



Architectural Review Board Minutes

June 17, 2026 – 3:00 P.M.

ADMINISTRATIVE

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

1. Roll Call

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

Members Present: Stephen Howle, Barja Wilson, Jennifer Roselius, Cartledge Blackwell, Stephen McNair, and Karrie Maurin.

Members Absent: Cameron Pfeiffer-Traylor, Abby Davis, and Catarina Echols

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

2. Approval of Minutes from June 3, 2026

Mr. Stephen McNair moved to approve the minutes of the June 3, 2026, meeting.

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

3. Approval of Mid-Month COAs granted by Staff

Mr. Cartledge Blackwell moved to approve the mid-month COAs granted by Staff.

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

MID-MONTH APPROVALS

- 1. Applicant:** Diversified Roofing Service Inc
Property Address: 1005 Augusta Street
Date of Approval: 05/28/2026
Project: Reroof in-kind replacing existing shingle roof with Oyster Gray GAF Timberline HDZ architectural shingles.
- 2. Applicant:** Robert Bronstein
Property Address: 701 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 05/29/2026
Project:
1. Paint exterior of 701 and 709 Dauphin Street the following Benjamin Moore colors to match existing:
Body: Providence Olive
Trim: Feather Down (cream)
Accent: Fairview Taupe
Shutters: Valley Forge Brown
2. Replace two shutters on the north elevation of 701 Dauphin in-kind to match existing in material, profile and dimension; replace two shutters on the east elevation of 701 Dauphin in-kind to match existing in material, profile and dimension.
- 3. Applicant:** Roof Doctor of Alabama Inc
Property Address: 1313 Dauphin Street

- Date of:** 06/01/2026
Project: Reroof in-kind replacing existing metal roof of the band room at the Alabama School of Math and Sciences with 26-gauge R-Panel (White) metal roof.
4. **Applicant:** EZ-Roof Gulf LLC
Property Address: 553 Church Street
Date of Approval: 06/08/2026
Project: Reroof to replace existing metal roof with dark gray hearthstone Atlas architectural shingles.
5. **Applicant:** Chad E Foster (BLD)
Property Address: 16 Gladys Ave
Date of Approval: 06/08/2026
Project: Reroof in-kind replacing existing shingle roof with GAF Timberline HDZ Pewter architectural shingles.

APPLICATIONS

1. 2026-34-CA

Address: 401 Civic Center Drive
Historic District: Church Street East
Applicant/Agent Sam Matheny/Volkert, Inc. on behalf of the City of Mobile
Project: Install a prefabricated loading dock guard shack for the Mobile Arena
Approved - **Certified Record Attached**

2. 2026-35-CA

Address: 401 Civic Center Drive
Historic District: Church Street East
Applicant/Agent Sam Matheny/Volkert, Inc. on behalf of the City of Mobile
Project: Exterior building and landscape lighting plan for Mobile Arena
Approved - **Certified Record Attached**

3. 2026-36-CA

Address: 401 Civic Center Drive
Historic District: Church Street East
Applicant/Agent Sam Matheny/Volkert, Inc. on behalf of the City of Mobile
Project: Commercial signage for Mobile Arena
Approved - **Certified Record Attached**

4. 2026-37-CA

Address: 250 St. Francis Street
Historic District: Church Street East
Applicant/Agent Steve Stone on behalf of Shree Kishan MOB, LLC
Project: Construct new hotel and establish two parking areas
Approved with Amendments - **Certified Record Attached**

5. 2026-30-CA

Address: 960 Dauphin Street
Historic District: Old Dauphin Way
Applicant/Agent Robert Brown
Project: After-the-fact approval to remove and replace original front door, transoms, and

OTHER BUSINESS

The next ARB meeting is scheduled for July 1, 2026.



Agenda Item #1

Certified Record 2026-34-CA

DETAILS

Location:

401 Civic Center Drive

Summary of Request:

Install a prefabricated loading dock guard shack for the Mobile Arena

Applicant (as applicable):

Sam Matheny/Volkert, Inc.

Property Owner:

City of Mobile

Historic District:

Church Street East

Classification:

Non-Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The proposed building materials, as presented, are not approved by the *Guidelines* for accessory structures.
- The proposed structure is prefabricated and could be moved or removed in the future if needed.

Report Contents:

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

PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

Church Street East Historic District was initially listed in the National Register in 1971 under Criteria A (historic significance) and C (architectural significance) for its local significance in the areas of architecture, education, and urban planning. The district is significant for its concentration of multiple 19th century architectural styles and because it encompasses the site of Mobile in the early 1700s. The district boundaries were expanded in 1984 and 2005.

The subject property, which recently has been subdivided to accommodate a new U.S. Army Corps of Engineers building and a six-story parking garage, is occupied by the 1964 Civic Center theater and arena and the 1973 exposition hall. The 1876 Hopkins ward map of Mobile showed the area bounded by Church, Lawrence, Canal, and Claiborne streets was densely developed with residences. The 1885 Sanborn map illustrates only the far northwest corner of the current Civic Center property, showing an area populated with one-story frame dwellings, “tenements”, and “shanties.” The entire Civic Center area is illustrated on the 1891 Sanborn map, which continues to show a densely developed residential area. Interspersed with the mostly one-story frame houses of varying size were grocery stores, barber shops, an ice cream shop, retail stores, a fire station, a church, a saloon, and a restaurant. Sanborn Maps published in 1904 and 1924, as well as the 1955 update to the 1924 map, show a similar pattern with a few exceptions. The grocery stores and barbers seem to have disappeared, and the block bounded by Madison, Claiborne, Canal, and Franklin streets had been cleared for use as a “Public Play Ground”. The two and one-half story brick Robert E. Lee Public School occupied the block bounded by Madison, Franklin, Hamilton, and Canal streets. Available aerial photographs of the Civic Center area taken in 1938, 1952, 1955, and 1960 show essentially the same development as reflected in the 1924/1955 Sanborn map.

By the time of the next available aerial photograph, 1967, more than seven blocks had been leveled to make way for the Civic Center. The only structure remaining was the public school bounded by Madison, Franklin, Hamilton, and Canal streets. The school disappeared by the time of the next available aerial photograph, taken in 1980. Demolition of the 1960s Civic Center building was completed in early 2025.

According to the vertical files of the Historic Development Department, the larger parcel, of which the subject complex was part until recently, has previously appeared eight (8) times before the Architectural Review Board (ARB). In November 1983, the ARB approved placement of a commemorative plaque on a brick base at the corner of Claiborne Street and Auditorium Drive (now Civic Center Drive). The installation of a 100’ telecommunications tower and construction of a one-story 10’x16’ accessory structure on a small parcel to the immediate north of the current site of a new office building was approved by the ARB in July 1998. The ARB approved the construction of two steel and glass bus shelters located along the Lawrence Street side of the parcel was approved in October 2009. The ARB approved construction of a six-story office building at the southeast corner of the Civic Center site over three meetings from August 2022 through April 2023. A six-level City parking garage was approved by the ARB in July 2023. In June of 2024, the demolition of the Civic Center Complex (including the theater, arena/auditorium, and exposition hall) was granted approval by the ARB. In October 2024, the ARB approved conceptual design for a new Civic Arena, with the caveat that additional design details – such as the cladding panels and decorative ironwork – would return to the Board for approval at a later date. The property most recently appeared before the Board on October 1, 2025 where exterior panels and decorative ironwork for the Civic Center was approved.

The three applications for the arena (2026-34-CA, 2026-35-CA, 2026-36-CA) were considered concurrently by the Board

SCOPE OF WORK (2026-34-CA)

Install prefabricated guard shack measuring 10’3¼” W x 6’3¼” D x 8’5” H

- Guard shack will sit on grade and will be located to the southeast of the Arena, along S. Claiborne Street frontage.
- Exterior walls and roof will be 16 gauge galvanized steel

- Roof will have 8" fascia with a 6" overhang on all sides.
- Unit will have two doors located on the south and north elevations of the structure.
 - Doors will be 36"x80" commercial grade steel framed slide doors constructed with 16 gauge galvanized steel panels.
- Unit will have six ¾" bronze tinted dual pane windows.
 - East façade and west (rear) elevation will have one window each measuring 66" W x 40" H.
 - North and south elevations will both have two windows measuring 37" W x 40" H each flanking the centered door.

STAFF ANALYSIS (2026-34-CA)

The subject property is a non-contributing site within the Church Street East Historic District. The application under review seeks approval for the placement of a prefabricated guard shack to be placed on grade to the southeast of the arena.

The *Guidelines* call for new accessory structures to be subordinate to the primary structure and for the accessory structure to be in line with other visible accessory structures. (9.1, 9.2). The proposed guard shack would be subordinate to the arena and would be located to the rear of the primary frontage of the arena. Additionally, the *Guidelines* direct that window placements should be representative and sympathetic to surrounding historic structures. The frequency of windows is not reflective of traditional window placements; however, as this would be a security structure, visibility on all elevations would be necessary.

The *Guidelines* provide that accepted materials for accessory structures include wood frame, masonry, cement-based fiber siding and installations (pre-made store bought sheds, provided they are minimally visible from ROW). Further, the *Guidelines* restrict the use of metal, fiberglass, plastic to greenhouses. The proposed accessory structure would be a prefabricated metal structure placed right off of S Claiborne, a highly visible location. Both the proposed material and location are contrary to the stated Guidelines. Consideration should be given to the removable nature of the structure as lifting eyes would be available on the roof of the structure for relocation or removal. Additionally, a metal structure would provide superior security. The exterior walls and windows meet hurricane resistant code. The proposed color matches the bronze color on the rear aluminum gate and accents on the arena building, creating a blending effect to visual minimize the structure's presence.

SCOPE OF WORK (2026-35-CA)

Exterior Building and Area Lighting (All poles, acorn heads, luminaries, and bases to be painted Mobile Jet Green)

Decorative Poles (see plans for location and detailed lighting information)

- Pole lighting to be located along the various walkways, public event plaza, and Civic Center Drive. Poles to include:
 - Replacement poles to match the height and location of the existing Civic Center Drive poles to be topped by a 3-head tenon arm with two SL1 luminaires and one SL2 liminary attached to the pole.
 - 28' poles (SLP1)
 - Install ten poles around the circular public event plaza with four luminaires attached to each pole.
 - 18' poles (SLP2 and SLP5)
 - Install forty poles topped by acorn lights with varying numbers of luminaires to be located along the pedestrian promenade, drive lane, South Hamilton Street walkway, the walkway to parking garage, and the event drop-off plaza.

Terrace Level Lighting (see plans for location and detailed lighting information)

- Lighting elements for the terrace level to be installed on the north and south terrace level. Terrace level lighting to include:
 - SL4 (column downlight)

- SL5-5 (underside of drink rail)
- SL14 (architectural metalwork backlight)

Roof and Soffit Lighting (see plans for location and detailed lighting information)

- Lighting to include:
 - SL13 Color tuning roof lighting
 - Color tuning lighting (Red, Green, Blue, White) to be mounted on the inside of the parapet wall and run around the entire arena.
 - DL1 Grand Hall recessed soffit lighting
 - Downfacing recessed soffit lighting to be located on the west elevation of the arena between the south and north gates.

Back of House Lighting (see plans for location and detailed lighting information)

- Lighting to include:
 - SL15 single wedge surface mount lights over the back of house entry doors
 - SLP3 back of house poles
 - Install four 25' poles with one downward facing 5" square light each to surround the player parking area to the east of the arena.
 - SLP4 back of house poles
 - Install five 25' poles with two downward facing 5" square lights each to surround the loading and drive thru bays to the south of the arena.

Landscape Lighting (see plans for location and detailed lighting information)

- Landscape lighting will include spotlight at ground level with three spotlights to a tree. The type of spotlights will include:
 - Narrow Beam
 - Approximately twenty single round medium output flood lighting
 - Medium Beam
 - Approximately ten single round narrow spot flood lighting
 - Wide Beam
 - Approximately nineteen single round medium output flood lighting

STAFF ANALYSIS (2026-35-CA)

The subject property is a non-contributing site within the Church Street East Historic District. The application under review seeks approval for the installation of exterior and landscape lighting to illuminate the new arena and grounds.

The *Guidelines* call for lighting elements and design to be in character with the setting (10.9). The new arena is a unique structure within the local historical district and requires unique lighting fixtures and design. Proposed lighting elements include acorns, square lights, removable luminaires, sconces, recessed can lights, single round landscape lighting, and other lighting features. The pole and acorns as well as the paint color, Mobile Jet Green, are reflective of the established design of light fixtures and signage found in Lower Dauphin and Church Street East Historic Districts. Single wedge light fixtures will be limited to the loading bays and away from main concourse areas as called for in the *Guidelines*.

The *Guidelines* provide that a fixture should be compatible with the architectural and site design elements and should softly illuminate important architectural features (10.9). The proposed lighting elements would serve to both illuminate the public areas and highlight the design elements of the arena. This is clearly demonstrated with the proposed backlighting of the architectural metalwork on the promenade, and the downlighting and spots proposed for the columns and the underside of the arched arcade .

Landscape lighting as proposed in the application would include approximately 49 single round lighting elements, installed at ground level and ranging from narrow beam, medium beam, to wide beam. The landscape lighting plan calls for three spotlights to illuminate each landscape tree in a configuration of different sized beams. The

Guidelines state that landscape lighting should be limited for its purpose of safety or to highlight important site features (10.9). The proposed would serve to illuminate the surrounding arboreal elements and provide safety measures by ensuring the main walking and gathering areas are well lit.

According to the *Guidelines*, lighting should not create a harsh glare or color, and should be contained within a site, avoiding spillage into neighboring properties. Given the size of the parcel and the scale of the structure, a substantial lighting package is required to properly illuminate the property and building for aesthetic, safety and security purposes. That said, the proposed plan and the submitted renderings demonstrate a lean toward the discreet; with predominantly inwardly and downward directed lighting; indirect and back lighting, and features such as programable lighting and color tuning which can be configured to produce softer reduced lighting during non-event periods.

SCOPE OF WORK (2026-36-CA)

Exterior Signage Types

- Monument Pylon (MON-A)
 - One fabricated aluminum sign cabinet with text “REGIONS ARENA” measuring 3’4” W x 9’2¼” H x 7½” D to be located NW of the arena and south of the passenger drop off area.
 - Painted Anchor Bronze Metallic with the lettering painted Plaque Gold Metallic.
 - Side inset design areas feature a minimal azalea flower pattern laser-cut from aluminum panel also painted Anchor Bronze Metallic.
 - Will be installed on a 2” H concrete base painted to match the sign cabinet.
 - Externally Illuminated
- Building ID, West (X-01)
 - Painted steel/aluminum channel letters to say “REGIONS ARENA” with translucent white acrylic faces and located roughly center on the west elevation of the arena.
 - Sign will be internally illuminated with white or programmable color changing LED lights.
 - Relief and structure to be painted Anchor Bronze Metallic.
- Building ID, East (X-01)
 - Painted steel/aluminum channel letters to say “REGIONS ARENA” with translucent white acrylic faces and located on the south end of the east elevation of the arena.
 - Sign will be internally illuminated with white or programmable color changing LED lights.
 - Relief and structure to be painted Anchor Bronze Metallic.
- Entrance ID (X-03)
 - Six ½” aluminum entry signs painted white to contrast the building face.
 - Five signs will be located on the east, south, and west elevations of the arena and the south elevation of the guard shack.
- Gate ID, South Gate (X-04)
 - Located on the west side of the arena and centered above the gate entrance doors the sign will read “SOUTH GATE” and will be an internally illuminated channel letter sign with translucent white acrylic faces with returns painted Anchor Bronze Metallic.
- Gate ID, North Gate (X-04)
 - Located on the west side of the arena and centered above the gate entrance doors the sign will read “NORTH GATE” and will be an internally illuminated channel letter sign with translucent white acrylic faces with returns painted Anchor Bronze Metallic.
- Pedestrian Pylon (X-07)
 - Five fabricated aluminum cabinet pylon signs measuring 3’0” W x 9’10 ¾” H x 7” D to be installed surrounding the arena to the north, west, and east.
 - Will have: arena name (painted Plaque Gold Metallic), navigational arrows (painted Plaque Gold Metallic), and map.
 - Bottom and side inset design areas feature a minimal azalea flower pattern laser-cut from aluminum panel also painted Anchor Bronze Metallic.

- Panel below azalea pattern painted Fuse Gold Metallic.
- Will be installed on a 2" H concrete base painted to match the sign cabinet.
- Externally Illuminated
- Pedestrian Pylon, Map Version (X-07A)
 - One fabricated aluminum cabinet pylon sign located at the northeast corner of property measuring 2'8 ½" W x 5'9 ¼" H x 7" D.
 - Will have: arena name (painted Plaque Gold Metallic) and map.
 - Bottom and side inset design areas feature a minimal azalea flower pattern laser-cut from aluminum panel also painted Anchor Bronze Metallic.
 - Panel below azalea pattern painted Fuse Gold Metallic.
 - Will be installed on a 2" H concrete base painted to match the sign cabinet.
 - Externally Illuminated
- Accessible Path ID (X-09)
 - Three fabricated aluminum cabinet signs to identify exterior routes that are compliant with ADA standards and measuring 10½"W x 4'0"H x 3"D located on the southwest, northwest, and northeast of the property.
 - Navigational arrow and icon to be dimensional and painted Plaque Gold Metallic and the pylon sign cabinet will be painted Anchor Bronze Metallic.
- Vehicular Directionals (X-12)
 - One fabricated aluminum cabinet sign to say "RESERVED PARKING" and measuring 2'7¼"W x 5'4 3/8"H x 7"D located at the entrance of the gated player parking area to the east of the arena.
 - Will have: arena name, navigational arrows, icons and type to be dimensional and painted Plaque Gold Metallic.
 - Bottom and side inset design areas feature a minimal azalea flower pattern laser-cut from aluminum panel also painted Anchor Bronze Metallic.
 - Panel below azalea pattern painted Fuse Gold Metallic.
 - Will be installed on a 2" H concrete base painted to match the sign cabinet.
 - Externally Illuminated.
- Loading Dock ID (plaque) (X-15)
 - Five ¼" thick aluminum panel signs painted Chocolate Bliss and to measure 1'8" W x 1'7" H centered 4" above the loading dock area on the south elevation of the arena
- Ride Share Pylon (X-16)
 - One fabricated aluminum cabinet sign painted Anchor Bronze Metallic to say "RIDE SHARE" measuring 10 ½"W x 8'0"H x 4"D to be located NW of the arena and south of the passenger drop off area.
 - Icon and type to be dimensional and painted Plaque Gold Metallic.
 - Will be installed on a 2" H concrete base painted to match the sign cabinet.
 - Externally Illuminated.
- Clearance Bar (X-17)
 - One ¼" thick aluminum panel signs painted Chocolate Bliss to measure 7'4" W x 1'2" H leading to the drive thru bay on the south elevation of the arena and will have the clearance height written on the sign.

STAFF ANALYSIS (2026-36-CA)

The subject property is a non-contributing site within the Church Street East Historic District. The application under review seeks approval for exterior and area signage for the new arena. There is a total of 29 proposed signs which include pylon signs, monumental signs, building identification signs, directional signs, and other sign types. The primary material proposed for use is fabricated aluminum.

Due to its size and function, the new arena is a unique structure within the historic district both in terms of scale and design. There is not an extant comparable reference located in the near vicinity. The closest structure to

compare to the new arena would be the previous civic center. However, the updated design, larger patronage capacity, and current requirements for zoning and ADA compliance necessitate an additional level of signage that the previous civic center structure and site did not have.

The design of the proposed signage incorporates historic and cultural references specific to the city such as the azalea flower in the proposed perforated panels and reliefs on the monument signage. The design of the proposed signs are predominantly compatible with the character of the building and the district, using a color scheme that echoes that of the building, and using simple fonts and forms on the building signs and on site to avoid visually disrupting architectural features, sight lines, and landscape elements. (11.3).

The majority of the proposed would be constructed from compliant materials per the *Guidelines*, with the exceptions being the two building identification signs and the two gate identification signs, which will feature full acrylic faces (11.9). These identification signs are internally lit which is also contrary to the *Guidelines* (11.8). The proposed internal lighting element for the building identification sign would be LED, which would be programable to allow for color and effect changes. The remaining signs, both on the building and at the site will be externally illuminated.

The proposed signage would far exceed the suggested square footage for both monument signs and total signage (64 sf) specified in the *Guidelines* (11.5, 11.9). However, considering the size and scale of the arena, the size, placement, design, and number of proposed signs produce a discreet, proportional, and unintrusive effect in relation to the subject building and site.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Sam Matheny, on behalf of Volkert Inc, presented the project to the Board.

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

BOARD DISCUSSION (Applications 2026-34-CA, 2026-35-CA, and 2026-36-CA were discussed concurrently)

Mr. Stephen McNair stated that he had no objections to any of the subject applications for the arena.

Ms. Jennifer Roselius asked about the font of the proposed signage.

Mr. Matheny replied that all signage fonts will match and will be as shown in the presentation.

Mr. Blackwell approved of the signage plans.

Ms. Roselius appreciated the minimalistic design of the signage. She then expressed concern about the lighting elements proposed. She stated that the historic looking acorn fixtures would be historic while the luminaires would appear more modern. She suggested an alternative light that was more geometric as seen around the Spanish Plaza.

FINDING FACTS

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

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Cartledge Blackwell moved that the applications 2026-34-CA, 2026-35-CA, and 2026-36-CA do not impair the architectural or historic character of the property or the district, and that the application should be granted a COA.

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



Agenda Item #4

Certified Record 2026-37-CA

DETAILS

Location:

250 St Francis Street

Summary of Request:

Construct new hotel and establish two parking areas.

Applicant (as applicable):

Steve Stone

Property Owner:

Shree Kishan MOB, LLC

Historic District:

Lower Dauphin Commercial District

Classification:

Non-Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The massing and height of the structure help to anchor the edges of the historic district as now demolished commercial buildings once did
- The proposed building materials, as presented, are compatible with other historic buildings in Mobile's historic districts, but also differentiate the subject structure as non-historic, as directed by the *Guidelines*
- The design proposes to incorporate architectural elements and features that recall traditional building patterns in Mobile, however do not sufficiently accomplish 'breaking up' the excess massing directed by the *Guidelines*
- The proposed site improvements serve to segregate, differentiate, and shield different areas of the site

Report Contents:

Property and Application History	2
Scope of Work	2
Applicable Standards	3
Staff Analysis.....	6
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 two large parcels have been host to numerous buildings and businesses as seen through the Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps. The 1881 Sanborn Map shows that the area around 250 St Francis featured a three-story commercial building called D.R. Dunlap Drug and Clothing. The 1881 Sanborn Map also shows that the proposed parking area north of the hotel once had a Synagogue, a Presbyterian Church, and several dwellings. The 1924 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map illustrates the increasing industrialization seen in Mobile during this period. The D.R. Dunlap store has been turned into a furniture factory; there is a three-story ice-cream factory at the corner of St. Michael and N Joachim; and an abundance of auto shops and garages can be seen on both sides of St. Michael Street. The updated 1955 Sanborn Map shows that the around 250 St. Francis is beginning to be cleared. There are fewer buildings on the block, primarily unnamed stores and a neon shop and dance studio in the place of the ice-cream factory and furniture factory. Historic aerials show that the area was primarily leveled between 1969 and 1980 with only one building present at the corner of St Michael and N Joachim. By 1985 the two lots have been cleared and are being used as parking lots.

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

SCOPE OF WORK

- 1. Construct a five-story brick and stucco-clad hotel on the block of St Francis, N. Joachim, and St. Michael Street.**
 - a. The building footprint will measure 128'11" along the St Francis (south) elevation; 185'4¼" along the N Joachim (east) elevation; and 66'5½" along the St Michael (north) elevation. There will be two primary entrances; one located on the east elevation facing N Joachim Street; and one on the west elevation facing the parking lot. Access to the parking lot is a 32'2¼" opening west end of the south elevation.
 - b. The building will be approximately 60' high with a central tower with a parapet wall that adds an additional 4'9" in height. The first floor will be 15' in height; the floor-to-floor height for the second to fourth floors will be 10'; the fifth floor will be 11' in height.
 - c. The first floor (base) of the building will be clad in a light tan brick (Brick A) laid in a running bond pattern with a brick rowlock layer approximately ¾ of the way up the wall and capped with a brick soldier lock pattern. The upper four stories will be clad in stucco with the tan (stucco A) on the St Francis and N Joachim Street elevations, and the gray stucco (stucco C) on the north and west elevations. The central parapet will be clad with dark gray brick (Brick B) in a rolling bond pattern with recessed sections with herringbone patterns on the east elevation.
 - d. An open dining area will be located underneath the proposed tower on the southeast corner.
 - e. The building will be constructed on grade.
 - f. The window and door materials will be aluminum.
 - g. The roof will be flat. There will be a rooftop pool and pool deck on the southwest section of the structure.
 - h. The aluminum windows will be placed to line up vertically.
 - 1) Windows on the first floor of the north end of the east façade and east end of the north façade will be evenly spaced full height one-by-one windows with an aluminum and fabric awning above.
 - 2) Windows on the northwest, south, east, and west elevations of the second through fifth floors will be evenly spaced one-by-one full height above aluminum AC grilles.
 - 3) Windows on the north elevations at the west end of the second through the fifth floors will be one full height with two vertical mullions and one horizontal mullion.
 - 4) A column of single full height windows centrally located on the more eastern north elevation (section on St Michael Street frontage).

- 5) Southwest elevation will not feature any windows.
- i. Aluminum storefront doors will be placed on the east elevation (N Joachim) and west elevation (leading from the parking lot underneath the covered drop off area)

2. Site Improvements

- a. Pave existing parking lot north of Saint Michael Street.
- b. Create parking lot to the west of proposed hotel.
- c. Install 48" high prefinished aluminum fence to enclose the parking lot on St. Michael Street.
 - 1) Primary entrance on the south side of the parking lot on the St. Michael frontage with exits on N Joachim and N Jackson Street.
- b. Install dumpster on the northwest area of the attached hotel parking area.
 - 2) Dumpster will be within a 6' high enclosure constructed of Trex or other composite material.

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

1. **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:
 - i. Wood
 - ii. Vinyl-clad wood
 - iii. Aluminum-clad customized wood
 - iv. 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:
 - i. Mill finish metal windows
 - ii. Snap-in or artificial muntins
 - iii. Vinyl

2. **6.46** Design shutters and awnings to be compatible with the building.
 - Use a shutter that fits the reveal of a window opening precisely.
 - Use an awning that fits proportionately over the window or door opening with an appropriate overlap at the side.
 - Use an awning with a simple design and material.
 - Use an awning with a color that is compatible with the overall building's color scheme. Canvas is preferred.
3. **6.47** Design shutters and awnings to be compatible with the district.

- Use operable blinds or shutter units hung with hinges.
- When using artificial materials, use a blind or shutter unit that has a thickness, weight and design similar to wood. An artificial material shutter will be considered on a case-by-case basis.
- Use an operable shutter where feasible.
- Where a blind or shutter is fixed, hang them on a window casing in a manner to replicate an operable shutter.
- If a synthetic awning is used, use one with a textured surface. Do not use an awning with a smooth vinyl surface.

ACCEPTABLE SHUTTER AND AWNING MATERIALS

- Materials that are similar in character, texture and durability to those used on nearby historic buildings are acceptable. These often include:
 - i. Louvered or solid panel wood (shutter)
 - ii. Louvered or solid panel composite
 - iii. Fabric (awning)

UNACCEPTABLE SHUTTER AND AWNING MATERIALS

- Materials that are not similar in character, texture and durability to those used on nearby historic buildings are unacceptable. These often include:
 - i. Lightweight plastic (shutter)
 - ii. Metal (awning)

4. **7.0** In order to assure that historic resources are appreciated as authentic contributing buildings, it is important that new buildings be distinguishable from them. Therefore, new construction should appear as a product of its own time, while also being compatible with the historically significant features of the area...Building materials and finishes for new structures...should contribute to the visual continuity of the district and appear similar to those seen traditionally.
5. **7.30** Orient a new commercial building to be similar to that of nearby historic structures.
 - Place buildings in line with adjacent historic buildings in terms of relationship to the street. If a project is flanked by non-historic structures, refer to nearby historic structures.
 - Design side setbacks to be similar to those in adjacent historic buildings. If a project is flanked by non-historic structures refer to nearby historic structures.
 - Orient façades of new commercial buildings similarly to adjacent historic structures. In most cases, new commercial structures should be oriented to directly face the street.
 - Face primary building entries toward the public street.
 - Screen ancillary buildings or place them behind the primary building.
6. **7.34** Design a building to be compatible with massing and scale with historic structures in the district.
 - Design building massing to reflect massing of nearby historic structures.
 - Where the volume of new construction is larger than historic structures in the district, break down the massing into smaller components to increase compatibility.
 - Limit the height or the perceived height of buildings to be similar to heights of nearby historic structures.
 - Use vertical and horizontal articulation design techniques to reduce the apparent scale of a larger building mass.
 - Incorporate changes in color, texture and materials.
 - Use architectural details to create visual interest.
 - Use materials that help to convey scale in their proportion, detail and form.
7. **7.35** Design building massing and scale to maintain the visual continuity of the district.
 - Incorporate floor-to-floor heights that appear similar to those of traditional commercial buildings in Mobile.
 - Design a new structure to incorporate a traditional base, middle and cap.
8. **7.36** Maintain traditional spacing patterns created by the repetition of building widths along the street.

- Proportion a new façade to reflect the established range of traditional building widths seen in Mobile.
 - Where a structure must exceed a traditional building width, use changes in building configuration, articulation or design features such as materials, window design, façade height or decorative details to break the façade into modules that suggest traditional building widths.
9. **7.37** Design the massing and scale of new commercial construction to be compatible with historic commercial structures in the district.
- Design building massing to establish a consistent street wall similar to that of nearby or adjacent historic commercial buildings.
 - Where there is an established street wall height on a block, provide additional setbacks for floors above the established street wall height in order to maintain the perceived height of buildings along the street. Ensure that this treatment is permitted by base zoning.

COMMERCIAL CORRIDOR CONTEXT

- New commercial construction in the Commercial Corridor context should exhibit massing and scale that is similar to adjacent and nearby historic residential structures in the district. The design of massing and scale of buildings should also consider relationships to rear-adjacent historic residential structures.
10. **7.40** Maintain the distinction between the street level and upper floor on multi-story structures.
- Incorporate a high percentage of transparent glass into the first floor of the primary façade.
 - Design upper floors to appear more opaque than the street level.
 - Express the distinction in floor heights between street levels and upper levels through detailing, materials and fenestration. The presence of a belt course is an important feature in this relationship.
 - Do not use highly reflective or darkly tinted glass.
11. **7.41** Maintain the traditional spacing pattern created by upper story windows.
- Use traditional proportions of windows, individually or in groups.
 - Maintain the traditional placement of window headers and sills relative to cornices and belt courses.
12. **10.5** Visually connect the street and building.
13. **10.7** Minimize the visual impact of parking.
- Locate a parking area at the rear or to the side of a site whenever possible.
 - Use landscaping to screen a parking area.
 - Minimize the widths of a paved area or a curb cut.
 - If a curb cut is no longer in use, repair the curb. In some areas, granite curbs may be required.
 - Do not use paving in the front yard for a parking area. Paving stones might be acceptable in certain instances.
 - Do not create a new driveway or garage that opens onto a primary street.

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)

14. **10.10** In commercial areas, consider using landscaping to screen and soften the appearance of surface parking areas. Use an internal and perimeter landscaping treatment to screen a fenced or walled parking area

STAFF ANALYSIS

The subject property is a vacant lot within the Lower Dauphin Commercial District. The application under review seeks approval for the construction of a five-floor hotel with associated parking lot to the north, on the other side of St. Michael Street. The proposed site does fall within the commercial corridor.

The *Guidelines* call for the design of new commercial structures to be compatible with Mobile's historic districts. One important element that determines compatibility is placement and orientation of the building. The *Guidelines* direct that newly constructed commercial structures be oriented on the lot in a similar way to those of nearby historic structures. Orientation includes its setback from the ROW, along with side setbacks. The placement of the structure does not conflict with the *Guidelines'* directions to "Place buildings in line with adjacent historic buildings in terms of relationship to the street" and "Design side setbacks to be similar to those in adjacent historic buildings." (7.30)

The proposed hotel would have two primary entrances. One primary entrance will be located on the east elevation facing N Joachim Street, which would align with the *Guidelines'* instruction that a new building's primary entries should be oriented toward a public street. (7.30) The second entrance will be on the west elevation facing the parking lot.

The *Guidelines* also discuss the importance of the massing and scale of a new structure for compatibility with the surrounding district. Here, the *Guidelines* direct that a new structure should be designed to "reflect massing of nearby structures"; and specifies that "where the volume of new construction is larger than historic structures in the district, break down the massing into smaller components to increase compatibility" with the use of vertical and horizontal expression, limiting the building's visual height, and integrating color, material, and texture variations (7.34-7.37). The proposed five-floor structure would be marginally taller than the surrounding commercial structures. The floor-to-floor fenestration, horizontal banding, and inclusion of a visual base, middle, and cap serve to establish a sense of human scale along the elevations and maintain continuity of the district. However, the proposed structure exceeds traditional building widths and heights. In this case, the *Guidelines* call for the incorporation of changes in configuration, height, and setbacks (especially for floors above established street wall height), and other decorative details to visually break up the excess.

The commercial massing of the proposed structure does fit within the context of the historic development along the street. Although the structure attempts to incorporate design features and variations along the elevations to create visual continuity and compatibility along the historic streetscape (7.34); it falls short of fully accomplishing the *Guidelines* directives regarding creating compatibility with massing and scale,

Example of nearby buildings with comparable massing include the Coastal Bank and Trust at 172 Saint Francis Street, 169 Dauphin Street, The Steeple at 251 St. Francis Street. The Hilton Garden Inn at 15 N Conception Street is an example of a new five-floor structure that has integrated design features to visually break up massing and scale.

Regarding the fenestration, the proposed aluminum windows and doors are approved materials for use in historic districts (6.45). The rhythm of windows would be sympathetic to the surrounding historic structures and would be evenly dispersed across the two façade elevations facing Francis Street and N Joachim Street. Additionally, the windows on the first floor would be full length to match the height of the primary entry on the east façade. The first floor of the central tower will be open to a recessed outdoor dining area, separated from the street with planters. Fabric awnings with aluminum framing will be fitted above the first-floor windows and openings along the east and south façades, with the exception of the openings on the darker brick tower. The simple design of the awning and the materials selected are compatible with the building and district (6.46-6.47).

While new buildings in historic districts should be compatible with the surrounding district, it is critical that they not attempt to recreate historic structures but be distinguishable from them. As the *Guidelines* state, “new construction should appear as a product of its own time, while also being compatible with the historically significant features of the area.” (7.0) In that vein, building materials and finishes for new structures should be visually similar to those seen traditionally, but they need not match. The exterior colored brick and stucco of the proposed hotel are visually similar to traditional material used in commercial and institutional construction in Mobile.

The proposed site improvements include the implementation of a landscape plan which includes hardscaping, soft scaping, a dumpster with an enclosure, and parking to the west of the structure and north of St Michael Street.

The *Guidelines* direct that there should be a visual connection between the street and a building in a historic district (10.5). This is accomplished due to the building’s appropriate setbacks on the south and east elevations which provide continuity with the district and create an appropriate connection between the sidewalk and main entrance on the southeast corner. There will be two asphalt parking areas. One directly to the west of the proposed hotel with approximately fourteen (14) spaces and another parking area to include approximately sixty-six (66) spaces, located to the north of the building, across St Michael Street. The *Guidelines* instruct that the visual impact of parking should be minimized (10.7). The utilization and placement of the proposed landscaping accomplishes this by screening the primary parking areas. The proposed concrete and asphalt paving materials are approvable under the *Guidelines*. (10.7,10.10)

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Steve Stone, on behalf of Shree Kishan MOB LLC, presented the project to the Board.

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Cartledge Blackwell suggested blind fenestration on the north side of the structure to break up the façade.

Mr. Stone agreed with Mr. Blackwell.

Mr. Blackwell suggested to the applicant that galleries be added along the street.

Mr. Stone responded that cost would be an issue to the owner. He stated that there will be other outdoor gathering areas along the street.

Mr. Blackwell asked the applicant about the location of the dumpster.

Mr. Stone replied that the location was chosen so that the garbage truck could access from the street without having to navigate the parking lot.

Ms. Karrie Maurin asked about the recesses.

Mr. Stephen McNair asked the applicant about the mechanical equipment on the roof.

Mr. Stone said that the equipment would be shielded from the street with the height of the parapet wall.

Mr. McNair asked about street lighting.

Mr. Stone replied that the owner is hoping to get funding for street lighting.

Ms. Maurin suggested a blade sign.

Mr. Stone said that a blade sign had been considered but there was concern about visibility. He continued that an application for signage would be submitted at a later date.

Ms. Jennifer Roselius agreed with the suggestion Mr. Blackwell made about adding blind windows on the west side of the north elevation facing St. Michael Street and south side of west elevation.

Mr. Stephen Howle agreed.

Ms. Roselius asked about amending the application to add the blind fenestration.

FINDING FACTS

Mr. Barja Wilson moved to find the facts as amended noting that the blind fenestration will be brought to the Board at a later date.

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

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



Agenda Item #5

Certified Record 2026-30-CA

DETAILS

Location:

960 Dauphin Street

Summary of Request:

After-the-fact approval to remove original doors, transoms, and sidelights from the south façade and replace with new wood doors that do not match existing.

Applicant (as applicable):

Robert Brown

Property Owner:

Same

Historic District:

Old Dauphin Way

Classification:

Contributing

Summary of Analysis:

- The *Guidelines* do not allow for removal of original features that can be repaired. If original features must be replaced due to damage or deterioration, the *Guidelines* explicitly state that the new feature must match existing in material, placement, dimension, style, and molding profiles.
- The historic doors, transoms, and sidelights had been fully repaired, painted, and fitted with new hardware immediately prior to their removal.
- All materials remain on site and are in repairable condition.
- **Update:** The applicant has submitted drawings proposing a new design for a single door with flanking sidelights. The proposed design does not replicate the original historic details and significantly alters the relative proportions of the door, sidelights, and transom.

Report Contents:

Property and Application History	2
Scope of Work	2
Applicable Standards	4
Staff Analysis	6
Attachments	9

PROPERTY AND APPLICATION HISTORY

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

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

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

In 2003, the ARB approved the addition of a screened porch at the northwest corner of the house, the enclosure with glass of the existing two-story gallery on the east elevation of the rear service wing, installation of a 6’ privacy fence, and the construction of a porte-cochere. It appears the screened porch and porte-cochere were never constructed. In November 2020, the ARB approved the construction of a two-story addition on the east side of the rear wing; construction of a free-standing two-car garage; construction of a porte-cochere; fenestration changes to an apparent 20th-century rear addition, east elevation, and south elevation; and construction of a gate beside the driveway. Before this work could be completed, the ARB reviewed and approved another application in April 2021 to complete similar work, including construction of a two-story porch on the east elevation of the rear wing; construction of a two-car attached garage; and fenestration changes to the east and south elevations and to a rear addition. It appears that these projects were stalled during the selective demolition phase and were never completed.

In May 2024, the Board approved the construction of a two-story porch and a deck on the east side elevation of a 19th-century addition, minor changes to the fenestration pattern, and wholesale replacement of existing windows. In November 2024, the Board agreed to amend the previous to allow the applicant to alter window sizes to allow installation of stock instead of custom windows. At the same time, the Board approved replacing the wood siding on sides and rear with fiber cement siding and some minor alterations to the design of the previously approved two-story side porch. At both hearings in 2024, the scope of work included repairing and preserving in place the historic doors, sidelights, and transoms on the south façade.

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Replace original wood paneled doors and surrounds with new multi-light doors.
 - a. Remove both historic doors – including associated historic trim, sidelights, and transoms – from the south street-facing façade.
 - b. Replace the original main entry door and sidelights with double-leaf multi-light wood doors with no sidelights and a simple rectangular transom.
 - c. Replace the historic center door on the second-floor gallery with a single multi-light wood door with a simple rectangular transom.
2. Remove existing square tile porch deck and replace with rectangular ceramic tiles.

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

1. **5.4** Preserve original building materials.
 - Repair deteriorated building materials by patching, piecing-in, consolidating or otherwise reinforcing the material.
 - Remove only those materials which are deteriorated, and beyond reasonable repair.
 - Do not remove original materials that are in good condition.
2. **5.6** Use original materials to replace damaged materials on primary surfaces where possible.
 - Use original materials to replace damaged building materials on a primary façade if possible.
 - Do not replace building materials on the primary façade, such as wood siding and masonry, with alternative or imitation materials unless it cannot be avoided.
3. **5.14** Preserve the decorative and functional features of a primary door.
 - Original doors and openings, including their dimensions, should be retained along with any moldings, transoms or sidelights.
 - Maintain the original position and proportions of a historically significant door.
4. **5.15** Repair or replace a damaged historic door to maintain its general historic appearance.
 - Replacement should reflect the age and style of the building.
 - Use materials that are visually comparable to that of the original.
5. **5.17** Preserve historic stylistic and architectural details and ornamentation.
 - Retain historic details and ornamentation intact.
 - Retain and treat exterior stylistic features and examples of skilled craftsmanship with sensitivity.
 - Repair historic details and ornamentation that are deteriorated.
6. **5.19** Where repair is impossible, replace details and ornamentation accurately
 - When replacing historic details, match the original in profile, dimension, and material.
7. **6.5** Repair a porch in a way that maintains the original character.
8. **6.6** If replacement is required, design it to reflect the time period of the historic structure.
 - Replace a historic porch element to match the original.
 - Use replacement materials and elements that are appropriate to the style, texture, finish, composition, and proportion of the historic structure.

STAFF ANALYSIS for May 20, 2026

The subject property is a contributing structure to the Old Dauphin Way Historic District. The application under review proposes removing the original Italianate door and surround from the main entry. The two façade doors and their surrounds are some of the last remaining elements original to the c. 1860 structure. The main entry door especially is highly indicative of the Italianate style, and its survival over the last 165 years are a testament to its excellent craftsmanship and material integrity. The application proposes replacing both the main entry and the second-floor gallery door with modern multi-light wood doors that are incompatible with the period and style of the c. 1860 Italianate-style residence. The property owner has also replaced a non-original tile floor with a modern tile floor that is not compatible in style with the dwelling.

Incompatible Replacement of Façade Doors

The *Design Guidelines* clearly state original building materials be retained and repaired wherever possible (5.4). The *Guidelines* dictate that character-defining features, and especially primary entrances, are to be preserved in their original condition wherever possible (5.4, 5.14, 5.15, 5.17). If repair of these features is not possible, the *Guidelines* stipulate that any replacements match the original in material, location, dimension, and proportions. Decorative moldings and ornaments are to be replicated as closely as possible (5.19).

While staff agree that the main entry showed considerable signs of wear, onsite inspections during the construction process indicated that the paneled wood door, sidelights, transom, and decorative trim could be repaired. Staff received no communication during the construction process that repair of either of the two façade door assemblies was not possible. On the contrary, prior to their removal, both façade doors and their surrounds had been repaired and painted in the white and black color scheme used on the rest of the residence. New hardware had been installed on the main entry door, suggesting it was operable. Upon receiving a 311 complaint that both doors had been replaced, staff visited the site and found that the contractor had salvaged both doors as well as their decorative surrounds, transoms, and sidelights. Workmen onsite assured staff that the doors and surrounds could be reinstalled in their original location and condition.

If for any reason the doors and surrounds could not be reinstalled, the *Guidelines* specify that a new door and surrounds would need to match the original as closely as possible. Since the original door and trim survive, it would be possible to have them replicated exactly in an insect-resistant wood such as mahogany. In contrast, the current replacement doors do not replicate any detail of the original. The original single-leaf entry door with transoms has been replaced with a double-leaf door without transoms. The new trim is lacking in the characteristic detail and depth of the original Italianate door surrounds. The new multi-light doors are themselves a significant departure from the historic solid wood paneled doors.

Ceramic Floor Tiles at Porch

Where the original porch floor is no longer extant, the *Guidelines* support installing a porch material that might have existed at the time the home was constructed (6.5, 6.6). When the home was constructed in about 1860, the most common porch type for the period would have been tongue-and-groove wood planks. Some high-style dwellings from the period featured mosaic floors made with either terra cotta or stone tiles. These were typically di- or polychromatic mosaics using square, hexagonal, or octagonal tiles made of either terra cotta or stone (see images 11 and 12).

Prior to this most recent renovation, the porch floor at 960 Dauphin was clad in a square ceramic tile that did not appear to be original. The original porch material is unknown. The newly installed tile floor features rectangular tiles of a single color in a simple running bond. This gives the tile floor a much more modern appearance than what would be expected of a c. 1860 dwelling. However, the material itself is one that would have been historically available, and the tile floor is minimally visible from the public right-of-way.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY May 20, 2026

Mr. Robert Brown, owner of the subject property, presented the project to the Board.

Charles McLeod came forward to speak against the application. He stated the home was constructed by his great grandparents and that if the door had to be replaced due to damage, the replacement door should match the original main entry door.

BOARD DISCUSSION May 20, 2026

Ms. Karrie Maurin asked the applicant what porch materials had been used.

Mr. Brown replied that the porch needed to be rebuilt and is poured concrete to match the previous porch with a different tiled surface.

Mr. Brown claimed he misread the original scope of work on the COA that was issued and that the front door has sustained significant damage.

Ms. Jennifer Roselius stated that the front door, if approved for replacement, should have been replaced in-kind with a similar door to the original.

Mr. Brown stated that replacing the door to match existing or repairing the door in-kind was cost prohibitive.

Ms. Karrie Maurin asked the applicant if he consulted an architect about the doors.

Ms. Annie Sawyer Allen provided that staff advised the applicant to repair the doors if necessary. She added during a site visit, staff observed the first-floor front door and surround. The door, casing, and surround had been sanded, painted and adorned with new hardware. They did not appear to be in need of repairs.

Ms. Maurin asked the applicant who fabricated the door.

Mr. Brown responded Jemison Window and Doors.

Ms. Roselius asked staff and fellow board members if they believe the original door is repairable.

Ms. Allen replied that no professional assessment of the condition of the door had been provided, but reiterated that during the site visit, it did not seem that the door was beyond repair.

Ms. Maurin asked the applicant why a similar door to the original was not procured from Jennison.

Ms. Roselius stated that the replacement door on the second floor and the tile on the front porch could be approved. However, consideration of the first-floor primary door should be tabled, to give the applicant time to propose an alternative to the newly installed first-floor door.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Mr. Stephen Howle motioned to table the application.

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

UPDATE for June 17, 2026

The proposal to replicate the original door and surround using new materials would result in the loss of significant historic material. This would violate the directive in the Design Guidelines that original building materials should be retained and repaired wherever possible (5.4).

At the hearing on May 20, the applicant presented images of termite and other forms of wood damage. These images include photographs of the door, the transom muntins, and modern framing inside the building wall. None of the photographs depict the condition of the sidelights, sidelight surround, dentils, or other exterior molding. The photographs cannot therefore establish that the entire surround is compromised.

The photographs of termite damage are exclusively of modern wood framing inside the building walls. Photographs of the historic door and transom do not depict significant termite damage. Old growth wood is known to be far more resistant to termite attack than modern lumber. The door also appears to be made of mahogany, a naturally insect-resistant wood.

Photos of the transom show relatively minor damage that could be repaired with dutchman and/or a wood epoxy. The black material shown on the transom in one photograph appears to be surface mildew, which would not compromise the integrity of the wood itself.

Photographs do show more significant damage to the door itself. This degree of damage may require extensive dutchman repairs that would impact the visual appearance of a stained door. However, these repairs would not be easily visible on a painted door.

The quality of the historic wood materials, their location under a protective porch, the fact that the door and surround had been finished and painted in the new white and black color scheme prior to their removal, suggest that the door and surround were in repairable condition.

The CAD drawings submitted do not replicate the intricate detail of the historic surround. They also significantly alter the relative proportions of the door, transom, and sidelights. The neoclassical pilasters on either side of the door are not present at all in the new drawing. Instead of the tripartite transom of the original, the proposed drawing has a single 4-light transom. The door has been simplified, and its 1-over-1 wood panels are far more typical of the early 20th century than the c. 1860 construction date of the subject property. The dentil molding is entirely out of scale. While the new design would be a significant improvement over the current multi-light French doors, it does not faithfully replicate the original Italianate door and surround.

As the Guidelines clearly state, that replacements of known historic details must “match the original in profile, dimension, and material (5.19).” Since the exact style and detailing of the original door and

surround is well documented, the only appropriate reproduction, according to the *Guidelines*, is one that fully and faithfully replicates the original. The proposed design does not meet this standard.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY June 17, 2026

Mr. Robert Brown, owner of the subject property, presented the project to the Board.

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

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Meredith Wilson and Mr. Bruce McGowin provided context for the application.

Mr. Brown stated that the door, sidelights, and transom will be restored by NOLA Wood Windows and the dental molding and jamb will be rebuilt by Oakleigh Custom Woodwork.

Ms. Jennifer Roselius clarified that the door, sidelights, and transoms would be restored.

Ms. Karrie Maurin asked about timeline for the project.

Mr. Brown replied that he was unsure until NOLA Wood Windows provides him with more details. Ms. Maurin asked staff about the repercussions if Mr. Brown does not replace the door as stated.

Staff replied that a notice of violation would be issued.

Mr. Cartledge Blackwell asked the applicant if the door and surrounds will look like the original.

Mr. Brown replied that they would.

Mr. Stephen Howle asked for clarification about what is being approved by the Board.

Staff replied that the new scope of work Mr. Brown presented to the Board during the meeting is being approved, as opposed to the scope submitted in the application.

FINDING FACTS

Mr. Cartledge Blackwell moved to find the facts as amended to note that the original door, sidelights, and transoms will be restored in-kind and the jamb and dental molding will be replicated in-kind.

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

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

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

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

Meeting adjourned at 4:11 PM