



Architectural Review Board Minutes

Sept 16, 2026 – 3:00 P.M.

ADMINISTRATIVE

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

1. Roll Call

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

Members Present: Cartledge Blackwell, Abby Davis, Stephen Howle, Stephen McNair, Jennifer Roselius, Steve Stone, and Barja Wilson

Members Absent: Karrie Maurin and Cameron Pfeiffer-Traylor

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

2. Approval of Minutes from September 2, 2026

Mr. Blackwell moved to approve the minutes of the September 2, 2026 meeting.
Mr. Stone seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.

3. Approval of Mid-Month COAs granted by Staff

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

MID-MONTH APPROVALS - APPROVED

1. **Applicant:** Bryan McCrainey
Property Address: 24 Houston Street
Date of Approval: 08/21/2026
Project: Install 36-inch wood picket fence along south property line, beginning at southeast corner of house and continuing to sidewalk.
2. **Applicant:** Anna Adcock
Property Address: 1213 Selma Street
Date of Approval: 08/24/2026
Project:
 - Remove existing deteriorated wood porch steps.
 - Construct new porch steps and cheek walls (per plans on file) using salvaged brick (per sample on file)
 - Install new iron handrail (per plans on file)
3. **Applicant:** Procision Restoration , LLC

- Property Address:** 11 Hannon Ave
Date of: 08/25/2026
Project: 1. Reroof in kind with architectural shingles.
- Shingle color: Charcoal
2. Remove metal awnings at front elevation.
3. Paint wood trim, windows, and doors.
- Color: Sherwin Williams Extra White
4. **Applicant:** Michael Dier
Property Address: 114 Lanier Ave
Date of Approval: 08/27/2026
Project: Install ridge vent on garage roof.
Patch with dark gray shingles to match existing.
5. **Applicant:** Chyrkeetra Maltbia
Property Address: 1223 Selma Street
Date of Approval: 08/27/2026
Project: 1. Install gutters on west (side) and south (rear) elevations, per submitted plans.
2. Install gutters on north, east, and west elevations of detached garage, per submitted plans.
3. Install French drain along driveway.
6. **Applicant:** Marya Bean
Property Address: 60 S Georgia Ave
Date of Approval: 08/26/2026
Project: Re-roof shed in kind to match existing.
Shingle color: black
7. **Applicant:** Joseph Pate
Property Address: 17 N Ann Street
Date of Approval: 08/28/2026
Project: Remove existing driveway paving. Install new paving within the same footprint as the existing. Install subsurface draining along new driveway.
8. **Applicant:** Pham Tuong Cong
Property Address: 106 Parker Street
Date of Approval: 08/28/2026
Project: - Re-roof with architectural shingle. Shingle color: weathered wood.
- Replace rotten wood at side and eaves in kind to match existing.
- Paint exterior. Color: Dove White.
- Add a wood deck at the back of the house (per submitted plan).
9. **Applicant:** Wendy McRae
Property Address: 456 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 09/01/2026
Project: 1. Install canopies over balconies (per submitted plans) to shed water away from balcony doors and prevent water intrusion into building interior.
- Canopies to sit on steel support brackets of similar scale to those supporting existing 1st-floor canopy. Support brackets to have a simple scroll design (per submitted plans).

- Steel brackets to be anchored into mortar joints wherever possible to prevent damage to exterior bricks.
- Canopy roofing to be galvanized metal to match existing 1st-floor canopy.
- 10. **Applicant:** Mike Rogers
Property Address: 115 S Conception Street
Date of Approval: 09/20/2026
Project: Termite repairs and patching penetrations on exterior of building
Twin Houses
Remove/replace rotten sills. Match existing materials and match existing paint
Remove vegetation growing in brick. Point brick on approximately 10% of the exterior to rectify water intrusion using type N mortar.
Cathedral
To Clean exterior masonry. Patch penetrations in exterior masonry with Cathedral Stone products to match existing as closely as possible. Install Cathedral Stone Water Repellant upon completion of patches.
Seal around windows with color matched sealant to match existing window trim color
Repaint window trim. Color to match existing
Repaint soffit and fascia. Color to match existing. Seal joints as necessary.
- 11. **Applicant:** Watkins Constructions
Property Address: 11 Monterey Street
Date of Approval: 09/02/2026
Project: 1. On rear addition, remove and replace self-adhering modified bitumen roofing in kind.
- Color: Desert tan (to match existing)
2. On rear, remove shingles around dormers to make any necessary repairs. Replace it in kind with new shingles.
- Shingle color: Driftwood (to match existing)
- 12. **Applicant:** Robert Dobson III
Property Address: 1063 Elmira Street
Date of Approval: 09/02/2026
Project: Replace rotten/damaged wood siding and porch boards as needed to match existing.
Repaint to match existing.
- 13. **Applicant:** Robert Dobson III
Property Address: 252 S Georgia Street
Date of Approval: 09/2/2026
Project: Replace rotten/damaged wood siding and porch boards as needed to match existing.
- 15. **Applicant:** Tara McCook
Property Address: 170 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 09/03/2026

- Project:** Remove and replace existing rear yard fence. Replace with 6-foot wood privacy fence at property lines around perimeter of rear yard. All fencing to be behind front plane of dwelling.
16. **Applicant:** Fortified Exteriors
Property Address: 519 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 09/03/2026
Project: - Replace shingles in kind on pitched roof and dormers.
- Shingle Color: Colonial Slate
- Install modified bitumen material on flat roof at building rear.
17. **Applicant:** Solark Development Group
Property Address: 158 S Warren Street
Date of Approval: 09/03/2026
Project: Replace missing shingles with new architectural shingles to match existing. Shingle color: Black, weather wood, or slate (to match existing)
18. **Applicant:** Randale Miller
Property Address: 904 Texas Street
Date of Approval: 09/04/2026
Project: Per submitted site plan, construct 8-foot wood privacy fence along east property line of 904 Texas and property zoned B-2 Neighborhood Business at 460 S Broad Street. Fence to extend along east property line from northeast corner of dwelling to southwest corner of parcel at 456 S Broad Street.

APPLICATIONS

1. 2026-49-CA

Address: 161 State Street
Historic District: DeTonti Square
Application/Agent: Cory Bronenkamp/ 195, LLC
Project: Window Replacement
APPROVED – CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

2. 2026-50-CA

Address: 257 N Jackson Street
Historic District: DeTonti Square
Application/Agent: Simon & Pam Thornton
Project: Construct a new single-family residence
APPROVED – CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

3. 2026-39-CA

Address: Parcels: R022906400011143/R022906400011142 (St. Emanuel Street)
Historic District: Church Street East
Application/Agent: City of Mobile
Project: Construct a 6'-0" high wood fence; and 7'-4" high brick screen wall; other site Improvements
APPROVED – CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

4. 2026-51-CA

Address: 318, 316, & 310 Dauphin Street
Historic District: Lower Dauphin Commercial District
Application/Agent: Robert Maurin on behalf of Devin Nobles
Project: Façade improvements; alterations
APPROVED – CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

5. 2026-52-CA

Address: 1668 Government Street
Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Application/Agent: Robert Maurin on behalf of Preston Nash
Project: Construct new ADA accessible entrance
APPROVED – CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

6. 2026-53-CA

Address: 152 Chatham Street
Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Application/Agent: Lucy Barr on behalf of Annie Sawyer Allen
Project: Construct a new single-family residence
APPROVED – CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

7. 2026-54-CA

Address: 913 Texas Street
Historic District: Oakleigh Garden
Application/Agent: Powe & Associates, LLC
Project: Demolish single-family dwelling
APPROVED – CERTIFIED RECORD ATTACHED

8. 2026-47-CA

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

OTHER BUSINESS

The next ARB meeting is scheduled for October 7, 2026.



Agenda Item #1

Certified Record 2026-49-CA

DETAILS

Location:

161 State Street

Summary of Request:

Replace six existing wood windows with aluminum-clad wood windows

Applicant (as applicable):

Cory Bronenkamp

Property Owner:

Acre Investments, LLC

Historic District:

DeTonti Square

Classification:

Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The windows proposed for removal demonstrate varying degrees of deterioration and rot
- The extant first-floor windows are not original or historic. It is unclear whether the second-floor windows are original
- The proposed replacement windows are an approvable material and match the existing windows in dimensions and light configuration.

Report Contents:

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

PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

DeTonti Square Historic District was initially listed in the National Register in 1972 under Criterion A for social and urban planning significance and Criterion C for significant architecture. The district was one of two historic districts created by a municipal ordinance in 1962 in an effort to halt the rapid demolition of historic buildings near the city's central business district. The district, named for the French explorer Henri DeTonti, contains a few structures surviving from the 1830s, but the majority were built in the 1850s as residences of the wealthy and influential cotton factors, merchants, and planters.

Constructed c. 1839, 161 State Street is one of the oldest extant brick buildings within the DeTonti Square Historic District. It was once part of a row of three buildings, of which two survive. The building is a two-story, four bay structure, which expresses vernacular Greek revival influences with its smooth understated façade, flat masonry lintels, and restrained sawtooth cornice. In the mid-1990s, the property received a façade grant and other funding and underwent an extensive rehabilitation. Historic Development records indicate that prior to this effort, the first-floor windows on the building's north façade had been replaced with glass block windows. During the rehabilitation of the building, these windows were replaced with wood six-over-six windows to match the second-floor façade windows. At the time of the rehabilitation project, it was noted that some or all of the second-floor façade windows were original, and the intent was to repair them if possible. However, it is unclear whether any original window fabric on the second-floor was retained or replaced.

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

SCOPE OF WORK

Replace six existing windows on north façade

Replacement windows will be six-over-six aluminum-clad wood, and will fit the existing openings

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 a contributing building in the DeTonti Square Historic District. The application under review seeks approval for the replacement of six double-hung wood windows with aluminum-clad wood windows to match the existing in overall dimension and light configuration. The window

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

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

The *Guidelines* stipulate that historic wood windows should only be replaced if they have deteriorated beyond the point of repair. The submitted window survey and photos indicate visible rot and gaps. Additionally, the first-floor window sashes fail to fully seat and seal against the windowsill when lowered, which suggests a problem with sash weights or cords, an obstruction created by buildup in the track, or a sash that has come out of alignment.

Restoration and repair may be possible to restore the existing windows. However, Historic Development property files document that the first-floor windows are not original, nor are they historic. The extant windows were installed in the mid-1990s to replace inappropriate glass block windows which had previously been inserted, altering the original first-floor window openings. It is unclear whether the second-floor windows are non-historic replacements as well. Available records from the 1990s rehabilitation state that the second-floor façade windows were to be repaired if possible and replaced if beyond repair. It is possible that all façade windows were replaced at the same time.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Cory Bronenkamp was present to represent the application. He gave a summary of the project.

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. Stone asked if the windows would have simulated divided lights. Mr. Bronenkamp replied that yes, the windows would have simulated divided lights. Mr. Bronenkamp agreed to provide staff with cut sheets showing proposed light configuration.

FINDING FACTS

Mr. Blackwell moved that the Board find facts as written by staff, with an amendment that the applicant provide staff with cut sheets for final approval.

Mr. Stone seconded the motion, and all approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

Mr. Stone seconded the motion, and all approved.



Agenda Item #2

Certified Record 2026-50-CA

DETAILS

Location:

257 N Jackson Street

Summary of Request:

Approval to construct a new single-family residence

Applicant:

Simon and Pam Thorton

Property Owner:

Simon and Pam Thorton

Historic District:

DeTonti Square

Classification:

Vacant lot

Summary of Analysis:

- The size, massing, and materials are generally in keeping with the district and are compliant with the *Guidelines*.
- The large front setback, while not compatible with adjacent contributing properties, is necessary to maintain two large oak trees on the east side of the lot.
- The front yard parking pad is not compliant with the *Guidelines* directives that parking be located at the side or rear of a building whenever possible. The parking pad also disrupts the connection between the main entry and the pedestrian right-of-way.

Report Contents:

Property and Application History	2
Scope of Work	2
Applicable Standards	4
Staff Analysis	8
Attachments.....	12

PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

DeTonti Square Historic District was initially listed in the National Register in 1972 under Criterion A for social and urban planning significance and Criterion C for significant architecture. The district was one of two historic districts created by a municipal ordinance in 1962 in an effort to halt the rapid demolition of historic buildings near the city's central business district. The district, named for the French explorer Henri DeTonti, contains a few structures surviving from the 1830s, but the majority were built in the 1850s as residences of the wealthy and influential cotton factors, merchants, and planters.

The property proposed for development is a vacant lot. The 1885 Sanborn map (the earliest available) shows a two-story frame house with front and rear two-story porches on the property that was listed as 61 N Jackson Street. The building displayed a compound plan with a wing extending from the northwest elevation. The house remained unchanged in the 1924 Sanborn map other than a street number change to 257 N Jackson Street. The 1955 updated Sanborn map also shows no change. Historic Aerial imagery and survey photos show that the residence was demolished sometime around 1980.

This property has appeared before the Architectural Review Board three times. May 20, 2013, a COA was issued for a single-family residence. On August 7, 2013, the plans approved in the previous meeting for the single-family home were amended. The approved structure was never constructed. Earlier versions of this application were presented to the Board on February 4 and July 1, 2026.

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Construct a two-story single-family residence with attached garage.
 - a. Setbacks
 - 1) Front (East): 35'-8" (from Jackson Street ROW)
 - 2) North side: 5'-0"
 - 3) South side: 7'-5"
 - 4) Rear (West): 7'-9"
 - b. Overall dimensions: approximately 72'-4" wide by 60'-8" deep.
 - c. Foundation: 3'-4" continuous, stucco
 - d. Wall cladding
 - a. Brick
 - e. First-floor height above grade: 3'-4"
 - f. Ceiling heights
 - 1) First Floor: 11'-0"
 - 2) Second Floor: 10'-0"
 - g. Windows:
 - 1) Material: Aluminum-clad wood
 - 2) Type: Push-out casement and fixed
 - 3) Light Configurations: Mix of 8- and 10-light casement and 2- and 3-light fixed
 - h. Front door:
 - 1) Material: Exterior mahogany, Spanish cedar, or equal
 - 2) Finish: Painted or stained
 - 3) Configuration: Paneled with 6 lights in upper 2/3
 - i. Garage doors:
 - 4) Material: Metal
 - 5) Configuration: Continuous horizontal panel

- j. All other exterior doors:
 - 1) Material: Exterior mahogany, Spanish cedar, or equal
 - 2) Finish: Painted or stained
 - 3) Configuration: Double-leaf paneled with 6 lights in upper 2/3; single-leaf paneled with 4 lights in upper 2/3
- k. Roof:
 - 1) Form: Complex cross-gable
 - 2) Material: Standing-seam metal, bronze anodized finish
 - 3) Pitch: 12/12, with occasional small shed projection with pitch of 12/3
 - 4) The primary roof system is a front gable with various cross-gable projections on the north and south sides. Two cross gables on the south side and one on the north are over second-floor interior spaces. Two cross gables on the north side are over first-floor interior spaces. Secondary gable roofs cover the attached garage and a rear porch.
- l. East Façade
 - 1) The primary focus of the façade is an off-center parapeted front gable projection with asymmetrical wings on either side. The central projection features a recessed entry porch at the northeast corner, a single 10-light casement window, and tripartite 8-light casement windows above. The left (south) wing features a double-bay garage at grade with a single 8-light casement window above. The right (north) wing features tripartite 8-light casement windows on the first floor with a single 8-light casement window above. A cross gable extends northward over a corner porch.
- m. North Elevation
 - 1) The north side elevation features one second-floor and two first-floor cross gables projecting outward from the north slope of the front gable roof. On the first floor, the eastern gable extends over the northeast corner porch. A masonry opening with a soldier brick lintel course frames the double-leaf 8-light doors that open onto a porch. A faux infilled opening beneath the west gable mirrors the placement of the true masonry opening and breaks up the blank brick cladding. A one-story rear porch extends from the northwest corner. A single 8-light casement window is visible at the opening to the rear porch.
- n. West (Rear) Elevation
 - 1) The rear elevation consists primarily of the gable end of the main roof structure. Gable projections at either end of the main block break up the otherwise flat elevation. The north gable extends over a single-story rear porch. A masonry opening frames double-leaf 8-light doors. A set of 10-light French casement windows are centered on the south gable projection. All other windows on this elevation are 8-light casement windows.
- o. South Elevation
 - 1) The south elevation primarily consists of the south elevation of the attached two-car garage. The garage sits under a distinct gable roof. The elevation features a single fixed window and a single-leaf 4-light paneled door with flanking sconces. Two cross gables projecting from the second floor of the main dwelling intersect the south slope of the garage roof. Below the two cross gables are 5 regularly spaced windows. All windows are 8-light casements, except for a fixed two-light window that lights an interior closet.
- 2. Construct a paved driveway and front parking pad

- a. Driveway will extend from the existing driveway opening at the south end of the existing site wall back to the attached double-car garage.
- b. The driveway will also connect to a paved parking area in the front yard space.
 - 1) Dimensions: approximately 30'-0" wide by 20'-0" deep.

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

- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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
- 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 to 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
- 6.39 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

- 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

- 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.
- 6.42 Design a porch to be compatible with the neighborhood.
 - Include a front porch as part of new construction if it is contextual and feasible.
 - When designing a porch, consider porch location, proportion, rhythm, roof form, supports, steps, balustrades and ornamentation relative to the main building and porches in the district.
 - Design the elements of a porch to be at a scale proportional to the main building.
 - Where a rhythm of porches exists on a street or block, design a porch that continues this historic rhythm.
 - Design a rear or side porch that is visible from the public right-of-way to be subordinate in character to the front porch.
- 6.43 Design piers, a foundation and foundation infill to be compatible with those of nearby historic properties.
 - Use raised, pier foundations.
 - If raised foundations are not feasible, use a simulated raised foundation.
 - Do not use slab-on-grade construction. This is not appropriate for Mobile's historic neighborhoods. If a raised slab is required, use water tables, exaggerated bases, faux piers or other methods to simulate a raised foundation.
 - Do not use raw concrete block or exposed slabs.
 - If foundation infill must be used, ensure that it is compatible with the neighborhood.
 - If solid infill is used, recess it and screen it with landscaping.
 - If lattice is used, hang it below the floor framing and between the piers. Finish it with trim.
 - Do not secure lattice to the face of the building or foundation.
 - Do not use landscaping to disguise inappropriate foundation design.

ACCEPTABLE FOUNDATION MATERIALS

- Materials that are similar in character, texture and durability to those used on nearby historic buildings are acceptable. These often include:
 - Brick piers
 - Brick infill
 - Wood (vertical pickets)
 - Framed lattice infill

UNACCEPTABLE FOUNDATION MATERIALS

- Materials that are not similar in character, texture and durability to those used on nearby historic buildings are unacceptable. These often include:
 - Mineral board panels
 - Concrete block infill
 - Metal infill
 - Plywood panel infill
 - Plastic sheeting infill
 - Vinyl sheeting infill
- 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

- 9.2 Locate a new accessory structure in line with other visible accessory structures in the district.

- These are traditionally located at the rear of a lot.

ACCEPTABLE ACCESSORY STRUCTURE MATERIALS

- Materials that are compatible with the historic district in scale and character are acceptable. These often include:
 - Wood frame
 - Masonry
 - Cement-based fiber siding
 - Installations (Pre-made store-bought sheds, provided they are minimally visible from public areas)

UNACCEPTABLE ACCESSORY STRUCTURE MATERIALS

- Materials that are not compatible with the historic district in scale and character are unacceptable. These often include:
 - Metal (except for a greenhouse)
 - Plastic (except for a greenhouse)
 - Fiberglass (except for a greenhouse)

- 10.5 Visually connect the street and building.
 - Maintain or install a walkway leading directly from the sidewalk to the main building entry.
- 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.

ACCEPTABLE WALK AND PAVING MATERIALS

- Materials that have a similar character, durability and level of detail to walks and paved areas associated with historic properties in the district are acceptable. These often include:
 - Gravel or crushed stone
 - Shell
 - Brick
 - Cobblestone
 - Grasspave or grasscrete (mix of grass and hard surface paving material that provides a solid surface)

STAFF ANALYSIS

The property under review is a vacant lot parcel located in the DeTonti Square Historic District. The application proposes approval to construct a new single-family residence at 257 N Jackson Street. The proposed design is broadly compliant with the *Guidelines* in terms of its size, massing, and materials. Points of contention include the front-facing attached garage, the paved parking area in the front yard, and the lack of a walkway from the main entrance to the sidewalk.

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 side setbacks of 5'0" and 7'5" are in keeping with the established range of side setbacks, which is 5 to 15 feet for nearby contributing properties. The proposed 35'8" front setback is significantly deeper than that of any nearby contributing structures. The setbacks for contributing structures on the same block of N. Jackson Street range from 10 to 12 feet. The largest setback for the ten nearest contributing structures is 19 feet. However, the proposed larger setback will allow two large oak trees to remain on the property. The existing brick site wall along the street frontage will also minimize the effect of the deeper setback on the street frontage.

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 overall size – particularly the footprint and height – of the proposed design is in keeping with the district. De Tonti Square is home to numerous two-story masonry townhouses, and all contributing structures on this block of N. Jackson Street are two-story residences over raised foundations. The proposed dwelling will also cover a comparable percentage of its lot compared to neighboring contributing structures. The average lot coverage for the 10 nearest contributing structures is 29% to 46% lot coverage. The lot coverage for the proposed dwelling would be approximately 40%.

The massing does differ from its neighbors in that the dwelling is roughly square in plan. Most neighboring contributing structures are rectangular in plan with their short axis running parallel to the street. The proposed design therefore has a much wider façade than its neighbors. The parapeted gable end that projects from the middle of the east façade helps to break up the elevation, creating multiple façade planes that read almost like a line of townhouses rather than a single large residence. Parapets on either side of the center projection also shield the various cross gables on the north and south elevations from view. This helps simplify the complex roof massing, which differs from the simple hipped and front gable roofs typical of the district.

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).

All proposed materials are listed as appropriate for new construction in the *Guidelines*. This includes the standing-seam metal roof, brick veneer, stucco foundation, steel garage doors, wood doors, and aluminum-clad wood casement windows.

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 combines elements of traditional architectural styles found in De Tonti Square with more modern details that render it recognizable as a 21st-century construction. The inset entry porch is of a similar scale to the entry porches at 254 and 263 N. Jackson Street and even the stoop and slightly recessed entry at 258 State Street. The secondary corner porch is somewhat unusual for the district, but it does echo wrap-around porches found at 310 N. Claiborne Street and 312 N. Jackson Street.

The sloped parapet wall and pediment caps of the proposed design is a treatment typically seen on the side elevations of parapeted townhouses in the district. The proposed design closely mimics the side elevation of 258 State Street, which presents a parapeted gable end to N. Jackson Street. While the use of this treatment on a façade is atypical of the district, it does reuse a traditional design feature in a way that clearly identifies the proposed dwelling as a modern construction. This complies with the *Guidelines’* directive that new construction should “differentiate itself from existing historic structures” while “drawing on the historic context” (p. 26).

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 front-facing garage doors are of comparatively little concern regarding the *Guidelines*. The *Guidelines* do not explicitly address the placement or orientation of garage doors on existing or new construction. The *Guidelines* merely state that parking should be to the side or the rear of the building, and that new garage doors should be compatible with the subject property and the district (6.3, 10.7).

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

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

Johnna Rogers, resident of the DeTonti Square neighborhood, was present to speak in favor of the application.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Roselius thanked the applicant for being receptive to feedback given during the Design Review Committee, especially regarding the placement of the driveway and setbacks from the street.

Mr. Blackwell agreed with Ms. Roselius.

Mr. McNair asked Robert Maurin, architect, to come forward and describe how the design presented in this meeting differed from previous meetings.

Mr. Maurin stated that alterations were made to some of the windows and parapets.

Mr. McNair inquired about the material of the garage doors. Mr. Maurin stated that the garage doors would be aluminum clad wood doors, likely painted a dark bronze color.

Mr. Stone asked whether the bedroom windows would meet code requirements. Mr. Maurin replied that the windows would meet manufacturer recommendations for safety codes.

FINDING FACTS

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

Ms. Davis seconded the motion, and all approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

Ms. Wilson seconded the motion, and all approved.



Agenda Item #3

Certified Record 2026-39-CA

DETAILS

Location:

Parcels R022906400011143/R022906400011142
(159 St. Emanuel Street)

Summary of Request:

- Construct a 6'-0" H wood fence and 7'-4" H masonry wall to enclose vacant lots adjacent to the Fort Conde Inn

Applicant (as applicable):

Douglas Kearley/Forte Conde Restoration
Venture LLC

Property Owner:

City of Mobile

Historic District:

Church Street East

Classification:

Vacant Lot

Summary of Analysis:

- The two subject parcels have been vacant lots since 1967-1969 and were established as a gravel parking area sometime between 2006-2009.
- The proposed materials for the fence and masonry wall are in compliance with the *Guidelines*.
- The *Guidelines* do not specify what considerations should be given for privacy fences located on a corner lot, nor do they provide parameters for masonry walls.
- The property is located within the Downtown Development District. The project has been reviewed by the Consolidated Review Committee (CRC)

Report Contents:

Property and Application History.....	2
Scope of Work.....	2
Applicable Standards.....	3
Staff Analysis.....	4
Attachments.....	5

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 two parcels proposed for redevelopment are currently being used as a parking area. The two lots first appear on the 1885 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map where 3527 St. Emanuel, a two-and-a-half-floor dwelling, was located on the corner of St. Emanuel Street and Theatre Street. The address for the dwelling was changed to 201 St. Emanuel on the 1891 Sanborn Map. The 1904 Sanborn Map shows significant changes showing three new dwellings replacing the previous dwelling. 103 St Emanuel Street was a single-story square dwelling with no setback from the street; 200 Theatre Street was a single-story dwelling with a full-width front porch and wing; 202 Theatre Street was a single-story dwelling with a full-width front porch and wing. The 1924 Sanborn Map these three dwellings had been replaced with two dwellings that both had two-stories with 161 St Emanuel Street having a full-width two-story front porch and 159 St. Emanuel having a full width single-story front porch. Little change is seen until the Historic Aerials shows that 161 St. Emanuel and 159 St. Emanuel were demolished sometime between 1967 and 1969. The two parcels were maintained as a grass lot until sometime between 2006 and 2009 when gravel was added, establishing the parking area.

There is no record of this property appearing before the Architectural Review Board.

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Along St. Emanuel Street
 - a. Construct a 7'-4" H brick façade screen with brick piers measuring 8'-0" H regularly spaced along the elevation
 - b. Install a pair of 5'-0" H wood gates with radiused top which will span 10'-0" across the elevation and be flanked by 1'-4" wide brick piers
 - c. The brick screen will run 74.71' N/S and will sit 23 – 4" east of the existing sidewalk along St. Emanuel Street
2. Along Theatre Street
 - a. Construct a 6'-0" wood fence with wood posts
 - b. Construct 12'x12" masonry piers with washed cement caps at regular intervals along the elevation
 - c. The wood fence will run 122.02' E/W and will sit 6'-0" south of the exiting sidewalk along Theater Street
3. Along the east (rear)property line
 - a. Install a 6'-0" H wood fence with wood posts
 - b. The wood would be installed horizontally
 - c. The horizontal wood fence will run 74.04' N/S

APPLICABLE STANDARDS

- 10.2 Design a fence to be compatible with the architectural style of the house and existing fences in the neighborhood.
 - Install a painted wood picket fence.
 - Install a simple wood or wire fence. Heights of wooden picket fences are ordinarily restricted to 36". Consideration for up to 48," depending on the location of the fence, shall be given. A variance might be required. Staff can advise and assist applicants with regard to a variance. If combined with a wall, the total vertical dimension of the wall and fence collectively should not exceed 36," or in some cases 48".
 - For surface parking areas associated with commercial uses, size a perimeter parking area fence to not exceed 48" in height.
 - Install a cast-iron or other metal fence not exceeding 48" in height if located in the front yard.
 - Install a fence that uses alternative materials that have a very similar look and feel to wood, proven durability, matte finish and an accurate scale and proportion of components.
 - Face the finished side of a fence toward the public right-of-way. Based on the chosen fence material, use proportions, heights, elements and levels of opacity similar to those of similar material and style seen in the historic district.
 - REAR AND NON-CORNER SIDE FENCES (LOCATED BEHIND THE FRONT BUILDING PLANE)
 - Design a fence located behind the front building plane to not exceed 72" in height. If the subject property abuts a multi-family residential or commercial property, a fence up to 96" will be considered.
 - An alternative fence material with proven durability, matte finish and an accurate scale and proportion of components is acceptable. A simple wood-and-wire fence is acceptable provided it is appropriate to the style of the house.
- ACCEPTABLE FENCE MATERIALS
 - Materials that have a similar character, durability and finish to those of fences of historic properties in the district are acceptable. These often include:
 - Wood picket
 - Wood slat
 - Wood lattice
 - Iron or steel
 - Historically appropriate wire fences
 - Aluminum that appears similar to iron
- UNACCEPTABLE FENCE MATERIALS
 - Materials that do not have a similar character, durability and finish to those of fences of historic properties in the district are unacceptable. These often include:
 - Chain link
 - Stockade
 - Post and rail
 - Masonite
 - PVC
 - Plywood or asbestos paneling
 - Razor wire
 - Barbed wire

STAFF ANALYSIS

The subject parcels located at the corner of St. Emanuel and Theater Streets are owned by the City of Mobile and appear to have been established as a parking area sometime between 2006 and 2009. The subject proposed project includes the installation of an 8' privacy fence to enclose the area N of 163 St Emanuel Street to establish a pool/sauna/spa which will be associated with Forte Conde Inn.

Section 10.2 of the *Design Guidelines* state, "Design a fence to be compatible with the architectural style of the house and existing fences in the neighborhood" The subject application proposes development for two parcels that currently do not have extant structures. The submitted site plan shows that the fence would establish the two subject parcels as a side yard for the historic structure at 163 St. Emanuel Street. If interpreted as a side yard, the location of the fence complies with the *Guidelines*. The proposed 6' fence height is in compliance with the *Guidelines*. The *Guidelines* do not provide any height parameters for masonry walls.

All materials for the proposed enclosure are approved under the *Guidelines* and are compatible with the surrounding district. The horizontal arrangement of the fence proposed for the east (rear) end of the property is more contemporary in design. However, it is minimally visible from the street. Masonry walls, though not all historic, are a common feature in the immediate vicinity and can also be seen further afield in the Church Street East Historic District.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Douglas Kearley, architect, and Mr. David Posner, owner of the Fort Conde Inn, were present to represent the application. Mr. Kearley provided a summary of the project.

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. Blackwell thanked Mr. Kearley for his work to improve Mobile's historic districts.

FINDING FACTS

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

Mr. Blackwell seconded the motion, and all approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

Ms. Wilson seconded the motion, and all approved



Agenda Item #4

Certified Record 2026-51-CA

DETAILS

Location:

310-318 Dauphin Street

Summary of Request:

Replace non-original storefronts, windows, and doors; remove non-original façade panels and replace with thin brick veneer; install new lighting

Applicant (as applicable):

Robert Maurin

Property Owner:

Devin Nobles

Historic District:

Lower Dauphin Commercial District

Classification:

Contributing (310 Dauphin)

Non-Contributing (316-318 Dauphin)

Summary of Analysis:

- Proposed alterations at 310 Dauphin Street would introduce a five-bay storefront that is inconsistent with the existing four-bay facade and with historic photographs.
- The proposed thin brick veneer, which would imitate historic salvaged brick, is non-compliant.
- Storefront alterations at 316-318 Dauphin Street would have minimal impact on the non-contributing structure.

Report Contents:

Property and Application History.....	2
Scope of Work.....	2
Applicable Standards.....	3
Staff Analysis.....	5
Attachments	8

PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

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

The contributing structure at 310 Dauphin Street was constructed in 1908. Sometime after 1956, a secondary façade of aluminum panels was installed over the original brick façade, encasing the original windows, mansard roof, and dormers. In 1996, the aluminum façade was removed to reveal the original façade and roofline. Much of the façade was stuccoed at this time to cover portions of the brick façade deemed too damaged for patching or repair. The existing cast-iron gallery was constructed in 2002. The second-floor windows were replaced with wood French doors in 2009.

The non-contributing structure at 316 and 318 Dauphin Street dates to after 1956. Sanborn Maps show that two-story brick stores occupied this portion of the block from 1885 to 1956. It is possible that the one-story structure is a remnant of these earlier structures. However, the removal of the entire upper story and original storefronts would constitute such a significant alteration that a new date of construction would be warranted. The building is currently clad in the same aluminum panels that were removed from 310 Dauphin in 1996. The existing storefront assemblies date from 2002.

According to Historic Development Department Records, this property has appeared 6 times previously before the Architectural Review Board. In 2008, the Board approved an application to construct a rear entrance vestibule. The Board approved the construction of the existing gallery across the façade of 208 and 310 Dauphin Street in 2002. In 1996, the Board approved removal of the c. 1960 metal panels from 308 and 310 Dauphin. At this time, the Board also approved adding stucco to the original façade due to the poor condition of the brickwork after removal of the aluminum cladding. In 1990, the Board approved other façade repairs and exterior painting. The Board approved applications for new signage in 2009 and 1999.

SCOPE OF WORK

Façade alterations at 310 Dauphin Street

1. Demolish non-original storefront assembly, entry doors, and portion of exterior wall.
2. Reconstruct storefront to be flush with façade wall above, instead of being angled inward.
 - a. Extend partition wall between 310 and 316 Dauphin outward so that it aligns with the existing façade wall.
 - b. Construct new flat storefront in line with façade.
3. Install new windows and entry doors per submitted plans.
 - a. Install two sets of double-leaf 8-light doors: one centered on the façade and one in the west end bay.
 - i. Centered door to have a large two-light transom window with horizontal divider. Upper light of transom to have rectangular base with curvilinear top.
 - ii. West door to have an arched stained-glass transom with molded upper trim piece.

- b. Install two large storefront windows on either side of centered door.
 - i. Storefront windows to feature 4 large vertical plate-glass lights over a paneled bulkhead. Multi-light transom to have rectangular base with curvilinear top, mirroring the same detail on the centered door.
- c. Install one smaller storefront window in east end bay.
 - i. Storefront window to feature 2 large vertical plate-glass lights over a paneled bulkhead. Multi-light transom to have rectangular base with curvilinear top, mirroring the same detail on the centered door.
- d. Rebuild portions of wall as necessary. Stucco to match existing.
- e. Provide new wall lamps on either side of each set of doors.
 - i. Manufacturer: TWTCC
 - ii. Type: European Style Outdoor Wall Lamp
 - iii. Material: Aluminum and glass
- 4. Remove and replace non-original doors on second story with new multi-light aluminum-clad wood doors.
 - a. Each door to have four lights arranged vertically.
 - b. Existing transoms to remain.
- 5. Provide new wall lamps on either side of each set of

Façade alterations at 316-318 Dauphin Street.

- 1. Remove non-original storefront assemblies.
- 2. Install new storefront assemblies, maintaining the existing masonry bulkhead.
 - a. At 316 Dauphin, install one set of double-leaf full-light doors in west end bay.
 - b. Install window wall with six vertical plate-glass lights to east of door.
 - i. Window wall to measure 31'10-1/2" wide.
 - c. At 318 Dauphin, center one set of double-leaf full-light doors.
 - i. Two-light storefront windows to flank doors on either side.
- 3. Remove existing aluminum façade panels. Reskin building in thin brick veneer.
 - a. Manufacturer: Old Mill Thin Brick Systems
 - b. Color/Model: Seaside

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

- 7.02** Repair an altered storefront to its original design.
 - » Use historic photographs when determining the original character of a store-front design.
 - » Where evidence does not exist, use a contemporary interpretation of a traditional storefront.
 - » Consider retaining a non-original storefront where it has achieved historic importance as an option.
 - » Do not remove a façade veneer if it may cause serious damage to the original historic materials underneath (i.e. historic brick).
- 7.03** Retain an original bulkhead as a decorative panel.
 - » Retain the bulkhead below the display window.

- » If the original bulkhead is covered with another material, consider exposing the original design.
- » If the original bulkhead is missing, develop a sympathetic replacement design that is similar in profile, texture and durability to the original.
- 7.05** Retain the original shape of the transom in a historic storefront.
 - » Preserve the historic transom shape and configuration.
 - » Add new glass if the original glass is missing.
 - » Do not remove or enclose a transom.
 - » If a transom must be blocked out, retain the original proportions.
- 7.06** Replace a historic storefront to be consistent with the historic location.
 - » Locate a new storefront in the same plane as it was historically.
 - » Do not recess or project a replacement storefront from the front façade.
- 7.08** If replacement of some material is required, use a material that is similar to that of the original.
 - » Use replacement mortar that is as soft as or softer than the original. Type O mortar is required for historic soft brick.
 - » Use true stucco instead of an imitation material.
 - » Do not use a rustic finish on masonry that will simulate aged masonry.
- 7.11** If necessary, replace a door in a fashion that is sensitive to the historic commercial character of the building.
 - » Use doors with high proportions of transparent glass.
 - » If a modern doorway is created, use metal with anodized or painted finish or varnished or painted wood.
 - » If a doorway was originally recessed, use a recessed doorway for the re-placement.
 - » Consider using a transom in a replacement storefront where appropriate.
 - » Design a replacement doorway to emphasize the commercial entrance.
 - » Do not use a residential door for a commercial building.
- 7.18** Preserve and repair an original detail or ornamentation on a historic commercial building.
 - » Maintain the original space patterns and location of windows. Most display windows have a bulkhead below and a transom above.
 - » Preserve the size and shape of an upper story window.
 - » Consider maintaining a Carrara glass or glass block storefront if it has attained historic significance as an alteration.
- 7.19** If required, replace original historic windows to be compatible with the windows on the original historic building.
 - » Use large panes of glass that fit the original opening for a display window.
 - » Where a display window is no longer required, the ARB will consider an alternative design.
 - » Do not use opaque treatments for a window, including black plexiglass. Do not paint a window.
 - » Do not use reflective mirror glass for a window.
 - » Unless evidence exists from existing buildings or historic photographs, do not use a multi-pane design that divides the storefront window into smaller components.
 - » Use a tempered glass window if required by the building code.
 - » Reopen an upper story window if it is blocked.
 - » If reopening an upper story window is not feasible, use a fixed shutter to de-fine the original proportion of the window opening.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The property under review is located within the Lower Dauphin Street Commercial District. The two-story structure at 310 Dauphin Street is listed as contributing, while the adjacent one-story structure at 316-318 Dauphin Street is listed as non-contributing.

310 Dauphin Street

The application proposes removing and reconstructing the existing storefront at 310 Dauphin Street. The existing recessed storefront would be removed and a new storefront constructed flush with the building façade. This new façade would be divided into five bays. The center and east end bays would each feature a set of double doors with arched transoms. The remaining three bays would feature storefront windows with multilight transoms above.

The *Guidelines* support alterations that return a non-original storefront to its historic appearance, provided the non-original storefront has not attained historic importance in its own right. The *Guidelines* specify that, where photographic or other evidence exists, storefronts should be returned to their original configuration. Where sufficient evidence is lacking, the *Guidelines* does support replacing a non-original storefront with a “contemporary interpretation of a traditional storefront” (7.02).

The existing storefront at 310 Dauphin Street is not original and likely dates to the late 1950s or 1960s. While it is old enough to be considered historic in its own right, it lost much of its historic context and architectural integrity when the c. 1960 modular façade was removed in 1996. The *Guidelines* would therefore support either returning the storefront to its original design or introducing a contemporary storefront. In this particular case, there is sufficient photographic evidence to determine the original configuration of the first-floor storefronts. The proposed design, however, would create a contemporary interpretation of a storefront. While the *Guidelines* allow both approaches, the *Guidelines* express a clear preference for a more faithful historic recreation when evidence allows.

Two historic photographs – one dated to c. 1920 and the other to c. 1930 – show that the first floor was divided into four bays that aligned vertically with the four bays of the second and third floors. The first and third bays from the west were both storefronts with recessed entry doors centered within the bay. Angled display windows with large plate glass windows flanked each entry door. The second bay from the west was a single recessed door, which likely led to an interior stairwell for the residential apartments on the second and third floors. In the earlier photo, the east end bay was a large arched carriage or car entrance with arched paneled doors. By the late 1920s, this carriage entrance had been modified as a small flush storefront, as seen in the c. 1930 photograph.

The application proposes creating a flush street-level façade divided into five bays. These bays do not align with the established window drops above and do not reflect the historic storefront configuration. The proposed arched transoms do echo the arches of the original carriage entrance and the second-floor window alcoves. However, the arch of the transoms is much shallower than these and photographs demonstrate that the original storefronts were rectilinear and not arched.

The multi-light entry doors do not comply with the *Guidelines'* stricture against introducing multi-pane doors and windows where they did not previously exist. Specifically, the *Guidelines* discourages the use of multi-light windows and doors unless drawing on evidence from "existing buildings or historic photographs" (7.19). Historic photographs of the range of buildings from 310 to 316 Dauphin Street show two door types. One is a light-over-panel wood door. The c. 1920 photograph shows this door type at the entrance to the apartment stair. The other type is a full-light wood door. The c. 1930 photograph shows this door type at the storefront entrances to 314 and 316 Dauphin Street. The storefront entry doors at 310 Dauphin Street are not visible in either photograph, but it is likely they would have been similar to the full-light storefront doors at 314 and 316 Dauphin Street. Both photographs do provide evidence of multi-light transoms at the visible storefronts. However, these transoms are rectangular and not arched.

The application also proposes replacing the existing non-original French doors at the second-story gallery. These doors are not original to the structure, which original featured 12-over-2 single-hung windows. The current French doors date to 2009. The proposed replacement doors would be slightly more historically appropriate. The large vertically stacked lights are similar to French doors seen in a c. 1930 photograph of 312-316 Dauphin Street. However, two full-light French doors would more closely replicate the two-lite sash windows that were original to 310 Dauphin Street.

316-318 Dauphin Street

The application proposes replacing all existing storefronts. The new storefronts would be recessed and slanted inward along the same angle as the existing storefronts. The application also proposes removal of the non-original synthetic siding on 316-318 and installing a thin-brick veneer.

316 and 318 Dauphin Street are both listed as non-contributing due to the significant alterations made to these buildings in the 1950s or 1960s. These alterations are now approaching 70 years old and could be viewed as historic. However, the most significant aspect of these c. 1960 alterations – the 3-story Zoghby Downtown Shopping Center façade – was removed in 1996. The remaining façade on 316 and 318 has therefore lost much of its context. It is doubtful that the National Park Service would accept shifting the designation of this building from non-contributing to contributing, given its history of alterations. In this case, the *Guidelines* would support either maintaining the existing storefront or creating a contemporary interpretation of a traditional storefront. The proposed design follows the latter approach.

The proposed storefront design would slightly alter the location of doors and the width and placement of plate glass windows. However, it maintains the existing masonry bulkhead, in compliance with the *Guidelines* (7.03). The proposed design does not include a transom, but as the existing building also does not feature a transom, this alteration would not constitute material change to the building or the district.

While the proposed thin brick veneer is an approvable cladding material, the proposed brick color and texture may violate the Guideline stricture against using a "rustic finish on masonry that will simulate

aged masonry” (7.08). The Old Mill Thin Brick pattern “Seaside” imitates the varied colors and textures of salvaged historic brick. A more uniform selection would be more appropriate, according to the *Guidelines*.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Robert Maruin, architect, was present to represent the application. He provided a summary of the project.

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. Stone approved of the applicant’s proposal to square off the front façade. He asked how the lanterns would be secured to the building, whether they would be wall mounted or hung from above. Mr. Maurin stated that he was not sure yet.

Mr. Blackwell opined that the proposed design would improve the streetscape.

Mr. McNair asked Mr. Maurin if he knew what year the window transoms were installed. Mr. Maurin did not know. Mr. McNair asked if the transoms would stay. Mr. Maurin stated that the transoms will stay.

FINDING FACTS

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

Mr. Stone seconded the motion, and all approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

Ms. Davis seconded the motion, and all approved.



Agenda Item #5

Certified Record 2026-52-CA

DETAILS

Location:

1668 Government Street

Summary of Request:

Construct new ADA accessible entrance

Applicant (as applicable):

Robert Maurin

Property Owner:

Preston Nash

Historic District:

Old Dauphin Way

Classification:

Not Listed

Summary of Analysis:

- The placement of the proposed ramp does not comply with *Guidelines* concerning the proper placement of alterations and directives against extending or altering an original front porch.
- The proposed design and materials are not in keeping with the Tudor Revival style of the subject property.

Report Contents:

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

PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

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

The subject property was constructed as a single-family residence in 1938. The Tudor Revival-style dwelling features brick cladding and cast stone ornamentation over structural masonry walls. In keeping with the Tudor Revival style, it has an irregular footprint and a complex hipped roof structure. The building was occupied as a single-family dwelling through the 1960s. The building likely transitioned to commercial use sometime in the 1970s. Prior to 1984, the commercial owner paved the front yard and constructed two large rear additions. The additions feature brick cladding and a flat roof structure that is not in keeping with the original dwelling. Originally listed as non-contributing when the district was created in 1984, 1668 Government Street was re-designated contributing as part of the 2002 update.

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

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Demolish and remove section of brick knee wall on east elevation of front porch to prepare for new ramp connection and bracing.
 - a. Dimensions of area to be removed: 2’7-1/2” wide by 2’5-3/4” high
 - b. Portion of cast stone sill to be salvaged for use on new ramp
2. Construct ADA-compliant pedestrian ramp along east elevation.
 - a. Ramp footprint: 31’3-1/4” deep and 10’7-3/4” wide
 - b. Materials:
 - i. Brick base with concrete coping at first section of ramp before switchback
 - ii. Metal frame, structural posts, and railing
 - c. Entry to ramp will be behind the front building plane.
 - d. Entire ramp will consist of four inclines and three flat landings, including a single switchback.
3. Construct a set of metal stairs leading up to the broad flat landing between the second and third inclines.
 - a. Stair will be 6’0” wide and extend approximately 4’3” east of the landing.
 - b. Stair will consist of seven metal steps.

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

- 6.17** Design and place a new porch to maintain the visibility to and integrity of an original historic porch, as well as the overall historic building.
- » Do not expand an original historic front porch. Additions of new front porches or expansion of existing front porches are generally not appropriate.
 - » Limit the height of a porch addition roofline so it does not interfere with second story elevations.
 - » Replace a rear porch where a previously existing rear porch is lost or enclosed.
 - » Design a rear porch so that its height and slopes are compatible with the original historic structure.
- 6.18** Design a new porch to be compatible with the existing historic building.
- » Design the scale, proportion and character of a porch addition element, including columns, corner brackets, railings and pickets, to be compatible with the existing historic residential structure.
 - » Match the foundation height of a porch addition to that of the existing historic structure.

- » Design a porch addition roofline to be compatible with the existing historic structure. However, a porch addition roofline need not match exactly that of the existing historic building. For example, a porch addition may have a shed roof.
- » Use materials for a porch addition that are appropriate to the building.
- » Do not use a contemporary deck railing for a porch addition placed at a location visible from the public street.
- » Do not use cast concrete steps on façades or primary elevations.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The subject property is listed as contributing to the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The application proposes constructing an ADA-compliant ramp and stair along the east elevation of the house. The ramp would connect with the east end of the front porch. Construction of the ramp would require removal of the brick knee wall of the arched opening at the east end of the porch.

The *Guidelines* do not contain any specific guidance related to ADA-accessible ramps or wheelchair lifts. The most relevant guidance is that related to porches and porch additions. The *Guidelines* state that “preserving a front porch is a high priority” (p. 51). Regarding porch additions, the *Guidelines* state that the expansion of an existing front porch is “generally not appropriate” (6.17). The *Guidelines* further specify that “a new porch is best located to the side or rear” (p. 59). New porches should be compatible with the existing building in scale, proportion, and materials (6.18).

While the *Guidelines* do not directly address ramps, they do address the appropriate location of building alterations and additions:

For most historic resources, the front façade is the most important to preserve intact. Alterations are rarely appropriate. Many side walls are also important to preserve where they are highly visible from public streets. By contrast, portions of a side wall that are not as visible may be less sensitive to change. The rear wall is usually the least sensitive, and alterations can occur more easily without causing negative effects to the historic significance of the property (p. 23).

The location of the proposed ramp is at odds with the *Guidelines*’ directives concerning building alterations in general and porch additions in particular. While located on a side elevation, the ramp will be highly visible from the public right-of-way. It also forms a connection with the front porch that can be considered an expansion of a historic front porch, something the *Guidelines* categorize as inappropriate. The connection between the ramp and the porch would also require partial demolition of a Tudor Revival-style arched opening, which is a character defining feature of the property. The alteration is therefore not reversible. If the ramp were to be removed in future, a seamless patch of the brick knee wall may not be possible. Furthermore, there appears to be ample space for constructing a ramp that accesses the non-historic rear addition.

The materials proposed for the ramp are considered appropriate in the historic districts but are not sympathetic to the Tudor Revival structure. A core characteristic of the style is the use – or even the appearance – of solid masonry construction. High-style versions tended to make use of load-bearing masonry wall construction, while more affordable versions used stucco over wood-framing to give the appearance of masonry construction (McAlester, *A Field Guide to American Houses*, p. 454). Porches frequently featured masonry knee walls rather than railings. When railings were used, they tended to be cast stone balustrades or square wood pickets more massive than those typically used for railings. The proposed metal railing is not in keeping with this design aesthetic. Relocating the ramp to the non-historic rear addition would mitigate these discrepancies in material and style. A ramp structure constructed entirely of brick masonry and cast stone elements would be more appropriate, but its location on such a prominent elevation would still be inconsistent with the *Guidelines*.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Robert Maruin, architect, was present to represent the application. He gave a summary of the project.

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. Blackwell stated that he appreciated that the ramp is reversible.

Ms. Roselius asked if the ramp could be placed at the rear of the building instead of the side. Mr. Maurin stated that the interior layout of the building would make that impractical.

Mr. Stone asked Mr. Maurin if he investigated using a lift system instead of a ramp. Mr. Maurin stated that a lift would not be feasible because the exterior door sits too high off the ground.

Mr. McNair inquired about the material for the handrail. Mr. Maurin stated that the rails would be metal of some sort. The exact material will be decided later.

FINDING FACTS

Mr. Blackwell moved that the Board find facts as written by staff, giving staff the power to approve the handrail material at a later date.

Mr. Howle seconded the motion, and all approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

Mr. Stone seconded the motion, and all approved.



Agenda Item # 6

Certified Record 2026-53-CA

DETAILS

Location:

152 Chatham Street

Summary of Request:

Construct a new single-family residence

Applicant:

Lucy Barr

Property Owner:

Annie Sawyer Allen

Historic District:

Oakleigh Garden

Classification:

Vacant lot

Summary of Analysis:

- While the *Guidelines* discourage new construction that replicates historic buildings or styles, reconstruction of a known historic structure is listed as an acceptable treatment (p. 21)
- The overall size, massing, materials, and site plan are compliant with the *Guidelines*.

Report Contents:

Property and Application History	2
Scope of Work	2
Applicable Standards	3
Staff Analysis	7
Attachments	9

PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

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

The property proposed for development is vacant. The 1878 City Atlas shows this lot as vacant. The 1925 Sanborn Map – the first to depict Chatham Street – shows two-story frame dwelling house with a two-story wraparound porch. By the time the Sanborn Maps were updated in 1956, the house had been converted into multiple apartments, and the two-story porch had been enclosed. Aerial photographs suggest that this dwelling house was destroyed or demolished sometime before 1974. Survey photographs taken in 1979 show a vacant lot.

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

SCOPE OF WORK

Construct one-story wood-frame residence.

1. Construct a one-story wood-frame residence. The proposed structure will consist of a reconstructed c. 1830 dwelling house with a rear addition that is new construction.
 - a. Setbacks
 - 1) Front (East): 20'-0" (from Chatham Street ROW)
 - 2) North side: 12'-1"
 - 3) South side: 5'-0"
 - 4) Rear (West): 53'-2"
 - b. Overall dimensions: approximately 57'-6" wide by 76'-6" deep.
 - c. Foundation: 5'-10" brick piers with wood lattice infill.
 - d. Wall cladding
 - a. Wood lap siding: reconstructed front wing
 - b. Fiber cement lap siding: new construction rear wing
 - c. Color: To be determined
 - e. First-floor height above grade: 6'-10"
 - f. Ceiling heights
 - 1) Reconstructed front wing: 13'-0"
 - 2) New construction rear wing: 10'-1 1/8"
 - g. Windows:
 - 1) Material: Wood (salvaged)
 - 2) Type: Double-hung sash and fixed
 - 3) Light Configurations: Mix of 6-over-6 double-hung sash and multi-light fixed
 - h. Front door:
 - 1) Material: Wood (salvaged)
 - 2) Finish: Painted

- 3) Configuration: Six-panel
- i. All other exterior doors:
 - 1) Material: Wood
 - 2) Finish: Painted or stained
 - 3) Configuration: Salvaged (to be determined)
- j. Roof:
 - 1) Form: Side-gable-on-hip and hip
 - 2) Material: Architectural shingle and standing-seam or 5-V Crimp metal.
 - 3) Pitch: 12/8
 - 4) The roof system on the reconstructed front wing will be a side-gable-on-hip with a hip extension off the rear. The new construction rear wing will be cross-gable that intersects with the rear wall of the reconstructed front wing without interfering with the front roof system. The roofs of both wings will be clad in architectural shingles. The roof over the hyphen will be clad in standing seam metal.
- k. East Façade
 - 1) The east façade of the reconstructed dwelling will feature a 3-sided wrap around porch with simple square columns in the Vernacular Greek Revival style. A flight of 11 wood steps will lead up to the two central bays of the six-bay-wide porch. Two six-over-six double-hung windows will be centered on the façade and flanked by two six-panel wood doors. The left (south) door will be operable and the right (north) door will be fixed.
- l. North Elevation
 - 1) The north elevation will feature the reconstructed dwelling on the left (east) and the new construction rear wing on the right (west). A hyphen connecting the two will feature a single-leaf full-light door with flanking full-light windows under a five-light transom. A side porch will run the full width of the hyphen. A flight of 10 steps will access the side porch at the west end. Windows on this elevation to be a mix of six-over-six double hung and 12-light fixed.
- m. West (Rear) Elevation
 - 1) The rear elevation of the new construction rear wing is seven bays wide under a hipped roof with a pyramidal cross hip extending outward from the three middle bays. A rear porch will be recessed under the northwest corner of the cross hip projection. A flight of 11 steps will access the rear porch. Windows on this elevation to be four-over-four double-hung and 12-light fixed.
- n. South Elevation
 - a. The south elevation will feature the new construction rear wing on the left (west) and the reconstructed dwelling on the right (east). A hyphen connecting the two will feature a single-leaf full-light door with flanking full-light windows under a five-light transom. A side porch will run the full width of the hyphen. A flight of 10 steps will access the side porch at the west end. Windows on this elevation to be a mix of six-over-six double hung and 12-light fixed.
1. Construct a paved driveway along the north property line
 - a. Driveway will extend from the existing curb cut along the north property line to a rear parking pad. The driveway will be held 1'-0" off the north property line.
 - 1) Driveway: approximately 10'-0" wide by 141'-0" deep.
 - 2) Rear parking pad: 37'-7" wide by 24'-0" deep.

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

- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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
- 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 to 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
- 6.39 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

- 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

- 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.
- 6.42 Design a porch to be compatible with the neighborhood.
 - Include a front porch as part of new construction if it is contextual and feasible.
 - When designing a porch, consider porch location, proportion, rhythm, roof form, supports, steps, balustrades and ornamentation relative to the main building and porches in the district.
 - Design the elements of a porch to be at a scale proportional to the main building.
 - Where a rhythm of porches exists on a street or block, design a porch that continues this historic rhythm.
 - Design a rear or side porch that is visible from the public right-of-way to be subordinate in character to the front porch.
- 6.43 Design piers, a foundation and foundation infill to be compatible with those of nearby historic properties.
 - Use raised, pier foundations.
 - If raised foundations are not feasible, use a simulated raised foundation.
 - Do not use slab-on-grade construction. This is not appropriate for Mobile's historic neighborhoods. If a raised slab is required, use water tables, exaggerated bases, faux piers or other methods to simulate a raised foundation.
 - Do not use raw concrete block or exposed slabs.
 - If foundation infill must be used, ensure that it is compatible with the neighborhood.
 - If solid infill is used, recess it and screen it with landscaping.
 - If lattice is used, hang it below the floor framing and between the piers. Finish it with trim.
 - Do not secure lattice to the face of the building or foundation.
 - Do not use landscaping to disguise inappropriate foundation design.

ACCEPTABLE FOUNDATION MATERIALS

- Materials that are similar in character, texture and durability to those used on nearby historic buildings are acceptable. These often include:
 - Brick piers
 - Brick infill
 - Wood (vertical pickets)
 - Framed lattice infill

UNACCEPTABLE FOUNDATION MATERIALS

- Materials that are not similar in character, texture and durability to those used on nearby historic buildings are unacceptable. These often include:
 - Mineral board panels
 - Concrete block infill
 - Metal infill
 - Plywood panel infill
 - Plastic sheeting infill
 - Vinyl sheeting infill
- 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

- 9.2 Locate a new accessory structure in line with other visible accessory structures in the district.

- These are traditionally located at the rear of a lot.

ACCEPTABLE ACCESSORY STRUCTURE MATERIALS

- Materials that are compatible with the historic district in scale and character are acceptable. These often include:
 - Wood frame
 - Masonry
 - Cement-based fiber siding
 - Installations (Pre-made store-bought sheds, provided they are minimally visible from public areas)

UNACCEPTABLE ACCESSORY STRUCTURE MATERIALS

- Materials that are not compatible with the historic district in scale and character are unacceptable. These often include:
 - Metal (except for a greenhouse)
 - Plastic (except for a greenhouse)
 - Fiberglass (except for a greenhouse)

- 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.

ACCEPTABLE WALK AND PAVING MATERIALS

- Materials that have a similar character, durability and level of detail to walks and paved areas associated with historic properties in the district are acceptable. These often include:
 - Gravel or crushed stone
 - Shell
 - Brick
 - Cobblestone
 - Grasspave or grasscrete (mix of grass and hard surface paving material that provides a solid surface)

STAFF ANALYSIS

The property under review is a vacant lot parcel located in the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. The application proposes approval to construct a new single-family residence at 152 Chatham Street. The proposed design is broadly compliant with the *Guidelines* in terms of its placement, size, mass, and materials. The front wing of the dwelling would be a reconstruction of a c. 1835 house once located at the 137 Tuscaloosa Street. This reconstruction will reuse as much of the original material that was salvaged when the house was deconstructed in 2018. The rear wing of the single-family dwelling will be new construction. A hyphen will connect the reconstructed wing to the new, and a shift in materials will distinguish new from old.

The *Guidelines* direct that new construction should be compatible with adjacent contributing properties and the district 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.

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 and side setbacks are in keeping with the established pattern for contributing dwellings on adjacent side streets. The proposed setback of 20 feet is well within the range for

contributing properties on Chatham Street and adjacent side streets. Setbacks for contributing properties on 100 and 200 blocks of Charles, Chatham, and George Streets range from 8 feet to 32 feet with an average setback of 20 feet. The proposed side setbacks of 5'0" and 12'0" also fall within established ranges. For the same comparison properties, the side setbacks range from 0'0" to 14'0" for the smaller side yard and between 3'0" and 71'0" for larger side yards. The average side yard setbacks overall are 6'0" and 18'0". The proposed site plan shows a setback of 5'0" for the south side yard and 12'1" for the north side yard. While the north side setback is slightly below average, it is well within the established range on Chatham Street and adjacent side streets.

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 overall size of the proposed dwelling is in keeping with the district. While the property is slightly wider than comparison properties on Chatham, Charles, and George Streets, it is comparable to adjacent properties on Church and Palmetto Streets. Comparison properties on Chatham and adjacent side streets range in width from 34'-0" to 55'-0". The reconstructed historic dwelling would be approximately 57'-0" wide. While slightly higher than the range of façade widths on side street, it is comparable to façade widths of the three nearest contributing properties (1013 Church and 1012 and 1050 Palmetto), which range from 57'-0" to 61'-0" wide. The overall footprint of the proposed new dwelling is also within established ranges. The proposed footprint will cover approximately 30% of the subject lot. Comparison properties on Charles, Chatham, and George Streets cover on average 37% of their lot.

While the proposed foundation height of 6'0" is not typical of the subject property's immediate neighbors, it is not without precedent in the surrounding blocks and the district. The nearest contributing properties – 1013 Church and 1012 and 1050 Palmetto Streets – all sit on raised pier foundation that are approximately 3 feet in height. However, raised cottages at 210 George Street and 1008 Palmetto Street sit on raised piers that are approximately 6'-0" in height. Photographs of the c. 1835 dwelling in situ at 137 Tuscaloosa Street demonstrate that the house originally sat on piers between 5'0" and 6'0" in height. Placing the reconstructed dwelling on 3'0" piers would therefore create a version of the reconstructed dwelling that never existed historically.

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).

All proposed materials are listed as appropriate for new construction in the *Guidelines*. This includes the architectural shingle roof, wood siding, fiber cement siding, brick piers, and wood doors and windows. The reconstructed front wing will consist of as much salvage material from 137 Tuscaloosa Street as is available. Any missing elements or pieces of siding or trim will be replicated in wood to match the original materials. The use of more modern materials will differentiate the new construction rear wing from the front, in compliance with the *Guidelines* directive that new additions be distinguishable from the original. While siding and trim on the rear wing will visually complement the reconstructed front wing, the rear wing will be clad in fiber cement boards rather than wood. All windows on both portions will be salvaged wood windows with true divided lights.

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 *Guidelines* directive against replica historic buildings is in reference to new construction that mimics the old. The *Guidelines* do list reconstruction as an accepted treatment. As a c. 1835 structure, the reconstructed dwelling will be architecturally sympathetic to the Oakleigh Garden District, which features several examples of antebellum homes in the Greek Revival style – most notably, the Oakleigh House Museum at 350 Oakleigh Place. The new rear wing will echo the understated and minimal classical detailing of the reconstructed front wing. However, the use of a hyphen to connect the two structures will provide a visual cue that the two wings are not contemporary to one another, as will the use of fiber cement siding on the rear wing.

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 side driveway and rear parking area satisfy requirements that parking be located to the side or rear of a building whenever possible. The design will also include a walkway from the sidewalk on Chatham Street to the porch steps, in compliance with the *Guidelines* directive that new residential buildings have a visible connection with the pedestrian right-of-way.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Ms. Lucy Barr, architect, was present to represent the application. She provided a summary of the project.

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. Blackwell commended Ms. Barr for her work on the project.

Ms. Roselius agreed, stating that she is pleased to see infill being added to the historic district.

Mr. Stone asked how high the original home sat off the ground. Steve May, homebuilder, came forward. Mr. May stated that the original home sat six feet off the ground.

Mr. McGowin interjected to note that the home under consideration belongs to Ms. Annie Sawyer Allen.

Mr. McGowin stated that Ms. Allen was not involved in the staff review of this application and has recused herself from the application process.

FINDING FACTS

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

Mr. Blackwell seconded the motion, and all approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

Ms. Davis seconded the motion, and all approved.



Agenda Item #7

Certified Record 2026-54-CA

DETAILS

Location:

913 Texas Street

Summary of Request:

Demolish a single-family dwelling.

Applicant (as applicable):

Powe & Associates, LLC

Property Owner:

Powe & Associates, LLC

Historic District:

Oakleigh Garden

Classification:

Not Listed

Summary of Analysis:

- The subject property consists of two c. 1905 shotgun houses with c. 1942 additions and a c. 1956 hyphen. The full complex has lost much of its architectural integrity, but the original shotgun facing Texas Street may still retain enough historic material to be considered contributing if the National Register district were to be expanded.
- The entire complex was placed in the City's nuisance abatement program in April 2026.
- The proposed redevelopment of the corner lot with three shotgun type dwellings would mitigate the loss of this corner structure in the streetscape.

Report Contents:

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

PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

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

The property at 913 Texas Street is in the “local only” portion of the Oakleigh Garden Historic District. It is therefore not listed as either contributing or non-contributing to the National Register District. It is best double dated as being constructed c. 1905 with c. 1942 alterations. The current structure is a combination of two shotgun houses that in 1925 were designated 501 (401) Marine Street and 913 (709) Texas Street. Both original structures likely date to c. 1905, given that 501 (401) Marine Street first appears in the 1906 City Directory and 913 (709) Texas Street in the 1908 City Directory. The current structure also includes several additions made to the former 501 Marine Street between 1925 and 1956. These additions likely occurred around 1942, the year that 501 Marine Street was renumbered as 915 Texas Street. The reorientation of the property toward Texas Street likely coincided with the infill of the original west porch, the creation of a new north entry porch, and the construction of several additions. Aerial photographs suggest a hyphen structure connected the two dwellings sometime between 1956 and 1974.

When surveyed in 2007 as part of a local-only expansion of the Oakleigh Garden District, the structure had the same footprint, form, and ornamentation that is seen today. At the time, the structure was considered a candidate for rehabilitation. In December 2009, City staff issued a Certificate of Appropriateness for roof and siding repairs at this address. It is not known if any of this work occurred. In February 2020, the then owner received a Notice of Violation for exterior maintenance concerns. A new owner acquired the property in June 2020 and applied for a building permit for exterior alterations the following August. This permit was denied on the grounds that no COA had been issued for this work. Records do not show any attempts to apply for a COA or to reapply for building permits. The property subsequently failed four NOV inspections between 2023 and 2025. The property was placed in Nuisance Abatement in April 2026. The current owner acquired the property in May 2026.

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

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Demolish unlisted residential structure.
 - a. Salvage the north end of the c. 1905 shotgun dwelling facing Texas Street for reuse in a new shotgun-type dwelling.
2. Subdivide lot into three lots that are 40' wide and approximately 83' deep.
 - a. Salvaged north end to become part of a proposed new shotgun dwelling on this lot (concept only).

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

The 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 913 Texas Street is in the local-only portion of Oakleigh Garden District. It therefore is not listed as contributing or non-contributing. The building consists of two c. 1905 shotgun dwellings combined with c. 1942 additions. Since 1942, aluminum awning windows have replaced most of the original wood windows. The c. 1942 porch was enclosed at an unknown date. A porch with folk Victorian bracketing remains on the north façade of the shotgun built facing Texas Street before 1908. The original porch on the west façade of the shotgun facing Marine Street was enclosed as part of the c. 1942 renovations. Folk Victorian fish scale shingles remain in this gable end along with remnants of a decorative vergeboard. Original wood lap siding remains on the Texas and Marine Street elevations, but rear elevations have been covered with plywood drop siding. In short, the complex of buildings is disjointed and difficult to recognize as belonging to a particular period or architectural style. The shotgun dwelling facing Texas Street has the most architectural integrity and on its own could be considered contributing to a future expansion of Oakleigh Garden 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 structure is unique in Oakleigh Garden District as an amalgamation of two shotgun dwellings with c. 1942 additions and a c. 1956 hyphen. However, one of the major c. 1942 additions – the cement block corner store shown on the 1956 Sanborn – has been lost. With the corner store, this residential complex told a story of working class Mobilians “making do” amid the economic boom and housing shortage of the Postwar Era. Without the corner store, the residential complex might be considered a rather poor example of two shotgun houses, rather than one of the last remaining examples of mixed-use vernacular architecture.

Condition

According to the *Guidelines*, “demolition may be more appropriate when a building is deteriorated or in poor condition.” The City of Mobile has cited this property multiple times and placed it in the Nuisance Abatement program in April of this year. The current owner purchased the property in May. In August 2026, the owner commissioned a structural assessment of the property. Bethel Engineering found that, while technically possible, the rehabilitation of the structure would not be cost-effective. The report concluded that “the scope of work required – full replacement of the siding, foundation, and a substantial portion of the framing – is not materially different from new construction.

Site photographs reveal that the c. 1942 additions appear to be in the worst state of deterioration. The two c. 1905 shotguns appear to be in somewhat better condition, but only the shotgun facing Texas Street retains much of its original architectural integrity.

Impact on the Street and District

The *Guidelines* further instruct that the impact of a structure’s demolition on surrounding structures, including neighboring properties, properties on the same block or across the street, or properties throughout the individual historic district should be considered. The loss of this property would create a third vacant lot on this corner of Texas and Marine Street. Removal of the north-facing shotgun house would in particular disrupt a grouping of three extant shotgun houses on this block of Texas Street.

Nature of proposed development at the origination property

The *Guidelines* instruct that the future use of a cleared site should be considered. After demolition, the applicant proposes subdividing the lot into three parcels wide enough to construct three new shotgun-type dwellings. This plan would greatly mitigate the loss of this corner structure and continue the rhythm of the three extant shotgun dwellings on this block of Texas Street. The applicant has also proposed salvaging the north end of the Texas Street shotgun, including the Folk Victorian porch, for use on a new shotgun dwelling in the same location. This compromise would allow some portion of the existing structure to remain as part of a new development.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

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

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 thanked Mr. Powe for submitting a report from a structural engineer.

Mr. Stone asked how many homes will be built. Mr. Powe said his goal is to have four houses total on the site.

Mr. Blackwell stated that Mr. Powe's plan to add more homes will improve the rhythm of the street.

Ms. Roselius advised Mr. Powe to keep in touch with staff as he formulates his plans to redevelop the site.

FINDING FACTS

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

Ms. Wilson seconded the motion, and all approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

Mr. Howle seconded the motion, and all approved.



Agenda Item #8

Certified Record 2026-47-CA

DETAILS

Location:

155 Houston Street

Summary of Request:

Replace thirteen existing wood windows with aluminum-clad wood windows

Applicant (as applicable):

Mike Anderson (Anderson Cabinet Company LLC)

Property Owner:

Kad Henderson

Historic District:

Old Dauphin Way

Classification:

Non-Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

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

Report Contents:

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

PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

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

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

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

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

SCOPE OF WORK

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

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

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

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

STAFF ANALYSIS

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

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

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

Assessment of Window Condition

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

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

Windows and Energy Efficiency

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

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

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Before the application could be presented, Mr. Blackwell stepped out of the meeting and did not return. The time was 3:46pm.

Josh Scaglione, contractor, was present to represent the application. He gave a summary of the project.

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. Stone inquired about the material for the proposed windows. Mr. Scaglione stated that the windows will be vinyl clad wood windows. Mr. Stone asked staff if vinyl is an approved window material for the historic districts.

Ms. Roselius stated that the windows appear to be repairable. She explained that the guidelines encourage repair over replacement.

Ms. Allen asked Mr. Scaglione to clarify whether the windows would be vinyl or aluminum clad. He replied that the windows will be vinyl clad. Ms. Allen informed Mr. Scaglione that vinyl is not an approvable material for windows.

Ms. Davis asked Mr. Scaglione if the property owner considered repairing the windows instead of replacing them. Mr. Scaglione was not sure.

Mr. Scaglione requested to table the application.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Stone moved to table the application.

Mr. Howell seconded the motion, and all approved.

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:57pm.