick. Additionally, a redesign of the southwest entry and parapet was suggested. The applicant resubmitted the subject updated proposal.

The new design minimally alters the parapet and visibly alters the appearance of the entry with the removal of the existing projecting storefront to expose the interior foyer (7.1). The orientation of the foyer entries will be modified from entry doors on both the southwest and northwest elevations to having a singular entry door on the northwest elevation. The proposed raising of the entry canopies creates alignment with the existing metal banding which will maintain the horizontal rhythm along the west elevation.

The project proposes the application of synthetic stucco on the vertical seam where the northwest and southwest storefronts meet. The *Guidelines* state to “use true stucco instead of an imitation material” (7.8).

STAFF ANALYSIS 5/6/25

The updated application was presented to the ARB on January 7, 2026, when the revised southwest entrance and the Keim mineral paint color Sandy Ridge was approved. Shortly after painting of 853 Dauphin began, a 311 complaint was submitted to Historic Development regarding the painting. Staff conducted a site visit where it was determined that a paint color not approved by the ARB, City Loft, was being applied to the structure. The applicant was given the choice to resume painting with the approved color, Sandy Ridge, or to return to the ARB to seek approval for the City Loft paint color. This update to the application proposes changing the approved paint color of Sandy Ridge to City Loft. This color is a lighter shade than the previously approved Sandy Ridge.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Keith Jones and Mrs. Alison Jones, owners of the building, presented the project to the Board.

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Stephen McNair asked what color was previously approved.

Ms. Annie Sawyer Allen replied that the approved color was Keim Sandy Ridge mineral paint and gave a brief history of the application.

Mr. Cartledge Blackwell supplied that since the approval to paint the previously unpainted brick has already been given, he does not have an issue with the new color.

Ms. Catarina Echols said that she did not see a huge difference between the two colors, though she does prefer the warmer Sandy Ridge.

Mr. Stephen McNair agreed with previous comments and asked for clarification about mineral-based paint's effect on the brick.

Mr. Jones replied that it preserves the brick.

Ms. Abby Davis approved of City Loft color.

Ms. Jennifer Roselius asked if the tile would be painted.

Mr. Jones replied that the tile would be painted on the parapet because of visible sustained damage.

Mr. McNair asked if painting of the tile was previously approved.

Ms. Allen replied that it was unknown at the time of the meeting but would be verified later (the previous COA approved scope of work includes painting of the tile).

Ms. Echols and Ms. Davis said that they were unsure about how effective painting glazed tile would be.

Mrs. Jones replied that the paint company, Keim, did say that the paint would adhere to the tile.

Ms. Davis asked about the damaged tile on the parapet.

Mr. Jones replied that they will recreate the shape and profile of the missing and damaged tile with another material.

Ms. Roselius expressed that she was reluctant to originally approve painting of the brick but was convinced to do so due to the mismatched infill brick but is now disappointed that the painting of the brick does not appear to have effectively fixed the variation of the brick colors. She then noted that the change in color is not significant enough to withhold further approval.

FINDING FACTS

Mr. Cartledge Blackwell moved to find the facts as amended to note the repair and painting of the tile.

Mr. Catarina Echols seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Cartledge Blackwell moved that the application as amended does not impair the architectural or historic character of the property or the district, and that the application should be granted a COA.

Ms. Catarina Echols seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.



Agenda Item #5

Certified Record 2026-26-CA

DETAILS

Location:

120 Michael Donald Avenue

Summary of Request:

After-the-fact fenestration replacement and alterations.

Applicant (as applicable):

Kelvin Brown

Property Owner:

same

Historic District:

Old Dauphin Way

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.
- A door was deleted from the east elevation and windows were deleted from the north and south elevations without a COA.
- The replacement window material (vinyl) does not conform 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

Old Dauphin Way Historic District was initially listed in the National Register in 1984 under Criterion C for significant architecture and community planning. The district includes most nineteenth-century architectural styles and shows adaptations of middle-class domestic designs of the nineteenth century to the regional, Gulf Coast climate. It includes “fine examples of commercial, institutional, and religious structures as well as 20th-century apartments.”

The property at 120 Mihael Donald Avenue is a non-contributing wood frame American foursquare multifamily building that was constructed around 1930. The structure first appears on the Sanborn Fire Insurance Map in 1956 and is listed as apartments. The footprint of the structure looks largely unaltered from the 1956 Sanborn map. The multifamily structure features a hipped roof, two columns with base and capital flanking the recessed entrance, and a previously enclosed porch.

According to Historic Development records, this property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board (ARB) but received a COA in 2018 to board up the windows.

SCOPE OF WORK

After the fact fenestration replacement and alteration

1. Remove all remaining windows and plywood covering over window openings.
2. Install new wood framing and window trim.
3. Replace all windows with 6/6 vinyl windows.
4. Replace siding where needed with fiber cement siding to match dimensions and profile of existing asbestos siding.

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)

STAFF ANALYSIS

The multifamily structure at 120 Michael Donald Avenue is a non-contributing resource within the Old Dauphin Way District. The application under review seeks after-the-fact approval for fenestration replacement and alterations.

The *Guidelines* state to, "replace exterior finishes to match original in profile, dimension and materials" (5.7). The fiber cement siding used for repairs matches the existing in profile and dimension though it differs from the original asbestos material. The *Guidelines* also say that "wholesale replacement of exterior finishes is generally not allowed" (5.6). The applicant is replacing the siding where needed as the *Guidelines* advise (5.4).

The *Guidelines* instruct that unrepairable historic windows should only be replaced with windows that match the design of the originals (5.21), which includes 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).

The condition of the windows prior to the installation of the current unpermitted vinyl windows is unknown. Photos from 2013 show that the windows present were one-over-one wood windows with metal windows in the enclosed porch on the west façade and north elevation. One metal window is still present on the north elevation of the enclosed porch and features a broken pane of glass.

Additionally, windows have been deleted from the north and south elevations, doors have been moved on the north and south elevations, and a door has been deleted on the east elevation. When the 2018 COA was given to board up the existing window openings, there were eleven window openings on the south elevation and twelve window openings on the north elevation. Currently, both south and north elevations express five windows each.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Kelvin Brown, representative of KB Construction and Development LLC, presented the project to the Board.

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Stephen McNair and Ms. Jennifer Roselius commended the applicant for his effort to rehab the property.

Mr. McNair asked about the window changes on the façade.

Mr. Matthew Sanford provided that the porch was enclosed sometime in the 1950s' and only one window remained.

Mr. McNair asked if the window openings on the façade had been modified.

Ms. Meredith Wilson replied that one large window on the enclosed porch on the façade had changed to three smaller windows, but the window opening appeared to be unmodified otherwise.

Mr. McNair responded that he had no problems with the application.

Mr. Cartledge Blackwell added that he was satisfied with the windows.

Ms. Abby Davis asked the applicant about the muntins on the new windows and expressed concern about the material of the windows.

Mr. Brown responded that the placement of the windows on the non-primary elevations was changed to accommodate the zoning requirements to change the four units to three units.

Ms. Davis asked if the windows were already removed when the applicant purchased the property.

Mr. Brown responded that many of the windows had been removed from the openings when he purchased the property.

Ms. Echols recommended in the future matching the lite-design of the original windows.

Mr. McNair asked about the location of the HVAC system.

Mr. Brown replied that the HVAC unit will be located to the rear of the building and hidden from the ROW.

FINDING FACTS

Mr. Cartledge Blackwell moved to find the facts as written.

Mr. Stephen McNair seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Cartledge Blackwell moved that given that the building is a non-contributing structure and all original windows have been lost and the changes to the façade largely remain within the configuration in terms of location, that the application does not impair the architectural or historic integrity of the property or the district, and that a COA be issued.

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