Architectural Review Board Minutes
October 7, 2026 – 3:00 P.M.

ADMINISTRATIVE

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

1. Roll Call
Annie Sawyer Allen, Historic Development staff, called the roll as follows:

Members Present: Cartledge Blackwell, Stephen Howle, Karrie Maurin, Stephen McNair, Cameron Pfieffer-Traylor, and Jennifer Roselius

Members Absent: Abby Davis, Steve Stone, and Barja Wilson

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

2. **Approval of Minutes of September 16, 2026**
Mr. Blackwell moved to approve the minutes of the September 16, 2026, meeting.
Mr. Howle seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.

3. **Approval of Mid-Month COAs granted by Staff**
Mr. McNair moved to approve the mid-month COAs granted by Staff.
Mr. Blackwell seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.

MID-MONTH APPROVALS - APPROVED

1. **Applicant:** Seascape Properties Inc dba Seascape Roofing
   Property Address: 1256 Selma Street
   Date of Approval: 09/09/2026
   Project: Reroof with shingles to match existing. Color: Charcoal
2. **Applicant:** Southern Pride Contracting
   Property Address: 1564 Bruister Street
   Date of Approval: 09/10/2026
   Project: Reroof historic dwelling and shed with GAF Timberline shingles. Color: Charcoal
3. **Applicant:** Chad E Foster (BLD)
   Property Address: 13 S Hallett Street
   Date of: 09/11/2026
   Project: Re-Roof with GAF Timberline HDZ Shingles. Color: Pewter
4. **Applicant:** Thomas industries Inc (BLD)
   Property Address: 111 S Conception St

Date of Approval: 09/15/2026
Project: Reroof SW building with GAF Timberline Shingles. Color: Charcoal

5. **Applicant:** I Ambach Roofing LLC dba I Am Roofing
   Property Address: 170 N. Lafayette Street
   Date of Approval: 09/16/2026
   Project: Reroof with Timberline HDZ shingles. Color: Oyster Grey
6. **Applicant:** Marya Bean
   Property Address: 1167 Texas St
   Date of Approval: 09/16/2026
   Project: Reroof with asphalt shingles. Shingle color: Brown
   Repair wood siding as needed. Replace siding on rear with wood to match existing.
   Repaint siding and trim.
   Paint manufacturer: Sherwin Williams
   Siding: Alabaster White
   Trim: White
   Door: Blue Peacock
7. **Applicant:** New Hand Signs LLC
   Property Address: 218 St Francis Street
   Date of Approval: 09/22/2026
   Project: Install a double-sided corner sign to southwest corner of the structure.
   Sign will measure 7.2' H x 3'W. Internal aluminum frame with vinyl graphics
   Sign will read "United Way of Southwest Alabama" with company logo.
   Sign will be attached to building with a corner bracket.

APPLICATIONS

1. 2026-55-CA

Address: 1008 Savannah Street
Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Application/Agent: Sarah Brock/7584 Construction LLC
Project: Construct a 1460 sf addition
APPROVED – CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

2. 2026-56-CA

Address: 105 S Jefferson Street
Historic District: Church Street East
Application/Agent: Figures Investment, Inc.
Project: After the fact approval of a 12’ x 15’ mural on north elevation
APPROVED – CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

3. 2026-57-CA

Address: R022906400010344/ 851 Church Street
Historic District: Church Street East
Application/Agent: Figures Construction & Development, Inc
Project: Construct a two-story mixed-use structure
APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS – CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

4. 2026-58-CA

Address: 960 Dauphin Street
Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Application/Agent: Robert Brown
Project: Install a fence
APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS– CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

5. 2026-59-CA

Address: 1206 Elmira Street
Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Application/Agent: Khalen Mason on behalf of Bobby Dixon
Project: After-the-fact approval to remove all existing wood windows and replace with vinyl windows; after-the-fact approval to paint brick foundation, knee wall, and column piers.
APPROVED – CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

6. 2026-60-CA

Address: 19 S Reed Street
Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Application/Agent: Jared Hayes/JH Builds, LLC
Project: Demolish single-family dwelling
APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS – CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

7. 2026-61-CA

Address: 115 S Conception Street
Historic District: Church Street East
Application/Agent: Rogers & Willard, Inc
Project: Window Replacement
APPROVED – CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

OTHER BUSINESS

The next ARB meeting is scheduled for October 21, 2026.

Ms. Allen introduced new staff member, Daniel Vasquez.

Architectural Review Board
October 7, 2026

Agenda Item #1

Certified Record 2026-55-CA

DETAILS

Location:
1008 Savannah Street

Summary of Request:
Construct 1460 sf addition

Applicant (as applicable):
Sarah Brock/7584 Construction LLC

Property Owner:
Catherine Mackey

Historic District:
Oakleigh Garden

Classification:
Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The proposed addition is subordinate to the existing structure in size and placement.
- The windows, siding, and trim details visually replicate those of the existing dwelling. Windows on the addition will be aluminum-clad wood, which is an approvable material for existing structures, additions, and new construction.
- Physical breaks – including an inset side porch and vertical trim boards – delineate the transition between the existing structure and the addition.

Report Contents:

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

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 contributing dwelling at 1008 Savannah was constructed c. 1925. The bungalow style dwelling features an inset porch with three bays and a front gable roof supported by five square posts. Two of the existing posts were added between 1979 and 1989, as seen in survey photographs from the Historic Development records. Prior to the construction of the property, the 1904 Sanborn Fire Insurance map shows a vacant parcel. The property appears on the 1925 Sanborn map, republished in 1956, as a one-story frame dwelling with a full-width front and rear porches. As early as the 1930s, the rear porch was enclosed, as noted in the Historic Development records.

According to Historic Development Department records, this property has appeared 4 times previously before the Architectural Review Board. On December 2, 2009, the Board approved an application to replace the tongue-and-groove decking on the front porch and approved an amendment to an existing COA to construct a deck measuring 12’ by 16’ as opposed to 8’ by 16’. On October 2, 2009, the Board approved an application to construct a deck measuring 8’ by 16’, paint the house, trim and window casing, install a 3’ picket fence with a single wood gate across the walk and a double gate to terminate the driveway, remove non-conforming windows and repair siding. On April 25, 1996, the Board approved an application to paint the body, trim, and foundation of the dwelling, reroof the dwelling using fiberglass shingles, replace rotten wood on columns, decking, and siding as necessary to match existing, and install lattice panels around foundation. On May 18, 1994, the Board approved an application to install a new Johns Manville roof.

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Removal of deck.
2. Removal of the hipped roof, door, and window on the enclosed rear porch and raise the roof to match the primary gable roof.
3. Construct a 35’-6” W by 41’-0” D addition.
    a. Addition will have
        i. Gable roof with a gable roof projection at the rear of the east elevation.
            1. Shingle to match existing roof.
            2. Soffit and fascia boards to match existing.
        ii. Siding to match existing profile, lap, and dimensions.
        iii. Floor height of addition will match existing structure except for a 1’-8” W by 12’-1” D section set on a slab-to-grade foundation.
4. West elevation will read as follows (from south to north): three-over-one, double hung, aluminum-clad wood window that will measure 34 1/8” W by 72 3/4” H; three-over-one, double hung, aluminum-clad wood window that will measure 34 1/8” W by 72 3/4” H; three-over-one, double hung, aluminum-clad wood window that will measure 26 1/8” W by 48 3/4” H; paired, three-over-one, double hung, aluminum-clad wood window that will measure 51 1/2” W by 48 3/4” H.
5. North (rear) elevation will read as follows (from east to west): three-over-one, double hung, aluminum-clad wood window that will measure 34 1/8” W by 72 3/4” H; three-over-one, double hung, aluminum-clad wood window that will measure 34 1/8” W by 72 3/4” H.
6. East elevation will read as follows (from south to north): three-over-one, double hung, aluminum-clad wood window that will measure 38 1/8” W by 72 3/4” H; double-leaf entry; three-over-one, double hung,

aluminum-clad wood window that will measure 38 1/8" W by 72 3/4" H. All fenestrations will be sheltered by an inset porch. A flight of three stairs will provided access to the porch.

7. South elevation of the projection will read as follows: paired, three-over-one, double hung, aluminum-clad wood window that will measure 51 1/2" W by 60 3/4" H.
8. East elevation of the projection will read as follows (from south to north): a ribbon consisting of three, three-over-one, double hung, aluminum-clad wood window that will measure 76 7/8" W by 602 3/4" H; double-leaf entry.

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

• 6.9 Place an addition so that it is subordinate to the historic residential structure.
  o Place and design an addition to the rear or side of the historic building wherever possible.
  o 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.
  o Design the massing of an addition to appear subordinate to the historic building.
  o Where feasible, use a lower-scale connecting element to join an addition to a historic structure.
  o 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.
  o Design the height of an addition to be proportionate with the historic building, paying particular attention to the foundation and other horizontal elements.
  o 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.
  o Use a physical break or setback from the original exterior wall to visually separate the old from new.
  o 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.
  o 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.
  o Use a material with proven durability.
  o Use a material with a similar appearance in profile, texture and composition to those on the original building.
  o Choose a color and finish that matches or blends with those of the historic building.
  o Do not use a material with a composition that will impair the structural integrity and visual character of the building.
  o Do not use a faux stucco application.

• 6.14 Design a roof of an addition to be compatible with the existing historic building.
  o Design a roof shape, pitch, material and level of complexity to be similar to those of the existing historic building.
  o 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.
o 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.
o Where possible, locate a dormer or skylight on a new addition in an inconspicuous location.
o In most cases, match a roof and window on a dormer to those of the original building.

• 6.20 Use details that are similar in character to those on the historic structure.
o Match a detail on an addition to match the original historic structure in profile, dimension and material.
o Use ornamentation on an addition that is less elaborate than that on the original structure.
o Use a material for details on an addition that match those of the original in quality and feel.
o 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.
o Size, place and space a window for an addition to be in character with the original historic building.
o 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.

ACCEPTABLE WINDOW MATERIALS

o 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

o Materials that do not appear similar to the original in texture, profile and finish are unacceptable. These often include:
- Vinyl
- Mill-finished aluminum
- Interior snap-in muntins (except when used in concert with exterior muntins and intervening dividers)

STAFF ANALYSIS

The subject property is a contributing structure to the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. The application under review proposes a one-story addition measuring 35’-6” W by 41’-0” D on the north (rear) elevation.

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. This application mostly achieves the scale and rhythm objectives with the placement of the addition on the rear of the property, which allows for the addition to harmonize with the original building. Additionally, the roof proposed for the for the addition also sits subordinate to the height of the existing primary roof. Foundation and ceiling heights proposed for the addition match those of the existing house. (6.9 – 6.11, 6.14, 6.15)

The *Guidelines* also say to clearly differentiate the exterior walls of the existing structure and the addition. The applicant has stated that the new structure will match as closely as possible to the current finishes, maintaining its architectural integrity and visual character. (6.13) The inset porch and the gable roof project create a physical break where the addition begins. A piece of vertical trim board between the existing dwelling and the addition will further distinguish new from old (6.12). The addition will also feature new aluminum-clad wood three-over-one windows that would match the existing windows in materials, profile, and design (6.21).

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Ms. Sarah Brock, contractor, was present to represent the application.

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. McNair voiced his appreciation that the addition will be clearly delineated from the original structure. Ms. Maurin agreed.

FINDING FACTS

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

Ms. Maurin seconded the motion, and all approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

Mr. Howle seconded the motion, and all approved.

Agenda Item #2

Certified Record 2026-56-CA

DETAILS

Location:
105 S Jefferson Street

Summary of Request:
After-the-fact application to paint a 12’ x 15’ mural on north elevation of 105 S Jefferson Strret, facing Government Street.

Applicant (as applicable):
Rashawn Figures

Property Owner:
Figures Investment Inc.

Historic District:
Church Street East

Classification:
Non-contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The wall sign/mural exceeds the 64-square-foot signage allowance for the properties within a local historic district.
- The wall/sign covers a secondary elevation of a new construction with previously painted brick.

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 non-contributing structure was constructed c.2025. It consists of three two-story, frame townhouses clad in brick veneer. The parcel was previously occupied by a one-story dwelling with a full-width porch as seen on the 1891 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map. A similar structure with the addition of two garages at 107 S Jefferson and 109 S Jefferson occupy the parcel through the 1924 Sanborn Map. The subject town houses appear in a 2025 aerial.

According to Historic Development Department Records, this property has appeared 2 times before the Architectural Review Board. On August 7, 2024, approval was given to construct three two-story town houses after submitting revised plans. On July 17th, 2024, the application was withdrawn due to suggested changes regarding the roof height and use of materials to harmonize better with the surrounding historic structures.

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Paint a wall sign/mural on the north (Government St.) elevation.
    a. The sign consists of a child looking through a window.
    b. The sign will measure 12’-0” W x 15’-0” H.

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

11.3 Design a new sign to be compatible with the character if a building and the district.
11.5 New signs are restricted to a maximum of 64 square feet.
11.6 Place a sign to be compatible with those in the district.

- When placing a new sign on a historic building, locate a sign to emphasize design elements of the historic building façade.
- Mount a sign to fit within existing architectural features.

11.7 Use a sign material that is compatible with the materials of the building on which it is placed and the district. New materials that achieve the effect of traditional materials and lighting solutions will be considered on case-by-case basis.

- Do not use highly reflective materials for a sing. All plastic faced box signs are not allowed.
- Design a sign to be subordinate to the building facade.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The property under review is a non-contributing, newly constructed structure in the Church Street East Historic District. This after-the-fact application involves the installation of a painted wall sign on the north facing (secondary) elevation.

The *Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic District* (Guidelines) direct that new signage in historic districts be “compatible with the character of a building and the district.” (11.3, 11.6) The proposed sign material and size – although outside the 64 square feet allowance – would be consistent with the established historic precedent of painting large commercial signage on secondary elevations of downtown commercial buildings in Mobile (fig 6–8). (11.5, 11.7) Moreover, multiple brick commercial buildings in the immediate vicinity of the subject property feature extensive wall murals on their secondary elevations. The proposed wall sign would not result in a significant aesthetic change to the subject property (which is new construction) or the surrounding street scape.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Rashawn Figures was present to represent the application.

Apollo, local artist, was present to speak in favor of the application.

Ms. Gail Lea, resident of DeTonti Square neighborhood, was present to express her concern that the mural did not get approval before being painted.

Mr. Figures suggested that Historic Development staff should be able to approve murals without them having to go before the Board. He stated that the mural has been well received by the community.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Blackwell pointed out that the mural is painted on a non-contributing building and is reversible. Mr. Blackwell advised Mr. Figures to make sure he gets proper approval before painting another mural.

Mr. McNair asked if the brick was already painted. Ms. Allen clarified that the structure was already painted. Mr. McNair stated that the mural does not detract from the historic character of the neighborhood.

Ms. Pfieffer-Traylor asked Mr. Figures if he had gone through the approval process before to get a mural painted within a historic district. He responded that yes, he had been through the application process before. He stated that for this mural he did not have enough time to get approval. He wanted the mural finished in time to participate in Mural Week, a special event being held in Mobile.

FINDING FACTS

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

Mr. Howle seconded the motion, and all approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

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

Architectural Review Board
October 7, 2026

Agenda Item # 3

Certified Record 2026-57-CA

DETAILS

Location:
851 Church Street/R022906400010344.

Summary of Request:
Construct two-story mixed-used structure

Applicant (as applicable):
Figures construction & Development, INC

Property Owner:
Same

Historic District:
Church Street East

Classification:
Vacant

Summary of Analysis:

- The vacant lot proposed for redevelopment is located at the western end of the historic district and is surrounded by many vacant lots and non-contributing structures.
- The overall size, massing, placement, and orientation of the proposed design are in keeping with adjacent contributing structures and the district as a whole.
- Minor points of contention include the textured fiber-cement siding and a door on the west side elevation, which does not align with the head heights of windows on that elevation.
- The head height of the west side entrance door does not align with window head heights on the west elevation.

Report Contents:

Property and Application History 2
Scope of Work 2
Applicable Standards 3
Staff Analysis 6
Attachments 10

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 property proposed for development is vacant. Depicted on the 1891 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map is a one-story frame dwelling with a partial width porch on the north elevation and a one-story rear addition. Located south of the dwelling is a one-story frame accessory structure. When the Sanborn maps were updated in 1904, the property was divided into 851 and 851 ½ Church and the previous structure was replaced by two one-story frame dwellings with full width porches. A one-story frame accessory structure was located south of the dwelling at 851 ½ Church. The two dwellings are seen again in the 1924 Sanborn Map. Aerial photographs suggest the buildings were razed sometime between 1955 and 1967.

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

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Construct a two-story mixed-use structure.
   a. The proposed structure would be rectangular in shape and would measure 35’ - 6” wide by 79’ - 1” deep. The height of the building to top of the roof to be 31’ - 2 ½”. Ceiling heights for first and second floors are 12’-6” and 9’-0”, respectively.
   b. The structure would be located on the lot such that it would sit 12’ - 0” back from the north (front) property line. The east and west yards would measure approximately 7’ - 0” and 11’ - 6”, respectively.
   c. The façade would be articulated with a two-sided wrap-around double gallery. The first and second stories would be clad in fiber-cement lap siding. A decorative trim would run across all four elevations and serve to define the division between the first and second stories.
   d. The hipped roof would be clad in shingles in the weather wood color, or 5V metal-panel roof.
   e. The foundation would be slab-on-grade clad in brick veneer and would measure 2’ - 0” in height.
   f. Fenestration: All windows would be aluminum-clad wood and bronze in color. Each door would have a six-light pane-and-panel design.
   g. Elevations would appear as follows.
      1) North façade (from west to east)
      First story - a flight of three stairs will access the two-sided wrap-around gallery, which features simple square columns and a decorative railing. Sheltered by the gallery is one-over-one window topped by a transom, a door topped by a transom, paired one-over-one windows with transoms, and a one-over-one window with transom.
      Second story – a two-sided wrap-around gallery with simple square columns and a decorative railing. Sheltered by the gallery are four one-over-one windows topped by transoms.
      2) South (rear) elevation (from west to east)
      First story - two one-over-one windows with transoms.
      Second story - two one-over-one windows.
      3) East elevation (from north to south)
      First story - a side gallery with simple square columns and a decorative railing will run a partial width of the elevation and be accessed by a flight of two stairs. Sheltered by the gallery will be a door topped by a transom, a faux window with shutters, and a one-over-one window topped by a transom. Located south (left) of the porch are four one-over-one windows topped by transoms.

Secon story - a side gallery with simple square columns and a decorative railing, will run a partial width of the elevation. Sheltered by the gallery will be a door, a faux window with shutters, and a one-over-one window. Located south (left) of the porch are four one-over-one windows.

4) West elevation (from north to south)
First story - a paired one-over-one window topped by a transom. Located south (left) of the window is a door accessed by a ramp clad in brick veneer siding.
Second story - a one-light fixed window, two one-over-one windows, and two horizontal slit windows.

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

1. **6.34** Maintain the visual line created by the fronts of buildings along a street.
    - Where front yard setbacks are uniform, place a new structure in general alignment with its neighbors.
    - Where front yard setbacks vary, place a new structure within the established range of front yard setbacks on a block.
2. **6.35** Maintain the side yard spacing pattern on the block.
    - Locate a structure to preserve the side yard spacing pattern on the block as seen from the street.
    - Provide sufficient side setbacks for property maintenance.
    - Provide sufficient side setbacks to allow needed parking to occur behind the front wall of the house.
3. **6.36** Design the massing of new construction to appear similar to that of historic buildings in the district.
    - Choose the massing and shape of the new structure to maintain a rhythm of massing along the street.
    - Match the proportions of the front elevations of a new structure with those in the surrounding district.
4. **6.37** Design the scale of new construction to appear similar to that of historic buildings in the district.
    - Use a building height in front that is compatible with adjacent contributing properties.
    - Size foundation and floor heights to appear similar to those of nearby historic buildings
    - Match the scale of a porch to the main building and reflect the scale of porches of nearby historic buildings.
5. **6.38** Design exterior building walls to reflect traditional development patterns of nearby historic buildings.
    - Use a ratio of solid to void that is similar in proportion to those of nearby historic buildings.
    - Reflect the rhythm of windows and doors in a similar fashion on all exterior building walls. The ARB will consider all building walls; however, building walls facing streets may face increased scrutiny.
    - Use steps and balustrades in a similar fashion as nearby historic structures.
    - Design building elements on exterior building walls to be compatible with those on nearby historic buildings. These elements include, but are not limited to:
        - Balconies
        - Chimneys
        - Dormers
6. **6.39** Use exterior materials and finishes that complement the character of the surrounding district.
    - Use material, ornamentation or a color scheme that blends with the historic district rather than making the building stand out.
    - If an alternative material is used that represents an evolution of a traditional material, suggest the finish of the original historic material from which it evolved.
    - Use a material with proven durability in the Mobile climate and that is similar in scale, character and finish to those used on nearby historic buildings.

ACCEPTABLE MATERIALS

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

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

UNACCEPTABLE MATERIALS

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

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

7. **6.40** Design a roof on new construction to be compatible with those on adjacent historic buildings.
   - Design the roof shape, height, pitch, and overall complexity to be similar to those on nearby historic buildings.
   - Use materials that appear similar in character, scale, texture, and color range to those on nearby historic buildings.
   - New materials that have proven durability may be used.

   ACCEPTABLE ROOF MATERIALS

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

   - Asphalt dimensional or multi-tab shingles
   - Wood shake or shingle
   - Standing seam metal
   - Metal shingles
   - 5-V crimp metal
   - Clay tile
   - Imitation clay tile or slate
8. **6.41** Design a new door and doorway on new construction to be compatible with the historic district.
   - Place and size a door to establish a solid-to-void ratio similar to that of nearby historic buildings.
   - Place a door in a fashion that contributes to the traditional rhythm of the district as seen in nearby historic buildings.
   - Incorporate a door casement and trim similar to those seen on nearby historic buildings.
   - Place and size a special feature, including a transom, sidelight or decorative framing element, to complement those seen in nearby historic buildings.
   - Use a door material that blends well with surrounding historic buildings. Wood is preferred. Paneled doors with or without glass are generally appropriate.
9. **6.43** 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

10. **6.44** Use details and ornamentation that help new construction integrate with the historic buildings in the district.
    - Use a decorative detail in a manner similar to those on nearby historic buildings. A modern interpretation of a historic detail or decoration is encouraged.
    - Do not use a decorative detail that overpowers or negatively impacts nearby historic buildings.
11. **6.45** Locate and design windows to be compatible with those in the district.
    - Locate and size a window to create a solid-to-void ratio similar to the ratios seen on nearby historic buildings.
    - Locate a window to create a traditional rhythm and a proportion of openings similar to that seen in nearby historic buildings.
    - Use a traditional window casement and trim similar to those seen in nearby historic buildings.
    - Place a window to match the height of the front doorway.
    - Place a window so that there is proportionate space between the window and the floor level.
    - Do not place a window to directly abut the fascia of a building.
    - Use a window material that is compatible with other building materials.
    - Do not use a reflective or tinted glass window.
    - Use a 1/1 window instead of window with false muntins. A double paned window may be acceptable if the interior dividers and dimensional muntins are used on multi-light windows. A double paned 1/1 window is acceptable.
    - Do not use false, interior muntins except as stated above.
    - Recess window openings on masonry buildings.
    - Use a window opening with a raised surround on a wood frame building.

ACCEPTABLE WINDOW MATERIALS

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

- Wood
- Vinyl-clad wood

- Aluminum-clad customized wood
- Extruded Aluminum

UNACCEPTABLE WINDOW MATERIALS

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

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

12. **10.5** Visually connect the street and building.
    - Maintain or install a walkway leading directly from the sidewalk to the main building entry.
13. **10.7** Minimize the visual impact of parking.
    - Locate a parking area at the rear or to the side of a site whenever possible.
    - Use landscaping to screen a parking area.
    - Minimize the widths of a paved area or a curb cut.
    - If a curb cut is no longer in use, repair the curb. In some areas, granite curbs may be required.
    - Do not use paving in the front yard for a parking area. Paving stones might be acceptable in certain instances. Do not create a new driveway or garage that opens onto a primary street.
    - Do not create a new driveway or garage that opens onto a primary street.
14. **10.10** Provide a landscaped front yard for a residential property in a historic district.
    - Maintain a predominant appearance of a planted front yard/lawn.
    - Minimize paved areas in a front yard.
    - Consider using decorative modular pavers, grass and cellular paving systems in order to minimize the impact of hard surface paving where grass or other plant materials are not used.
    - In commercial areas, consider using landscaping to screen and soften the appearance of surface parking areas. Use an internal and perimeter landscaping treatment to screen a fenced or walled parking area.
    - Do not use landscaping to hide a design feature that is inconsistent with these Design Review Guidelines.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The property under review is a vacant lot parcel located in the Church Street East Historic District. The application requests approval to construct a single-family residence on a corner lot at 851 Church Street. The corner lot is adjacent to multiple vacant lots, and nearby contributing structures vary significantly in size and massing. The structure is somewhat larger than its nearest neighboring structure, but overall, it falls within the wide range of building sizes and typologies of the surrounding blocks. The proposed materials and neo-traditional design broadly comply with the *Design Guidelines*. Points of contention include the faux woodgrain textured siding and a west side entrance door, which is out of scale with windows on that elevation.

The *Guidelines* direct that new construction should be compatible with adjacent contributing properties and the district as a whole without trying to copy a single historic building or architectural style. To achieve this, the *Guidelines* focus primarily on building placement, orientation, scale, massing, and materials. The overall style and detailing of a building are of the least concern, though these too should be compatible with adjacent contributing properties and the district as a whole.

Placement and Orientation

The spatial relationship of the property to its nearest neighbors is the most crucial aspect of the design, with an emphasis placed on front and side setbacks and orientation to the public right-of-way. New buildings should have front and side setbacks that fall within the range already established by adjacent contributing structures. A

deviation from this established pattern may be appropriate if it mitigates another undesirable site condition, such as a wider side setback that allows parking to be placed at the rear rather than the front of a property (6.35).

The proposed front setback of 12'0" is within the established front setback range for nearby contributing structures. The nearest contributing structure, and in fact the only extant contributing structure on this block of Church Street, sits approximately 11' to 12' back from the public sidewalk. Setbacks for contributing structures on adjacent blocks range from approximately 5' to 20'.

The proposed side setbacks of 7'-0" and 11'-6" are likewise in keeping with the established range of side setbacks. The dwelling at 855 Church Street has side setbacks of 0'-0" and 16'-0". Contributing properties on adjacent blocks have side setbacks ranging from 0'-0" to 15'-0" for their narrower side yard and 11'-0" to 30'-0" for their wider side yard.

Size and Massing

After placement and orientation, it is most important to consider the overall size and massing of a new building. This includes the overall building footprint and height as well as the complexity of the building shape, relative proportions of building elements, and the pattern and placement of window and door openings. New buildings should be of a comparable size and mass to their neighbors (6.36, 6.37). For buildings that are larger than their neighbors, the Board may consider design strategies that mitigate any disparity when viewed from the public right-of-way (p. 70). In addition to overall size, the Board should also consider the overall massing of the structure – that is, how simple or complex the geometry of the structure is, and the relative volumes of major building component, such as wall planes, roofs, and porches. In general, these aspects of building massing should be comparable to what is seen on nearby adjacent contributing properties. The solid-to-void ratio – that is, the ratio of solid wall space to window and door openings – should also be comparable to that of adjacent contributing properties and the district (6.36, 6.38, 6.40, 6.42).

The location of the subject lot makes it difficult to compare the size and massing of the proposed structure directly to adjacent contributing structures. Most of the surrounding lots are vacant and what contributing structures do remain display a wide range of sizes and massing. The proposed design falls within this broad array of building heights and widths, though it skews somewhat larger than many of the nearest contributing dwellings.

There is only one contributing structure extant on this block of Church Street. This is 855 Church Street, a raised one-story cottage directly west of the subject lot. The north side of this block of Church Street is entirely vacant, as is the corner lot immediately east across S. Jefferson Street from the subject property. After 855 Church Street, the next nearest contributing properties are a one-and-a-half story raised cottage at 153 S. Jefferson Street and the Big Zion African Methodist Episcopal Church at the corner of Church and S. Bayou Streets. Nearby streets likewise demonstrate a wide range of building sizes and typologies. S. Jefferson Street primarily features one-story cottages and shotgun dwellings that are rectangular in plan with their long axis running perpendicular to the street. Extant dwellings on Church and S. Broad Street are also one story but more square in plan with facades that are four or five bays wide. Dwellings and mixed-use buildings on Government and S. Bayou Streets are typically two-stories and rectangular in plan with their long axis perpendicular to the street.

The proposed design is for a two-story dwelling with a facade that is five bays wide. While the nearest contributing dwellings are less than two stories in height, the contributing ecclesiastical building immediately northeast of the lot is comparable in height to a three or four-story residence. Two-story residences are also found on neighboring blocks of S. Bayou and Government Streets. The proposed facade width of 35'-6" is comparable to those of 855 Church Street and 153 S. Jefferson Street. The double gallery is comparable in scale to the two-story porches at 108 S. Bayou Street and 803 Government Street. The cross-hip roof structure is comparable in size and form to dwellings at 106 and 108 S. Bayou Streets.

The proposed fenestration patterns for the north facade and east and west elevations are generally in keeping with contributing properties in the district. The paired windows on the first floor of the north facade are a minor

departure from established fenestration patterns, but the dwelling at 106 S. Bayou Street also features irregular spacing of windows and doors on its first-floor facade. Irregular window dimensions and spacing on the west side elevation are likewise of minimal concern. While fenestration tends to be more regular on the facade and highly visible side elevations of contributing dwellings, side elevations along a narrow side yard tend to feature more varied window sizes and irregular spacing of openings to align with interior room divisions and staircases. The fact that the door head height and window head heights do not align on the west elevation is more concerning. This could be remedied with the addition of a transom over the west side door.

Materials

After its spatial relationship to its neighbors, the materials used in the construction of a new building are of the utmost concern. The *Guidelines* provide lists of materials that are appropriate and inappropriate for new construction. In general, those materials listed as "inappropriate" should not be allowed in new construction. The use of alternative materials – that is, modern materials not explicitly approved by the *Guidelines* – may be appropriate, provided that the new materials are visually compatible with the district and demonstrate proven durability in Mobile's climate (p. 24-25).

The proposed materials are listed as appropriate for new construction in the *Guidelines,* with the exception of the faux woodgrain texture specified for the fiber-cement siding. The *Guidelines* state that smooth fiber-cement siding is preferred to textured. It is a common misconception that textured fiber-cement boards are more "authentic" or historically appropriate. While rustic vernacular buildings may have had raw sawn lumber cladding, historic wood siding was usually planed smooth so that woodgrain was not visible after painting.

Style and Details

Architectural style and details should only be considered after a design is shown to comply with the more pressing design characteristics discussed above. In general, the *Guidelines* are lenient on what style or degree of detailing is appropriate for new construction. The *Guidelines* state that contemporary design styles are appropriate within the local historic districts, provided the new construction does not detract from nearby contributing properties (P. 28). The *Guidelines* also allow for more traditional design styles while discouraging designs that replicate a historic building or style (p. 66-67).

The proposed design is overtly neo-traditional but with sufficient modern elements to identify it as belonging to the 21st Century. In particular, the transoms over the first-floor windows would not have been used traditionally and immediately identify the structure as modern. The box columns and picket railings are appropriately simplified versions of more traditional design features.

Site Considerations

The *Guidelines* aim to limit the visual impact of parking on the public right-of-way and to encourage connection between buildings and the pedestrian realm. To this end, the *Guidelines* state that parking should be located at the rear or side of a site whenever possible. Landscaping may be used to screen parking that is visible from the public right-of-way. The *Guidelines* advise against using paving in the front yard for a parking area (10.7). The *Guidelines* also direct that a walkway should connect the main building entry to the public sidewalk (10.5). The proposed parking area shown on the site plan is not compliant with these directives related to parking. While the existing site wall will screen the front yard parking area from view, it still impedes the pedestrian connection between the dwelling and the public realm. In particular, the front yard paving makes it impossible for a pedestrian walkway to lead directly from the main entry to the public sidewalk.

The site plan does not include any site fences or walls. A concrete parking pad is located to the rear of the building, in compliance with the *Design Guidelines*. Concrete walkways connect both the public sidewalk and the rear parking pad to the front porch.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Rashawn Figures, owner of the property, was present to represent the application.

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Maurin inquired about the second-floor porch railing. Mr. Figures stated that the railing will be identical to the iron railing used on townhomes he constructed across the street. Ms. Maurin asked Mr. Figures if he would consider using wood for the railing instead of iron. He stated that he was open to using wood railing.

Ms. Roselius stated that she did not see a problem with the proposed iron railing.

Mr. Howle appreciated that the structure would be mixed use. He agreed with Ms. Maruin that a wood railing would make more sense. Mr. Howle also suggested using smooth siding instead of textured siding.

Ms. Pfieffer-Traylor asked about the roof material, whether it would be metal or asphalt shingles. Mr. Figures was open to either option.

Mr. McNair asked Mr. Figures why transoms would be placed above the first-floor windows but not the second-floor windows. Mr. Figures stated that because the first floor will be used as commercial space, he wanted to have larger windows.

Mr. McNair asked whether the shutters will be operable. Mr. Figures stated that the shutters will be used to create a faux window.

FINDING FACTS

Mr. Blackwell moved to find the facts as amended, noting that railing and roof materials will be chosen later and smooth siding will be used.

Ms. Maurin seconded the motion, and all approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

Ms. Maurin seconded the motion, and all approved.

Architectural Review Board
October 7, 2026

Agenda Item #4
Certified Record 2026-58-CA

DETAILS

Location:
960 Dauphin Street

Summary of Request:
Fence

Applicant (as applicable):
Robert Brown

Property Owner:
Same

Historic District:
Old Dauphin Way

Classification:
Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The existing fences proposed for removal are not original to the property and have been in place for less than fifty years.
- The proposed new fence uses approvable materials in a configuration that is comparable to other fences at adjacent contributing properties.
- The fence would exceed the 48-inch maximum height allowed for front-yard fences. It should be noted that the *Guidelines* are inconsistent regarding the appropriate height of a metal front-yard fence and unclear on whether a brick coping should count toward the overall height of an aluminum front-yard fence.

Report Contents:

Property and Application History 2
Scope of Work 2
Applicable Standards 3
Staff Analysis 4
Attachments 6

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-story, wood-frame, side-hall house with rear service wing was constructed c. 1860. The 1878 Hopkins map shows the original side-hall plan with offset rear service wing and one outbuilding located at the northwest corner of the property. The 1904 Sanborn map shows the historic footprint of the house with a porch wrapping the east and north elevations of the service wing. Four outbuildings were present. Representations on the 1925 and 1956 Sanborn maps are identical. The historic porches along the east and north elevations were removed and a rear addition constructed sometime after 1956. The property is protected by a façade easement held by the Mobile Historic Development Commission, who approved the changes proposed in this application on May 6, 2024.

According to Historic Development Department files, this property has appeared five times previously before the Architectural Review Board (ARB).

In 2003, the ARB approved the addition of a screened porch at the northwest corner of the house, the enclosure with glass of the existing two-story gallery on the east elevation of the rear service wing, installation of a 6' privacy fence, and the construction of a porte-cochere. It appears the screened porch and porte-cochere were never constructed. In November 2020 and April 2021, the ARB approved two similar applications to make significant alterations, including construction of a free-standing garage, construction of a two-story porch on the 20th-century rear addition, fenestration changes, and construction of a driveway gate. These projects were stalled during the selective demolition phase and never completed.

In May 2024, the Board approved the construction of a two-story porch and a deck on the east side elevation of a 19th-century addition, minor changes to the fenestration pattern, and wholesale replacement of existing windows. In November 2024, the Board agreed to amend the previous approval to allow the applicant to alter window sizes to allow installation of stock instead of custom windows. At the same time, the Board approved replacing the wood siding on sides and rear with fiber cement siding and some minor alterations to the design of the previously approved two-story side porch. In May 2026, the Board heard an after-the-fact application to remove and replace the original Italianate door and surround with modern French doors. The Board required that the applicant return with an alternative scope of work. In June 2026, the Board approved an amended application to replicate the original door and restore the original sidelights and transom.

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Remove existing iron fence along south (street-facing) property line.
2. Remove existing wire fences along east and west property lines.
3. Install new metal fencing with brick coping and brick piers along south, west, and east property lines.
    a. Materials: Aluminum fencing set on brick coping with brick piers
    b. Total Fence Height: 4'-6" to 5'-0"
        i. Height of brick coping: 1'-6"
        ii. Height of metal fencing: 3'-0"
        iii. Height of brick piers: 5'-0"
    c. Bricks piers will be spaced at regular intervals between 8 and 10 feet apart.

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

- 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".
    - Install a simple wood-and-wire fence, provided that it is appropriate to the style of the house and does not exceed 48" in height as measured from grade. If combined with a wall, the total vertical dimension of the wall and fence collectively should not exceed 48".
    - Install a cast-iron or other metal fence not exceeding 36" in height if located in the front yard. 48" shall be considered under certain circumstances. Coping walls located below cast-iron fencing may be appropriate in certain locations and do not count toward the total height.
    - 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 subject property is a contributing structure to the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The application under review proposes removing an existing fencing and constructing with a new brick and metal fence that exceeds the max 48-inch height that the *Guidelines* allows for front-yard fences. The existing fence is not historic, and the new fencing would be in keeping with similar fences along Dauphin Street. The existing *Design Guidelines* are inconsistent on which height (36" or 48") is appropriate for front-yard fences and on whether a brick coping wall counts toward the overall height of a fence.

The *Design Guidelines* state that "historically significant" cast iron fences should be maintained (10.1). The *Guidelines* state that new fences should be "compatible with the architectural style of the house and existing fences in the neighborhood" (10.2). The *Guidelines* are unclear and self-contradictory when it comes to the allowable height of new front-yard fences. Simple "wood or wire" fences are "ordinarily restricted to 36 inches" but a height of 48 inches may be allowed "depending on the location of the fence." However, a simple "wood-and-wire fence," is allowed a max height up to 48 inches. The *Guidelines* state on page 118 that "a cast-iron or other metal fence" should not exceed 36 inches but add that "48 inches shall be considered under certain circumstances." However, on the following page, the *Guidelines* state outright that a cast-iron or other metal fence may be 48 inches in height.

Likewise, the *Guidelines* are unclear as to whether a brick coping wall does or does not count toward the overall height of a fence. For wood, wire, and wood-and-wire fences, the *Guidelines* state that the coping should be calculated in the overall height of the fence. For cast-iron fencing, the *Guidelines* that that the coping should not be calculated in the overall height. The *Guidelines* do not state whether the coping should be calculated as part of the overall height of an aluminum fence (10.2).

The existing iron fence at 960 Dauphin Street does not appear in survey photographs taken in the 1980s. The fence is therefore not original to the structure and has been in place less than 50 years. Removal of the existing fence will therefore not result in the loss of historic architectural material. The proposed replacement fence pulls inspiration from an existing brick-and-metal fence located across the street at 1001 Dauphin Street. The proposed fence is also in keeping with the style and period of the subject property.

At between 54 and 60 inches, the total height of the fence would exceed the 48-inch height allowed for front-yard fences in the *Design Guidelines*. As stated above, the *Guidelines* are inconsistent on whether the masonry coping should be counted in the overall height of the fence. Given this lack of clear guidance, the Board should consider the overall impact of the fence on the property, regardless of its height. The open nature of the proposed metal fence will not significantly alter views of the property from the public right-of-way. The increased height is unlikely to have a negative impact on the property or the surrounding district.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Blackwell exited the meeting at 3:28pm, moments before the application was presented to the board. He did not return to the meeting.

Mr. Robert Brown, owner of the property, was present to represent the application.

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Roselius asked how tall the fence is currently. Mr. Brown responded that the fence is 3 feet tall.

Mr. McNair asked staff if the new fence would need a height variance. Ms. Wilson clarified that the fencing portion of the proposed design will fit within the current historic district guidelines. But the added coping will exceed height recommendations in the guidelines.

Ms. Roselius opined that the proposed height of the fence would be an improvement over the current fence. Mr. Howle agreed.

Ms. Maurin asked Mr. Brown if he had selected a brick for the fence columns and base. Mr. Brown stated the brick will be a white old Mobile brick. The caps will be made of concrete.

Ms. Pfieffer-Traylor inquired about the entry gate. She asked if the brick columns on either side of the entry gate would be taller than the other columns. Mr. Brown stated he was open to recommendations from the Board.

Mr. Howle stated that Mr. Brown would probably need a taller entry gate than the one currently installed.

Ms. Roselius stated that she was open to amending the facts to include brick color and granting staff the power to make approvals later for the entry gate design.

Ms. Pfieffer-Traylor inquired about the low concrete curb separating the front yard from the sidewalk. Mr. Brown stated that the curb will remain in place and the new fence will be built right behind it.

Ms. Maurin expressed concern over the proposed brick color. Mr. Brown stated that he chose a white brick so that he would not have to paint the brick white. Ms. Roselius stated that she was okay with the brick selection. Ms. Pfieffer-Traylor agreed.

FINDING FACTS

Mr. McNair moved to find the facts as amended, granting staff the power to approve gate design and brick color.

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

Ms. Pfieffer-Traylor seconded the motion.

The motion passed on a 4:1 vote, with Ms. Maurin voting to deny.

Architectural Review Board
October 7, 2026

Agenda Item #5
Certified Record 2026-59-CA

DETAILS

Location:
1206 Elmira Street

Summary of Request:
After-the-fact approval to remove all existing wood windows and replace with vinyl windows; after-the-fact approval to paint brick foundation, knee wall, and column piers.

Applicant (as applicable):
Khalen Mason

Property Owner:
Bobby Dixon (c/o Khalen Mason)

Historic District:
Oakleigh Garden

Classification:
Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The *Design Guidelines* state that existing historic windows should be repaired instead of replaced whenever possible. When appropriate, replacement windows should match the original in size, location, and light configuration.
- The *Design Guidelines* list vinyl replacement windows as inappropriate in the local historic districts.
- Exterior brick foundations and porch have been partially painted. While painting unpainted historic masonry is not compliant with the *Guidelines*, the visual impact is minimal in this case.

Report Contents:

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

PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

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

The subject property is a one-story wood-frame Craftsman bungalow, constructed c. 1929, the first year that the address appears in the Mobile City Directory. The bungalow has a front gable roof and a prominent porch with its own gable roof. The porch features square wood columns on masonry piers with a low masonry knee wall instead of a porch railing or balustrade. Concrete copings cap the masonry piers and knee walls. The yellow face brick on the porch and porch stair continues onto the raised continuous foundation of the main dwelling. The house itself is clad in wood clapboards. The dwelling originally featured double-hung wood windows with a four-over-one light pattern typical of the Craftsman style.

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

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Remove all existing wood 4-over-1 wood windows and replace with 1-over-1 vinyl windows to fit the openings.
2. Paint side knee walls of brick porch and foundation at south façade black.

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

1. 5.05 Preserve and restore the visibility of original historic materials.
    - Do not cover or obscure original building materials.
2. 5.08 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.
3. 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.
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. 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 subject property is listed as contributing in Oakleigh Garden Historic District. The application under review seeks after-the-fact approval for the removal and replacement of all original four-over-one wood windows with one-over-one vinyl windows that appear to fit the existing window openings. The application also seeks after-the-fact approval to paint the brick raised foundation, porch stair, knee wall, and column piers, as well as the concrete coping.

The *Guidelines* recommend that historic windows that are intact and in repairable condition be retained and repaired, and those that are not repairable be replaced with new windows that are consistent with the existing in location, framing, and light configuration. (5.20, 5.21). Acceptable replacement window materials include wood and aluminum-clad wood. According to the Guidelines, the Board should first consider the condition of the existing windows. If the existing windows are beyond the point of reasonable repair, the Board should then consider the materials, dimension, placement, configuration, and details of the proposed replacement windows. The Guidelines are unclear regarding the painting of unpainted historic masonry. The *Guidelines* specifically restrict painting "19th Century imported Philadelphia and locally manufactured brick" without mentioning appropriate treatments of other historic masonry (5.08). However, the Guidelines' explicit instruction against covering or obscuring original building materials may be generalized to discourage painting of unpainted historic masonry (5.05).

Assessment of Existing Window Condition

The original windows had already been removed by the time staff responded to a 311 complaint of unpermitted work in a local historic district. The condition of the original windows is unknown.

Replacement Windows

The existing replacement windows are non-compliant regarding their material, configuration, and details. They appear to be compliant in their dimensions and placement.

The Design Guidelines explicitly list vinyl as inappropriate for replacement windows in existing structures in the local historic districts. The one-over-one sash configuration does not replicate the original four-over-one double-hung wood windows. However, one-over-one sash windows would have been in common use when the subject property was constructed in 1929. The replacement windows are therefore in keeping with the period of construction even if they do not exactly replicate the original appearance of this specific structure. A one-over-one configuration is also preferable to a four-over-one sash with superficial "stick-on" muntins. The addition of superficial muntins at this point would therefore not be a desirable compromise.

The replacement windows do appear to fit the existing openings. Likewise, it does not appear that any window openings were removed or added as part of the unpermitted work. The overall fenestration pattern therefore remains intact.

The primary points of mitigation are therefore the inappropriate window material and the one-over-one light configuration. The narrow side yards on this block of Elmira Street mean that most of the windows on the side of the home are minimally visible from the public right-of-way. Windows on the rear are not visible at all from the public right-of-way. One possible mitigation would be to replace the four windows on the facade and the two windows nearest the street on the east elevation with either wood or aluminum-clad wood windows with a four-over-one light configuration. These windows would need to have exterior muntins and an interior spacer bar to imitate the appearance of the original windows.

Painted Masonry Porch

When staff responded to a complaint regarding unpermitted work, the brick foundation and porch were already partially painted. Painting unpainted historic brick is not recommended because it alters the structures original material palette and design intent. Painting can also damage historic masonry if the paint used is not sufficiently vapor permeable. It is not known what type of paint was used in this application. If a masonry-specific paint formula was used, risk to the brick is minor.

The visual impact of the painted brick is far less significant than the inappropriate replacement windows. Painting is limited to the side knee walls of the front porch and the continuous foundation at the south façade. The south walls and steps of the porch remain unpainted. Paint removal is likely to cause damage and is therefore not a realistic mitigation.

Agenda Item #6
Certified Record 2026-60-CA

DETAILS

Location:
19 S Reed Avenue

Summary of Request:
Demolish a single-family dwelling.

Applicant (as applicable):
JH Builds, LLC

Property Owner:
Jerry Boykin

Historic District:
Old Dauphin Way

Classification:
Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The applicant seeks approval to demolish a contributing single-family residence that suffered severe fire damage in April 2026.
- The applicant intends to construct a new single-family residence on the lot. Specific designs for a new residence would be submitted at a later date.

Report Contents:

Property and Application History..... 2
Scope of Work..... 2
Applicable Standards 2
Staff Analysis 2
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 19 S. Reed Avenue is wood-frame raised bungalow constructed in 1909 with significant alterations dating to c. 1930. The inset porch and semi-octagonal bay are typical of folk Victorian dwellings of the early 20th Century. However, the steep gable roof and dormer are more typical of the Craftsman style. A significant increase in property value between 1930 and 1931 suggests the property underwent a significant alteration at that time. The MHDC property file cites anecdotal evidence that the c. 1930 renovation occurred after a significant fire.

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

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Demolish contributing single-family dwelling.
2. Applicant intends to construct a single-family residence on this lot. Plans for the design have not been submitted at this time.

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.
3. Nature of Proposed Development
    - Consider the future utilization of the site.

STAFF ANALYSIS

Significance of the Structure

The *Guidelines* state that determining the significance of a property should be the initial step in considering a demolition application. The structure at 19 S. Reed Avenue is listed as contributing to the National Register District. The c. 1909 bungalow underwent significant alterations dating to c. 1930 with MHDC property file citing anecdotal evidence of a c. 1930 rebuild due to a significant fire.

Prior to the fire in April 2026, the home at 19 S. Reed retained most of its character-defining features. However, the fire compromised much of the building interior and resulted in significant damage to the roof system, Craftsman style dormers, and many of the wood windows. The front porch remains largely intact, but it also shows signs of fire damage.

Condition of the Structure
According to the *Guidelines*, "demolition may be more appropriate when a building is deteriorated or in poor condition." As stated above, a fire in April 2026 significantly compromised the building interior, the roof system, rear addition, and rear porch. While rehabilitation may be technically possible, it is not known how much original material would be salvageable. It would likely require significant material replacement.

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. The styles expressed at 19 S. Reed Avenue are common within the local area. Fewer buildings show the combinations of the two styles, though examples do exist.

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 S Reed Avenue remains mostly intact, with no vacant lots seen. The deletion of the building at 19 S. Reed Avenue would interrupt the rhythm and create a vacant lot. However, the applicant has stated their intention to construct a new single-family residence on the lot. Construction of a new home would significantly mitigate any disruption of the existing streetscape. Any new construction would require approval by the Board, who would ensure that the new construction was of compatible size, massing, and overall design for the street and the district.

Nature of proposed development at the origination property
The *Guidelines* instruct that the future use of a cleared site should be considered. The applicant intends to construct a single-family residence on this lot. Plans for the design have not been submitted at this time.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Jerad Hayes, contractor, was present to represent the application.

Jerry Boykin, homeowner, was present to speak in favor of the application.

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Maurin asked Mr. Hayes if he acquired a report from a structural engineer. Mr. Hayes stated that he did not have a structural engineer's report.

Ms. Roselius opined that the structural damage looked severe. Mr. Howle agreed.

Ms. Roselius asked Mr. Hayes what his plans are for the site after demolition. Mr. Hayes stated he wants to get grass established on the site while plans are finalized for a new home to be built. Mr. Howle inquired about the timeline for getting a new home built. Mr. Hayes stated he is currently having plans drawn up and hopes to have construction begin either at the end of this year or the beginning of next year.

Ms. Maurin asked Mr. Hayes if the home was occupied by the owner at the time of the fire. Mr. Hayes responded that yes, the home was occupied by the owner.

Ms. Pfieffer-Traylor proposed amending the facts to include Mr. Hayes's plans for the site after demolition.

FINDING FACTS

Ms. Maurin moved to find the facts as amended to include plans to establish grass and build a home on the site.

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

Ms. Karrie Maurin seconded the motion, and all approved.

Architectural Review Board
October 7, 2026

Agenda Item #7
Certified Record 2026-61-CA

DETAILS

Location:
109-111 S. Conception Street

Summary of Request:
Replace 26 existing wood windows with fully operable, single-pane wood replica windows to match the existing

Applicant (as applicable):
Mike Rogers, on behalf of Rogers & Willard, Inc.

Property Owner:
Protestant Episcopal Church

Historic District:
Church Street East

Classification:
Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The existing windows exhibit several generations of past repairs and a wide array of conditions. While some are technically repairable, all require partial or full replacement of horizontal rails and repairs to both the vertical stiles and muntins.
- Windows on the north elevation are in the worst condition, while sheltered windows under the west gallery porch are in the best condition. All windows require some degree of repair.
- Proposed replacement windows would replicate exactly the materials, appearance, and function of the historic windows.

Report Contents:

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

PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

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

The subject property at 109-111 S. Conception Street consists of attached two-story twin townhouses constructed of load-bearing masonry walls. A two-story iron gallery runs the full width of the west façade. The dwellings' Greek Revival style is expressed in its classical door surrounds with rectangular transoms, decorative brick cornice, and six-over-six double-hung sash windows. On the façade, each window featured a paneled jib door below and marble lintel above. Windows on the side elevation feature simple jack arches and simple wood sills.

According to Historic Development Department records, this property has never appeared before the Architectural Review Board. In 1990, the Architectural Review Board approved the reconstruction of a rear gallery on 111 S. Conception. In 1991, the Board approved an application to install a new cast-iron fence and gate at 111 S. Conception Street that would replicate an existing cast-iron fence and gate at 109 S. Conception Street. The Board approved the enclosure of an existing porch on a rear dependency at 109-111 S. Conception Street using clear glass and white anodized aluminum storefront system in 1999. In 2008, the Board tabled discussion of an application to replace an existing rear balustrade with a fiberglass railing. This application appears to have been withdrawn, as there is no record of discussion at a later Board meeting. The Board approved various exterior repairs in June 2013. In January 2018, the Board approved removal of the existing rear gallery and storefront enclosure system (approved in 1990 and 1999, respectively) and construction of a new rear entrance pavilion.

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Remove and replace 26 original wood windows with replicated single-pane wood windows to match existing in dimension, location, light configuration, and molding profiles.
    - West (primary) façade
        - Remove and replace four windows on the first-floor level
        - Remove and replace six windows on the second-floor level
    - South elevation
        - Remove and replace four windows on the first-floor level
        - Remove and replace four windows on the second-floor level
    - North elevation
        - Remove and replace four windows on the first-floor level
        - Remove and replace four windows on the second-floor level
2. Remove and replace non-original sacristy window.

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

1. 5.20 Preserve the functional historic and decorative features of a historic window.
    - Where historic (wooden or metal) windows are intact and in repairable condition, retain and repair them to match the existing as per location, light configuration, detail and material.
    - Preserve historic window features, including the frame, sash, muntins, mullions, glazing, sills, heads, jambs, moldings, operation, and groupings of windows.
    - Repair, rather than replace, frames and sashes, wherever possible.
    - For repair of window components, epoxies and related products may serve as effective solutions to material deterioration and operational malfunction.
2. 5.21 When historic windows are not in a repairable condition, match the replacement window design to the original.

- In instances where there is a request to replace a building's windows, the new windows shall match the existing as per location, framing, and light configuration.
- Use any salvageable window components on a primary elevation.

3. ACCEPTABLE WINDOW MATERIALS
   Materials that are the same as the original, or that appear similar in texture, profile and finish to the original are acceptable. These often include:
   - Wood sash
   - Steel, if original to structure
   - Custom extruded aluminum
   - Aluminum clad wood
   - Windows approved by the National Park 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 subject property is listed as contributing in Oakleigh Garden Historic District. The application under review seeks approval to remove 26 double-hung wood sash windows and replace them with new single-pane wood windows that will replicate exactly the dimensions, light configurations, and molding profiles of the existing windows. The application also proposes replacing the non-original sacristy window to match existing.

The *Guidelines* recommend that historic windows that are intact and in repairable condition be retained and repaired, and those that are not repairable be replaced with new windows that are consistent with the existing in location, framing, and light configuration. (5.20, 5.21). Acceptable replacement window materials include wood and aluminum-clad wood. According to the Guidelines, the Board should first consider the condition of the existing windows. If the existing windows are beyond the point of reasonable repair, the Board should then consider the materials, dimension, placement, configuration, and details of the proposed replacement windows.

Assessment of Existing Window Condition
The applicant submitted a thorough window survey including interior and exterior photographs of each window as well as a detailed description of damage and deterioration to the sash and frames. The applicant also invited staff on site to view the windows from the building interior to assess the window conditions. Windows range in condition from poor to fair, and most exhibit several iterations of previous repair campaigns, including wood putty patches, epoxy repairs, and wood dutchman repairs. Many windows would require so much replacement material that repair would practically constitute reconstruction. All windows require some amount of repair work, and most require at least partial replacement or dutchman repairs.

Windows on the north elevation are in the worst condition. This is common on the north sides of buildings, where limited sun exposure creates damp conditions that accelerate wood rot and deterioration. Most windowsills on the north elevation have already been replaced due to rot. Rot is common at most horizontal rails. The upper check rails have mostly failed and would require replacement. The bottom rails show signs of rot. Some of these might repaired using epoxy, but many have been previously repaired and would require replacement. Rot is also common at the vertical stiles where they attach to the lower rails. Muntins also show signs of rot where they insert into the sash, especially at the lower rails. The window labeled 2L (north side, second floor, second from the west end) is so deteriorated that the lower half of the bottom sash fell away when the window was opened to assess its condition. This window is boarded with plywood to prevent water intrusion.

Windows on the south and west elevation are in somewhat better condition, especially the four windows sheltered under the west gallery porch. These four windows show relatively little rot. Even so, the bottom rails of both the top and lower sash may require replacement. The jib doors are in fair condition, but they lack sufficient weatherstripping. Unsheltered windows on the west and south elevations are more exposed to sun and water. This is apparent in more extensive rot at their horizontal rails, most of which require some degree of repair or replacement. Vertical stiles for these windows are in relatively good condition compared to windows on the north.

In summary, while repair is possible for many of the windows, this repair would require significant wood replacement and dutchman repairs, as well as the removal and replacement of old epoxy and putty repairs. This would require significant reconstruction of window sash that would not be far from full replacement, especially on the north elevation. As stated above, the sheltered first-floor windows on the west elevation are in the best condition and are the best candidates for repair.

Proposed Replacement Windows
The proposed replacement windows would exactly replicate the existing windows in material, dimensions, light configuration, and molding profiles. This negates the main concern with new replacement windows, which is the fact that modern double-pane wood windows can never fully replicate the aesthetics of a true single-pane divided-light window. The new replica windows would also function exactly as the existing historic windows, including the ability to disassemble the window sash for repairs and maintenance. The proposed replica windows would therefore have the same sustainability of historic wood windows in that they can be repaired multiple times over their lifetime – much as the current windows have been. Since the new windows would be fully operable with working sash cord and weights, replacement will also restore the full function of the historic windows, which many generations of delicate repairs have rendered mostly inoperable.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Lewis Golden was present to represent the application.

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Pfieffer-Traylor inquired about the jib windows. Mr. Golden stated that the jib windows will remain and will still be operational.

FINDING FACTS

Ms. Maurin moved that the Board find facts as written by staff.

Mr. Howle seconded the motion, and all approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Ms. Maurin moved that the application does not impair the architectural or historic character of the property or the district, and that the application should be granted a COA.

Mr. Howle seconded the motion, and all approved.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:11pm.